43725

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Il Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

MUHAMMAD SIDDIQUE

te of Birth — Date de naissance

8 April 1946

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

PAKISTAN

rmanent Address — Résidence fixe

77 COLUMBIA Dr. SASKATOON, SASK.

le of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

WORK AND FAMILY IN A CONTEMPORARY URBAN-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: AN ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN DATA.

iversity — Université

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

gree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ar this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1980

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

JAMES L. TURK

rmission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF NADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of e film.

e author reserves other publication rights, and neither the esis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherse reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

te

MARCH 28, 1980

Signature

C. M. Siddique

-91 (4/77)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

uality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon ality of the original thesis submitted for microfilm- very effort has been made to ensure the highest of reproduction possible.

pages are missing, contact the university which d the degree.

me pages may have indistinct print especially if iginal pages were typed with a poor typewriter or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

eviously copyrighted materials (journal articles, ned tests, etc.) are not filmed.

eproduction in full or in part of this film is governed Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. read the authorization forms which accompany esis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

3/77)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

WORK AND FAMILY IN A CONTEMPORARY URBAN-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: AN ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN DATA

by

C. Muhammad Siddique

Department of Sociology

A Thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Toronto

© C. Muhammad Siddique 1980

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

II

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

MANUSCRIPT THESIS

AUTHORITY TO DISTRIBUTE

NOTE: The AUTHOR will sign in one of the two places indicated. It is the intention of the University that there be NO RESTRICTION on the distribution of the publication of theses save in exceptional cases.

(a) Immediate publication in microform by the National Library is authorized.

Author's signature ...C. M. Siddiqee... Date ..28.3.1980

or

(b) Publication by the National Library is to be postponed until ..... 19.. (normal maximum delay is two years). Meanwhile this thesis may not be consulted in the University Library except with written permission on each occasion from me.

Author's signature ..... Date .....

This restriction is authorized for reasons which seem to me, as Head of the Graduate Department of ..... , to be sufficient.

Signature of Graduate Department Head .....

Date .....

BORROWERS undertake to give proper credit for any use made of the thesis, and to obtain the consent of the author if it is proposed to make extensive quotations, or to reproduce the thesis in whole or in part.

Signature of borrower	Address	Date

A

SED AUGUST 1973

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PROGRAM OF THE FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OF

MUHAMMAD SIDDIQUE

2:00 p.m., Friday, March 28, 1980

Room 307, 63 St. George Street

WORK AND FAMILY IN A CONTEMPORARY URBAN-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: AN ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN DATA

Committee in Charge:

Professor N.C. Field, Chairman
Professor N. Bell
Professor C. Carrise, External Examiner
Professor N. Howell
Professor W. Kalbach
Professor J. Reitz
Professor B. Schlesinger
Professor J. Turk, Supervisor

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

M. Siddique

WORK AND FAMILY IN A CONTEMPORARY URBAN-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: AN ANALYSIS OF CANADIAN DATA

This dissertation examines the articulation between work and family systems in a sample of urban families who live in a highly industrialized city of Canada. Empirically, the problem investigated deals with an analysis of the degree of differentiation and jointness in family activities in relation to the work experience of wage-earners.

The existing research on work and family has not succeeded in providing a clear conception of the linkages between different aspects of work and family systems. The findings accumulated by other studies that have tended to seek explanations of differentiation by concentrating on the socio-economic status (SES) of the family and its network connectedness, are only of limited value. Our critical analysis of this literature reveals meagre support for the SES hypothesis and an inconclusive picture of the network hypothesis.

We developed a tentative theoretical model in which we conceptualized differentiation and jointness as modes of adaption. These modes indicate two of the several possible ways by which the family adapts or adjusts its internal and external activities to the exigencies of the world of work.

With respect to family, we identified four subtypes of family activities: two of these, family tasks and decisions, relate to internal activities of the family, and the other two, primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity, to its domain of external activities. In regard to the work system, we concentrated on the following three structural components: work setting, content of work, and work career. Operationally, we

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

defined work setting as to its level of bureaucratization, work content in terms of its social complexity, and career as to the degree of orderliness.

The three components of work were linked with four aspects of family activities. This generated 12 theoretical hypotheses. Briefly stated, we expected that the families of wage-earners who work in bureaucratic organizations, and those who hold less socially complex jobs, and those whose careers have been less orderly would be more likely to adapt to a differentiated mode of participation in each aspect of internal and external family activities.

These hypotheses were tested with data on 105 intact, single-earner families where either husband or wife worked as a primary wage-earner. This sub-sample was derived from a larger sample of 211 East York families who participated in The Family Dynamics Study.

All 12 hypotheses were substantiated by the empirical evidence. The observed patterns of family activities were largely invariant among families having different levels of network involvements and were only moderately affected by their SES. Further examination of the data generated findings which were opposite to the network hypothesis.

We interpreted these findings as indicative of greater strength for our explanation of family differentiations than the one offered by SES and network studies.

The findings of this research have implications of particular relevance to the study of work and family in contemporary urban-industrial societies. They make it clear that the social experience of industrial workers is not segmental as some earlier writers have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tended to believe. And unlike much of the current theorizing in stratification research, these findings indicate that work can no longer be considered an invididual activity. To increase involvement in family life that may allow a greater jointness, the need for certain fundamental alterations in the work system seems apparent. This implies that the modern developments of industrialization must be subordinated to socio-political policies sensitive to the existence of dual linkages between work and family worlds.

In future research there is a need for shifting the conventional focus from SES and networks to micro studies of work-family linkages. Special attention must be given to a specification of the process by which work and family systems affect each other. For a better understanding of the reciprocal effects of work and family, future research must recognize the importance of developing more dynamic and interactional models.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: C. Muhammad Siddique

HOME ADDRESS: 77 Columbia Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
(Phone number: (306)665-3067

MAILING ADDRESS: c/o Department of Sociology,
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask. S7N 0W0

DATE OF BIRTH: April 1947

MARITAL STATUS: Single

NATIONALITY: Canadian citizen

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION:

Year	Degree	Major Area	University
1968	B.A.	Economics	University of Panjab, Lahore, Panjab
1970	M.A.	Sociology	University of Panjab, Lahore, Panjab
1974	M.A.	Sociology	University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
1972-73	Ph.D. (Student)	Sociology	University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
1973-80	Ph.D. (Student)	Sociology	University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS: i) University of Panjab Merit Scholarship (1968-1970)
ii) University of Saskatchewan Fellowship (1971-1973)

Ph.D. COMPREHENSIVE AREAS: Bureaucracy and Complex Organizations;
Sociology of the Family.

Ph.D. THESIS TITLE: Work and Family in a Comtenporary Urban-Industrial Society:
An Analysis of Canadian Data.

Ph.D. THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Professor James L. Turk (supervisor)
Professor Norman W. Bell
Professor Jeffrey G. Reitz

AREAS OF INTEREST: Research Methods and Data Analysis
Social Theory: Classical and Contemporary
Sociology of Economic Development and Change
Sociology of the Family

TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

1970-1971 Lecturer University of Panjab, Lahore, Panjab. (Courses taught: Industrial Sociology; Research Methods; General Sociology)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1971-1973	Teaching Assistant	University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask.
1973-1977	Teaching Assistant	University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario. (Courses assisted: Social Statistics, Research Methods and Data Analysis; Complex Organizations; Criminology; Social Change; General Sociology)
1974	Research Associate (part-time)	Metropolitan Hospital Planning Council, Toronto, Ontario
1977-1978	Assistant Professor	Department of Sociology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask. (Courses taught: Canadian Society: Structure and Change; History of Social Theory; General Sociology)
1979-1980	Revised the Ph.D. thesis	

M.A. THESES TITLES

1970 *The Effects of Relative Deprivation on Academic Achievements*, University of Panjab, Lahore, Panjab.

1974 *Patterns of Familial Decision-Making and Division of Labor*, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask.

PUBLICATIONS:

(Spring 1977) "Structural Separation and Family Change", *International Review of Modern Sociology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 13-34.

(Summer 1977) "Changing Family Patterns: A Comparative Analysis", *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, vol. VIII, no. 2, pp. 179-200.

(September 1977) "On Migrating to Canada: The First Generation Indian and Pakistani Families in the Process of Change", *Sociological Bulletin*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 203-226.

(June 1978) "Social Structural Pressures to Change", *Asian Profile*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 231-247.

(1980) "Conflict and Change: The Socialization of the First Generation of Immigrants" (under review)

PAPERS PRESENTED:

1974 "The Role of Military in the Political System of Developing Countries: The Case of Pakistan—1947-1971", *VIII World Congress of Sociology*, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

EXTRACURRICULAR INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES:

1968-1969	President, Panjab University Sociological Association, Lahore, Panhab
1972-1973	President, International Students' Union, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask.
1978-1979	President, Pakistan-Canada Cultural Association, Saskatoon, Sask.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
One	WORK AND FAMILY WORLDS: INTRODUCING THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Two	THE FAMILY AND ITS SOCIAL CONTEXT: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE AND FORMULATION OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	15
Three	THE FAMILY DYNAMICS STUDY: DESCRIPTION OF EAST YORK FAMILIES AND THE SUB-SAMPLE	95
Four	THE STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF WORK AND FAMILY SYSTEMS: MEASUREMENT PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THEORETICAL CONCEPTS	121
Five	WORK AND FAMILY MODES OF ADAPTATION: TESTING RESEARCH HYPOTHESES WITH EAST YORK DATA	161
Six	WORK AND FAMILY IN CONTEMPORARY INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH	214
BIBLIOGRAPHY		247
APPENDICES		
APPENDIX A	SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON SES HYPOTHESIS	265
APPENDIX B	SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON BOTT'S NETWORK-HYPOTHESIS	268
APPENDIX C	A COPY OF THE REFERENCE LETTER	270
APPENDIX D	TABLES FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS	273

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have valuably contributed to this dissertation. Though I shall name only a few, I am deeply indebted to all others as well.

Special thanks must go to Dr. James L. Turk, both as a teacher and my Ph.D. supervisor. I have benefited from Professor Turk in numerous ways. He has been most generous with his time and very kind in sharing his ideas and research interests with me. At each stage of this dissertation, he worked very closely with me and always encouraged me to develop my own ideas. Without his sustained attention, searching discussion, and candid criticism on each draft, the completion of this dissertation could never have been possible. For this, I am thankful to Professor Turk.

I express my gratitude to Dr. Norman W. Bell for making fruitful suggestions at the inception of this dissertation and for offering extremely perceptive and useful comments upon several drafts. These suggestions and comments proved of immense help in clarifying my thinking and in bringing the dissertation to its final drafting. The occasional discussions which I have had with Professor Bell were always intellectually stimulating and a learning experience.

Dr. Jeffery G. Reitz has continuously encouraged me with his valuable criticism and sage advice. His contribution has been of great importance not only with regard to the theoretical matters explored in the dissertation but also in regard to my method of presentation of the material.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The larger research project of which this study is a part was financed by the Vanier Institute, the Laidlaw Foundation, and the Clarke Institute Research Fund. I record my acknowledgement of this aid.

I am most indebted to the people who provided the substance for this inquiry: the East York families; whom I never saw in person but whose experience of work and family life I have shared in this dissertation.

To Hazel Bartolo of Toronto for typing a number of earlier copies of the thesis and to Mrs. Mary-Ann Barr of Saskatoon for typing and re-typing until it reached its present form, I offer my thanks with appreciation.

I wish to thank all of my friends, fellow students and colleagues for sharing several critical moments involved in thinking and writing of this dissertation with tolerance and good humor.

Finally, my greatest indebtedness remains to my family members for giving me encouragement to undertake the Ph.D. program and for bearing with me throughout the duration of this program. I am particularly grateful to my elder brother, Chaudhary M. Ali, who had been the main source of inspiration, intellectual support, and financial help during all the years of my studentship. By way of expressing my gratitude to my brother, I hereby *dedicate* this dissertation to him.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 3.1	Distribution of East York Families by Life-Cycle Stages	97
Table 3.2	Number and Sampling Ratios for Standard-Sized Samples of East York Families	98
Table 3.3	Life-Cycle Distribution of East York Families Completing Both Phases of the Study: The Larger Sample	100
Table 3.4	Life-Cycle Distribution of Single-Earner Families: The Sub-Sample	104
Table 3.5	Size of Families and Number of Family Members Living in Household	106
Table 3.6	Family Religion	107
Table 3.7	Family Ethnicity	109
Table 3.8	Generation in Canada	110
Table 3.9	Level of Education	112
Table 3.10	Family Income	113
Table 3.11	Occupational Status	115
Table 4.1	Family Task Index	128
Table 4.2	Family Decision Index	132
Table 4.3	Primary-Level Activity Index	139
Table 4.4	Organization-Focussed Activity Index	142
Table 4.5	Intercorrelations (Zero-Order) between Sub-Types of Intra-Family Interaction and Extra-Family Social Activity	143

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

		Page
Table 4.6	Intercorrelations between Structural Components of the Work System	150
Table 5.1	Summary of Findings on Major Research Hypotheses (Pearson's r)	164
Table 5.2a	Modes of Adaptation to Family Tasks by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates	171
Table 5.2b	Modes of Adaptation to Family Decisions by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates	174
Table 5.3a	Modes of Adaptation to Primary-Level Activity by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates	176
Table 5.3b	Modes of Adaptation to Organization-Focussed Activity by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates	178
Table 5.4	Zero-Order Correlation Matrix	181
Table 5.5a	Regression of Family Task Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors	183
Table 5.5b	Regression of Family Decision Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors	187
Table 5.6a	Regression of Primary-Level Activity Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors	189
Table 5.6b	Regression of Organization-Focussed Activity Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors	191
Appendix D		
Table 1	Regression of Family Task Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables	274

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Page

Table 2 Regression of Family Decision Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables 275

Table 3 Regression of Primary-Level Activity Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables 276

Table 4 Regression of Organization-Focussed Activity Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables 277

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER ONE

WORK AND FAMILY WORLDS: INTRODUCING THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The Research Problem

This thesis seeks to explore the process by which work and family systems are related. The impetus for this comes from the fact that this area has elicited only the most perfunctory consideration. Due to scant theoretical and empirical literature, several conceptions about the nature of interaction between work and family have tended to persist although they have rarely been examined for their validity.

The research problem which we propose to investigate deals with the influence of work organizations, job content, and career patterns on family life. Analytically, the problem involves an examination of the degree of differentiation or jointness in family interaction and external social activities in relation to the work experience of wage-earners. It is this area which has been largely neglected in the past.

We conceive of differentiation and jointness in family activities as modes of adaptation.† The differentiated mode refers to a pattern of

† In this thesis, differentiation and jointness as "*modes of adaptation*" are considered as two of the several possible ways by which the *family* adapts or adjusts its internal and external activities to the exigencies of the world of work. An elaboration of the process of adaptation and a discussion of work conditions that influence the degree to which a family adapts to a given mode may be seen in chapter two.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

family life in which the members, husband-wife and the children, maintain a segregated participation in internal family activities relating to household tasks and decisions, and external social activities such as visiting kin, relatives and friends, including ties with formal clubs and voluntary associations. The individuals in such families who adapt to this pattern carry out their participation in these activities separately and independently of other family members. This may be contrasted with a joint mode where family members tend to practice an active interchangeability of their internal activities and a mutual sharing of external activities of a social nature. In reality, however, these patterns may occur in varying degrees among the families under investigation. Therefore, we shall view the research families as *relatively* joint or differentiated in terms of their participation in these domains of activities.

It is clear from this delineation of the concepts that differentiation and jointness in the context of this study denote patterns of organizing the family activities, and as such make no reference to the values or normative systems of the family. The families may, however, come to see a certain value in a given pattern or give it a particular meaning, and may incorporate it in their general value systems. But the major concern of this thesis is to examine these modes in their *behavioral manifestations* as indicated by the participation of family members in certain concrete sets of internal and external family activities.

There are two reasons for choosing this analytical focus. First, a study of family differentiation and jointness forms a continuous partnership with the interest shown by social scientists in the questions of "sexual division of labor" and "family companionship", and therefore,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

may allow drawing of implications of general relevance. Second, an analysis of family activities in terms of these patterns seems important for gaining insights into the nature of internal family life and external social ties which serve to connect the family with the larger community. Given this, an investigation of family activity patterns in the context of work world might enable us to uncover certain occupational conditions under which these characteristics of family life may vary.

The Relevance of Work

There are several theoretical and empirical considerations that lead us to assume the relevance of work experience to the problem of family differentiation. Theoretically we view work and family as social systems linked in intimate interchanges. The continuity of these interchanges is seen closely related with the adjustive efforts of family members which they make to lend support to their wage-earners. One important aspect of such efforts is likely to involve a structuring of family activities into differentiated or joint patterns so as to make them consistent with the work experience of wage-earners. In this regard, these modes constitute a focal point in the day-to-day articulation of work and family systems. It is this closeness between the work and family worlds which seems to facilitate the convergence of activities and orientations of their participants. Clearly then, the significance of work experience to an understanding of the problem of differentiation cannot be minimized.

The empirical consideration stems from the failure of the current research, that has tended to explain differentiation by concentrating on *socio-economic status* (SES) of the family and its *network connectedness*,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to offer a consistent set of findings. Both the *SES hypothesis*—suggesting an inverse relationship between differentiation and SES—and the *network hypothesis*—positing a direct relationship between differentiation and network connectedness—do not always produce a clear pattern of theoretically proposed relationships. The explanation of family differentiation presented by these approaches are only of marginal strength, and are often based on questionable assumptions. The overall variance in family differentiation accounted for by SES and network studies is too small to justify the attention which these variables has received. It is perhaps more important to note that these studies do not elucidate variations in differentiation among families subject to different job circumstances within the *same* category of class and social network.

This seems to indicate that an exclusionary focus of SES and network research has not sufficiently grappled with the volume of structural constraints on family life in modern industrial societies. The fact that occupational realities are more concrete and their impact sharper, a fuller understanding of the nature of family activities seems unlikely without considering the influence of work on the wage-earner and his family. Especially, since the work dimensions which we wish to examine represent dominant structural features of industrial societies, e.g., an increasing bureaucratization and mechanization of jobs, and fluctuations in career patterns, their effects are likely to be experienced by a large majority of workers. Indeed, their impact may transcend the boundaries of social classes and networks and may shape modes of family activities irrespective of these characteristics. This suggests that a potentially strong explanation of the problem of differentiation may come from the world of work.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The possibility of work having a close connection with family differentiation is also indicated by the existing research on work-family interrelations. Though the studies directly bearing on the problem of differentiation are fragmentary and unsystematic, there are numerous descriptive accounts that show the influence of certain aspects of work such as job autonomy, alienation, the nature of work setting, the type of job performed, time spent on the job, and the career experience on different realms of family life. With respect to the latter, these studies have addressed themselves to a host of diverse areas, including socialization philosophies, mental health, family cohesion and stability, marital adjustment, and the amount of involvement in family concerns. This body of literature—which we will review in chapter two—further documents the relevance of work to the problem of family differentiation. This means that a fresh and thorough look at the problem must be in order. The present study makes an effort in this direction.

The Conventional Explanations

In proposing to examine family differentiation in relation to work experience, we depart from the conventional SES and network studies in significant ways. As we will briefly note in this section, the major difference lies in the theoretical focus and the explanation of differentiation offered by SES and network research and the one we wish to develop in this thesis. The following summary comments are meant to place our study in its proper perspective. A detailed critique of empirical studies will be presented in chapter two.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

One common assumption which seems to run through SES and network studies is the continuity of early socialization between the family of orientation and the family of procreation. Briefly stated, the SES analysis suggests that the earlier sex-role images are likely to be sustained, especially *if* both spouses come from a similar class background and maintain their old connections with their families and peers. With regard to close-knit networks, it is their spatial stability which makes previously learned sex-segregated interests possible after marriage. And *if* the conditions are such that each spouse can retain his/her ties with the same sex, the differentiation within the family may continue itself. Several studies of SES and networks provide some evidence to show that these conditions are often met.

As we shall see in some detail in chapter two, the explanations of differentiation suggested by these studies are largely unstable, and partial at best.

By considering the close articulation between work and family systems of central importance, the present study stresses the role of *occupational socialization* in the process of adaptation. This socialization, which tends to shape the attitude and orientation of the wage-earner and other members, seems to influence the manner by which family structures its activities. This line of argument, which we will develop in this thesis, would enable us to accomplish the first step in shifting the focus of analysis from SES and networks to the effects of work on family life.

There is yet one other difference in the explanatory mode of this study and those of the SES and network studies. The link between SES and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

family behavior, for instance, seems to be developed by drawing upon the *correlates* of SES, e.g., a certain belief or value system. These values are assumed to affect family life by giving differential meanings to SES. Where this link is sought directly from the objective indices of SES—education, occupation, and income—*their* socio-psychological meanings for the worker and his family are rarely emphasized. Even no attempt is made to spell out the *process* by which these effects *displace* into the family. Instead, the argument looks to the overriding influence of values on the family; SES simply mediates this influence.

Elizabeth Bott, who first suggested the network hypothesis, has tried to establish a direct link between family differentiation and certain characteristics of social networks. Unlike SES studies, she also pays some attention to the process by which the effects of networks may pervade the family life. But her argument too is substantially weakened by her *presumption* as to the existence of different norms of behavior in close and loose networks. Without specifying the contents and composition of networks such an assumption seems untenable. Since without this assumption the network in itself becomes more than half theoretically empty, Bott was led to pose it as a mediating variable which "stands between the family and the total social environment." In this position, it seems to carry over the effects of physical and social mobility (or stability) to the family. No serious consideration is given to the influence of work on social networks and family life.

Recognizing the importance of work, the proposed study elaborates a case for viewing family differentiation in the context of work. In contrast to SES and network studies, it will offer a more systematic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

explanation of differentiation that will be derived from an examination of the *effects* of the objective job conditions, their pressures and constraints, on the family life of the worker. The distinctiveness of the present study may, therefore, be seen in its attempt to develop an *alternative approach* to look at the problem of differentiation. Second, by showing the relevance of work experience to family differentiation, this study would also hopefully add to our understanding of work-family relations, which the existing literature has seldom clarified.

The section that follows offers a brief introduction to the theoretical model with which we propose to investigate this problem empirically.

THEORETICAL MODEL

A notable lack of research on the articulation of family and work experience seems to have resulted from an interplay of various ideological factors and theoretical conventions which tend to consider work and family as separate worlds. These same reasons may be held partly responsible for a narrow focus on SES and networks since they seem to surround the social context of the family more immediately than the world of work.

This indicates that in order to initiate research in this area, it is essential that we begin to view work and family systems interlocked in close and subtle bonds where convergence of social experience is almost unavoidable. This suggests the need for developing models that would allow a deeper look into work-family transactions. The present study outlines a tentative model in chapter two. A resumé of the model and the hypothesized relationship between work and family variables is presented below.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Nature of Work-Family Linkages

Specifically, we consider the world of work critical in shaping individual behavior and personality. As a miniature society, it provides a social context where work socialization takes place. The content of this socialization seems to be affected in large measure by certain fundamental conditions of this context, such as the degree to which it is bureaucratized, the type of work a wage-earner performs and the nature of career experience. Consistent with these characteristics, the work socialization tends to instill certain distinct values, self-conceptions, and specific patterns of accommodation in the general orientation of the wage-earner and perhaps in his structure of consciousness. This leads to the development of a particular type of *work personality*, with which the wage-earner learns to cope with his "environment" that may consist of his work, family, and other spheres of concern.

It is this work personality which constitutes an important link between work and family systems—which are apparently segregated in the physical sense. It provides a sort of channel through which the wage-earners are likely to carry over work experience, certain pressures, and patterns of behavior to the family. In its adaptive response, the family seems to absorb these effects into its internal and external activities by changing them to joint or differentiated modes. It is then, this ongoing transaction between work and family, mediated by work personality, which tends to shape the modes of adaptation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Work and Family Variables

The main objective of this thesis is to explore the possible link between work and family differentiation closely and at a micro-level. To investigate this problem empirically, the thesis will offer a conceptual framework in chapter two which shall guide our selection of the relevant variables from work and family systems for analysis.

With respect to work, the variables include: *bureaucratization*, *social complexity*, and *work career*. The family activities are classifed into two major types: *intra-family interaction*, comprising of internal activities, and *extra-family social activities*, which include external activities of the family. For analytical purposes, the dimension of intra-family interaction is subdivided into *family tasks* and *decisions*, and *extra-family social activity* into *primary-level activity* and *organization-focussed activity*. It is in these four sub-types of family activities that we intend to explore the extent of *jointness* or *differentiation* in relation to the aforementioned three work variables.

The prediction of given patterns would be based on the specification of an elaborate theoretical process that connects work and family worlds. To recapitulate our conception of work-family linkages, it is a carry-over process between work and family systems facilitated by the work personality, which shapes the modes of adaption. In accord with this reasoning, it is expected that the actual occurrence of a given mode will vary with bureaucratization, social complexity, and orderliness of work career for each affects personality in a distinct way.

For instance, bureaucratization may produce conditions relevant to differentiation by inculcating certain basic values of bureaucracy, i.e.,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

specialization of tasks, impersonality, and a limited sense of sociability, in the work personality. Less socially complex jobs that not only tend to restrict the formation of social skills and relational orientation but subject the worker to social alienation, may likewise induce a differeniated pattern of participation in family activities. An unstable picture of role-conceptions, a low level of self-esteem, and a constant fear of negative evaluation, which seem to characterize a disorderly career wage-earner, might render the growth of a joint pattern unlikely. By elaborating these types of links, the following research hypotheses will be developed in chapter two.

Hypotheses

Bureaucratization of Work Setting

Intra-Family Interaction

There is an inverse relationship between the degree of bureaucratization of the wage-earner's work setting and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks, and b) family decisions.

Extra-Family Social Activity

There is an inverse relationship between the degree of bureaucratization of the wage-earner's work setting and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity, and b) organization-focussed activity.

Social Complexity of Work

Intra-Family Interaction

There is a direct relationship between the degree of social complexity in the wage-earner's job and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks, and b) family decisions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Extra-Family Social Activity

There is a direct relationship between the degree of social complexity in the wage-earner's job and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity, and b) organization-focussed activity.

Orderliness of Work Career

Intra-Family Interaction

There is a direct relationship between the degree of orderliness of the wage-earner's work career and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks, and b) family decisions.

Extra-Family Social Activity

There is a direct relationship between the degree of orderliness of the wage-earner's work career and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity, and b) organization-focussed activity.

These hypotheses will be empirically examined by data on 105 intact, single-earner families of East York, Toronto.

Objectives

An investigation of these hypotheses, we hope, would enable us to achieve the following objectives which motivated us to undertake this research.

First, a verification of these hypotheses would help us in developing a clear conception of the articulation of work and family systems and the manner by which members adapt to these systems. Such an outcome is important, since the existing studies, we believe, do not sufficiently aid in comprehending the nature of work-family linkages.

Second, after examining these hypotheses, we would be in a position

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to determine the extent to which work-family interaction is influenced by a family's socio-economic standing and its involvement in social networks. This will also help us in re-assessing the explanations of differentiation and jointness offered by SES and network studies; these explanations, we feel, are not only partial but often based on dubious assumptions. To achieve this objective, we shall be treating the variables of SES and networks as "*test factors*" in the model sketched above. By "controlling" their effects on the original relationships between work and family variables, we would determine the strength of our explanation vis-à-vis those suggested by SES and network studies.

Third, by exploring the proposed hypotheses we will be able to know the strength of our model. The validity of this model will be taken as an indication of a need for developing a more dynamic type of models that may stimulate further research addressing the articulation of experience of people in both their work and family worlds.

Finally, the verification of these hypotheses with data collected from an urban-industrial city of Canada will be interpreted to draw broader implications for the quality of work and family life in other industrial countries. In light of these implications, it would be possible to point up certain important issues relating to work and family which may be explored in the future research.

Chapter Outline

Chapter Two includes the following material: First, it offers an appraisal of the existing perspectives on work-family relations. Second, it presents a critical review of literature on the relationship of family

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with SES and networks. Third, it elaborates the theoretical model and delineates the definition of key concepts. Fourth, it derives and examines the research hypotheses in the light of relevant literature.

Chapter Three describes the larger sample of 211 East York families, on which *The Family Dynamics Study* was based, and compares it with the sub-sample of 105 single-earner families utilized in the present study.

Chapter Four specifies the operational definitions of the concepts introduced in the theoretical model as sketched in chapters one and two.

Chapter Five presents findings relating to research hypotheses. The findings generally confirm the hypotheses.

Chapter Six summarizes the major findings of the study and seeks their implications for the nature of work-family articulation in the context of contemporary urban-industrial societies. The chapter ends after making several suggestions for future research.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FAMILY AND ITS SOCIAL CONTEXT: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE AND FORMULATION OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

In this chapter we wish to elaborate the case for the proposed study. To be able to achieve this objective, we will first assess the present state of research on work-family relations and indicate the major perspectives which have been often used in the literature. Second, we will review those studies that have explored the relationship between socio-economic status, social networks and family interaction and activity patterns. We hope this review would offer a fairly broad survey of family dynamics in relation to the social context of the family. In part two of this chapter, we will expand on our theoretical model and discuss the relevant variables.

Research on Family and its Social Context

The World of Work

The issues relating to work-family relations in contemporary urban-industrial societies are being looked at from several perspectives which seem to suggest different degrees of closeness and levels of interchanges between work and family systems. The following pages provide an introduction to these perspectives and identify the approach which we shall adopt in this thesis.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Most of the earlier sociological studies of the interplay between economic and other spheres of life have largely directed their attention to the social impact of the Industrial Revolution,[1] which affected the structures and processes of work and family in diverse ways. Empirical research and theorizing that grew out of this interest have tended to view the relationship between family and industrialization in the framework of a much general *theory of structural differentiation*. This tradition seems to have been instrumental in prompting many analysts to assume the separation of family and occupational activities as a rather inevitable consequence of an ever increasing structural complexity of an urban-industrial mode of life.

This seems to have contributed to exaggerate the obvious physical segregation between work and family—apparently initiated by industrialization—to the extent where these systems have often been regarded as insulated against the effects of each other. It is this notion which seems partly responsible for the meagre research that seeks to develop linkages between *specific* aspects of family and the world of work. The failure of earlier studies to capture the effects of industrialization on family life may also be attributed to their greater reliance on the "ideal type" method, and to their consistent preference for using global conceptions of family and the change-producing forces—whose origin lies in industrialization-urbanization complex (Edwards, 1969b; Harris, 1969). In short, it may be said, the contribution of large-scale studies with respect to understanding the nature of work-family interrelations had been far less illuminating.

It is in recent years that some researchers have begun to undertake

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

more careful analyses of work-family linkages at the micro level. Although most of these analyses are based on data obtained as a minor part of projects with other primary concerns, they are important in suggesting modifications in conventional views on the inter-relationship between work and family systems. In this regard, it is interesting to note that a growing number of sociologists have come to believe that the implications drawn from physical separation of these systems are extremely overstated.

Thus, Parsons (1955: 13) suggests that work role being a "boundary role" may be viewed "both as a role *in* the occupational system, and *in* the family". He points to the inevitable flow of work roles to the family by calling it "an example of the phenomena of 'interpenetration'". Similarly, Dyer (1956: 231) speaks of the wage-earner as "a point of juncture between the two social systems" who links them with each other and with the larger community. Bell and Vogel (1968) feel that any fruitful analysis must view work and family as adaptive systems. To describe the process by which work and family modes of behavior and attitudes affect the structure of each system, they suggest the use of a more dynamic concept referred to as "interchanges". Rapoport and Rapoport (1965) call attention to the possibility of family roles being modeled on the occupational roles to redress the balance between these regions of life. After analyzing several degrees of work-family linkages, Aldous (1969b: 712) concludes that a complete segregation of work and family life is "more myth than reality".

Several miniature perspectives have appeared in this literature. One perspective predicts the modes of adaptation by looking at the *relative salience* of work and family roles (Oeser and Hammond, 1954; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1965; Aldous, 1969b). It asserts that there is a "structured

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

competition" between familial and occupational roles and that time and energy devoted to one sector is at the cost of the other. Highly salient jobs, e.g., the professions which demand a primacy of commitment or certain jobs with unpleasant conditions, according to this perspective, frequently "compete or even supplement the family as a major concern" (Aldous, 1969b). In other words, this position argues that greater involvement in the work system tends to result in a reduced participation in family life. This imbalance is often seen to produce negative effects on child socialization, marital satisfaction and adjustment.[2] The empirical studies which interpret their findings in line with this perspective present a somewhat mixed picture.

In a study of married female teachers and their husbands, Ridley (1973: 234-35) found a moderate inverse relationship between *job involvement* (measured in terms of time involved with job in excess of the normal work day) and marital adjustment. Generally, "better" adjusted were those couples where the work involvement was low or medium. Gerstl (1963) compared dentists, advertising executives and professors for their work and family involvement and found that average work times for each of these occcupational groups were inversely related to the amount of time each group spent on household tasks and with their children (p. 149).

Edgell (1970: 318-19) observed that *spiralists* (e.g., success-oriented individuals) who defined their work as a "central life interest" were more apt to show less participation in family activities than the "home-centred" wage-earners. From their analysis of the link between "public success" and "private life" of 437 "significant" Americans—occupationally successful executives and policy-makers—Cuber and Harroff

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(1970) noted that in the majority of cases both husbands and wives pursued fairly separate interests inside and outside the home with minimal sharing. This led them to conclude a) that there is a weak connection between work and family life, and b) that occupational success is not necessarily generalisable to other facets of life.

Clark, Nye, and Gecas (1978) examined the implications of relative salience of work and family roles more thoroughly and directly. Their data on 390 Seattle couples did not show any significant effect of the husband's work involvement on the quality of his performance in "household roles" and his sharing of these roles with the wife.[3] Willmott (1971) feels that his findings, based on a "pilot" study of 92 individuals from two British firms, "call into question the common-sense belief that involvement in one sphere of life must be at the expense of involvement in another" (p. 583). He further argues that greater work involvement is likely to "spill over" into other sectors of life to attain an even pattern of involvement. Hence, the customary designations of individuals as "work-centred", "leisure-centred", and "family-centred" are not entirely consistent with reality.

As this overview of research shows, the perspective of relative salience of family and occupational roles, seems to present a simplistic picture of highly complex interrelationships between the work and family worlds. Some studies, therefore, find it necessary to place this approach in the framework of a related but more broader perspective referred to as the *reciprocity-exchange model*. The studies cast in this latter perspective, instead of confining themselves to the effects of easily detectable elements of work, e.g., time and energy expanded on job activity, give more weight to the operation of certain less tangible, but highly important, aspects of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work-family transactions. This perspective, too, views work and family as competitive role-systems. But by giving special attention to a much larger spectrum of interaction processes and outcomes, it makes one sensitive to the complexity of interchanges between these systems and to their probable effects on the wage-earners and their families.

Following this approach, Scanzoni (1970) seeks to link the husband's *occupational integration* with family cohesion and stability. In suggesting this link, he was guided by a basic assumption that "the husband in modern society exchanges his status for conjugal solidarity". Thus, the husband's greater articulation with the economic opportunity structure and the reward which he brings to the family motivate the wife to respond to him positively. This gives rise to a cycle of reciprocities in the family, and each spouse tends to define his expressive and instrumental rights and duties as being met. This not only increases cohesion in the internal family structure but leads to a fuller interlocking of work and family systems (pp. 19-21). The empirical evidence provided by Scanzoni seems to bear out these hypotheses.

The results of several studies are generally consistent with this position. Kemper and Reichler (1976: 937-38), using work satisfaction as a proxy measure of work integration, report a strong association between marital satisfaction of both husband and wife and *intrinsic* job satisfaction, e.g., meaningfulness of job, liking for it, control over its pace and style. In a previously mentioned study, Ridley (1973) attempted to determine the impact of job satisfaction on marital adjustment. Interestingly, for the married female teachers the predicted positive relationship emerged only when they defined occupations *highly salient* while for their husbands this relationship remained strong regardless of the degree

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of importance they attached to occupational success (p. 233).

Dyer (1956) provides further evidence from interviews with 87 Iowa families which indicates that the wife and children of satisfied workers tend to show favorable attitudes toward work and its implications for family life. In a latter elaboration of his earlier findings, Dyer (1965: 86-91) suggests that satisfied workers more often bring positive feelings from work to home. This permits a relatively complete marital communication. The result is an increasing awareness of the wage-earner's job, its conditions and rewards in the family group. This initiates a reciprocal facilitation of stable family relations with a fuller participation of all members in family activities.

Lack of work integration is often seen in this perspective as a failure of the wage-earner to exchange valued resources in the family. This situation entails serious repercussions for his roles in the family and the type of responses which he receives from other family members. Following this reasoning, Raymond Smith (1956) attributes instability of the Guianese family to the male's occupational instability. He shows how the *interruptions in the male's work role*, resulting from the seasonal type of jobs, render him a poor provider. This, in turn, makes the father-child relationship extremely tenuous and his status of being a husband unimportant in the family. This situation strengthens the mother-child relationship and consequently the family tends to move towards "matrifocality". Greenfield (1966) interprets his observations on the Barbados family in a similar fashion. He reiterates Smith's argument by saying that matrifocality develops within the family as a result of the male's inability to obtain a firm position in the occupational structure that will give him sufficient

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

income and prestige which are his prime obligations to his family.

Studies of black families in the U.S., made by Moynihan (1965) and Rainwater (1971), which have produced findings remarkably similar to these studies of the West Indian family, also emphasize this theoretical stance. Specifically, it is argued that a partial withdrawal of male workers from the family is a generalized reflection of their awareness of having an inadequate participation in the work world and of meagre rewards to exchange with family members.

Other studies seem to suggest opposite predictions. The wage-earners may be highly integrated with the work world, as Cuber and Harroff's policy and decision-makers, yet they may not exchange any great amount of emotions within their families. Instead, they may individually form a more extensive outside peer group activity but continue to expect their wives to compensate in household task areas for the prestige and income they contribute to their marriages. This pattern may also hold true for a small minority of technically constrained industrial workers (Wilensky, 1964). Likewise, relatively dissatisfied and less integrated workers may compensate their frustrations by developing a more satisfactory marital relationship (Edgell, 1970). However, the predominant pattern of adaptation which obtains more consistent empirical support is the one where work integration and family satisfaction tend to occur simultaneously (McKinley, 1964; Kornhauser, 1965).

Perhaps these different predictions stem from different conceptions of closeness between work and family systems, and of the range of work-effects on the wage-earners. Obviously, an exchange model which is often charged for failing to specify the hierarchy of valued resources and for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

its inability to look into the "subjective meanings" attached by individuals to these resources, cannot provide an exhaustive explanation of human behavior (Edwards, 1969a; Heer, 1963).

These problems in this model are not adequately solved as yet. Thus, some studies have found it profitable to look at work-family linkages in a slightly different manner. Their main approach has been to view work and its environment as forming an important *context for socialization* where a wage-earner learns occupational values, behavior patterns, and coping styles, which eventually come to encompass his total personality. In other words, this perspective argues that the centrality of job and its meaning for self-worth and identity tend to pervade the whole tenor of his life outside the work situation. The values and orientation learned by the worker inevitably affect every aspect of exchange processes which he may enter into for carrying out his multiple roles in work, family, and other social systems (Neff, 1968; Kohn, 1969).

The intensity of work socialization can be seen from a frequently made observation that wage-earners, consciously or unconsciously, tend to project their work values and standards to other family members. Thus, Aberle and Naegele (1968) in one study found that professional men, who flatly rejected the idea of a close connection between work and family system, in practice applied the standards of occupational world to their family life, and evaluated the behavior of their sons in terms of these standards. Consistent with their occupational values and attitudes, these middle-class fathers demanded their male children to show initiative, be competitive and aggressive; this behavior was seen by most of the fathers as a prerequisite to a successful occupational life (p. 194). A similar

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

observation was made by Seeley et al. (1956: 117). They feel that wage-earners tend to carry over into family life the standards and attitudes from the work world to resolve the conflict which may result from apparently different expectations of these sectors of life.

This aspect of work-family interchanges is further explored in several studies by linking certain specific dimensions of work to socialization and child-rearing philosophies. Miller and Swanson (1958) have shown that parents who worked in *bureaucratic settings* tended to teach their children to be accommodative and conformist while the *entrepreneurial* parents encouraged their children to exercise greater self-control, to be self-reliant, and to assume an "active, manipulative stance toward their environment". Kohn (1969) has investigated parental values in child socialization in *bureaucratic* and *non-bureaucratic* families. His data showed that the wage-earners who held jobs in bureaucracies valued self-direction while those who performed their work roles in non-bureaucratic organizations tended to stress conformity and obedience in the process of socialization. This inconsistency in the findings of these studies arises from Kohn's, Miller's, and Swanson's different conceptions of bureaucracy; both are at variance with Weber's (1973) original model. However, it is important to note that both studies suggest that a convergence of occupational values with other facets of life is almost unavoidable.

Using this same perspective, Kohn (1969) also examined the effects of *substance of work with data, people, and things* on socialization practices. He observed that men who worked primarily with things, or jobs that require little self-reliance, valued conformity and those who worked with data, and with people, valued greater self-direction (pp. 156-158).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This relation existed independent of SES and in both Italian and American samples. Kohn limited his analysis to socialization only but the implication of his data for other spheres of family life can easily be discerned from the generality of his conclusions. He states, for instance: "Occupational experience helps structure men's view not only of the occupational world but of social reality in general" (p. 164). The wage-earners come to view their occupational values as virtues in their own right, and, in the course of family interaction, communicate them to their wives and children.[5]

These studies that regard work-experience as a socializing force represent an important move in bringing work and family worlds closer to each other. But they have not been able to specify the *process* that connects these worlds. For instance, the questions as to what precisely the job or its settings impart to wage-earners and how they transfer their experience to family and other spheres of primary relationships are not given the attention they deserve. Even some of the major writers in this area (e.g., Miller and Swanson, 1958; Kohn, 1969) have tended to assume the existence of certain links through which work experience filters into the family but they never built the process in their theoretical models.

In recapitulating, the following features of the literature reviewed here seem to stand out clearly. First, a large number of studies report data on individuals or on a particular dyad in the family but seldom make the family a unit of analysis. Therefore, it is rather difficult to form a clear-cut picture of the articulation of work world with the family. Nevertheless, these studies are significant for they testify to the complexity of linkages between work and family systems. Second, it is also

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

clear from this body of research that as yet no consensus regarding the use of concepts and assumptions has developed; this seems to complicate the task of explaining certain discrepancies in the empirical findings or in their interpretations. Such problems obviously restrict the generalizability of the conclusions of these studies.

Ideally, a more comprehensive and well-integrated perspective is needed for a fuller understanding of work-family interrelations. Our own study, though influenced by several approaches reviewed here, bears a close affinity with the latter approach that looks at work in terms of its *socializing* impact. However, unlike many other studies, we shall identify more precisely the mechanism by which work experience tends to be carried over to family and other domains of life. We will undertake this task later in this chapter. Here we will review SES and network research that specifically deals with the problem of family differentiation.

Socio-Economic Status (SES)

Probably there are few variables that occupy a more central position in sociological studies of family than the variable of SES. Several studies, conducted on both sides of the Atlantic, have related this variable with modes of participation in internal and external activities of the family. What emerges from this research is a *social class*[6] *or SES hypothesis* that suggests a positive relationship between SES and the extent of jointness in family activities.

In the United States, the research carried out by Lee Rainwater and his colleagues offers a thorough exploration of the link between SES and different aspects of family life including differentiation of family

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

interaction and social activities. From their earlier study of working and middle class families, Rainwater, Coleman and Handel (1959: 89) conclude that it is "a pattern of separateness rather than sharing" that characterizes the role organization of the working class family. "The husband has his, usually only a few chores; the wife has hers." Likewise, "sharing of recreational and sporting interests is not common. The [working-class] wife and mother tends to be almost totally absorbed in her home-making chores and interests; her husband has outside recreational interests and often does not want her to share them. Even vacations are not always family matters" (p. 85). On the other hand, middle-class wives considered family vacations as something mandatory. They also shared more clubs and voluntary organizations with their husbands. Regarding household tasks, Rainwater et al. write: "Middle class wives tend to see a greater interchangeability between the marriage partners in handling the work that must be done. There is much more interest in doing things together whether it be the dishes or painting the wall; 'togetherness' is largely a middle class value" (p. 89).

Rainwater's latter research provides further evidence that lends strength to these observations. His 1965 study revealed rather more "sharp class differences"[7] with respect to patterns of role relationship and social participation (pp. 32-53). In one review paper on "cultures of poverty", Rainwater (1964) states that the correlation between low SES and differentiation which he found in the U.S.A. also holds true in England, Puerto Rico and Mexico. He views this differentiation as a reflection of the more general segregation between males and females encouraged by early socialization which tends to continue through a distinct culture of the poor (p. 460).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Several other studies show that lower class families are more likely to be differentiated in terms of their internal interaction and external social activities. These include Gans' (1965: 48-51) study of second-generation Italians of Boston, Rubin's (1976: 185-203) research on San Francisco Bay families, and Komarovsky's (1967) study of blue-collar families of Glenton. With respect to extra-family social life, Komarovsky observes: "In Glenton, joint social life with friends is far from being the important leisure-time pursuit that it is in the higher socio-economic classes. This applies to exchange of home visits as well as to joint visits to public recreational places" (p. 311). In the areas of household tasks and family decisions the degree of differentiation manifested by less educated blue-collarites was much higher than the high school graduates (pp. 50, 223). Crysdale's (1975: 277-78) data on "conjugal roles" in working-class families living in the downtown area of Toronto also point up a greater prevalence of "traditional division of labor" among blue collar families. As in the case of Gans' families of manual and low income workers, the males and females in this community tended to split into separate groups on those occasions which involved entertaining friends and not-so-close relatives. But in "white-collar, or middle-class circles women were more apt to join men in more or less equal association even when strangers were present" (p. 278).

The finding reported by McKinley (1964) in his *Social Class and Family Life* reveals only minor class differences. For instance, 39% upper, 36% middle, and 34% lower class parents in this study shared "instrumental decisions" (the use of money), and the respective percentages of the classes who shared "expressive decisions" (planning for vacation) were 47, 34, and 37 (p. 107). Blood and Wolfe's study of a more heterogeneous sample of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

urban families indicates a tendency in the middle-class families to participate jointly in extra-family social activities (p. 169) and to practice a syncratic or shared mode of decisions (pp. 33-34). But their data on the relationship between SES and task-performance do not show a consistent pattern.

Young and Willmott's research in England, which spans well over 20 years, has led them to stress a decline in class distinctions and a corresponding reduction in family differentiation. Their Bethnal Green study seems to suggest a moderate correlation between differentiation and SES, but they feel that couples in this working-class sample rarely maintained rigidly segregated conjugal roles (1957: 27-30). However, compared to Bethnal Green, in the middle class families of Woodford, the husbands shared a wide range of "feminine" activities, and the wives, on their part, jointly participated in "masculine" activities (Willmott and Young, 1960: 21). In another study conducted in the London Region, which provides data on several classes, Young and Willmott (1973: 94) made the following observation: "There is now no sort of work in the home strictly reserved for 'the wives'; even clothes-washing and bed-making, still ordinarily thought of as women's jobs, were frequently mentioned by husbands as things they did as well. The extent of the sharing is probably still increasing." This general trend towards sharing varied slightly in different occupational classes.[8] They attribute this to a widespread diffusion of middle class values in other classes which are still at the rear of the economic column. Rosser and Harris' (1965) analysis of Swansea families also supports Young and Willmott's view on the changing articulation of class with family behavior. They conclude: "Indeed the whole trend of change . . . is in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the direction of a *convergence* in behavior between the social classes" (pp. 290-91). This is perhaps one reason that Rosser and Harris could not find any strong correlation between SES and differentiated marital roles (p. 209).

A few other studies that present data on upper and upper-middle-class families indicate that the relationship between class and differentiation is somewhat more complex than it is commonly understood. Adams and Butler (1967: 505), basing on their Greensboro investigation, suggest that families of "top professionals", though not as differentiated as those of the blue-collar class, are relatively more differentiated than both the middle and upper-middle-class families. Mowrer (1969: 339) in his study of Chicago families also discovered greater differentiation of the "instrumental" and "expressive" roles for higher occupational status families. A similar pattern has been observed by Humphreys (1966: 203) among the upper class families of Dublin, and Young and Willmott (1973) seem to note this tendency in the social life of upper-class English families.

In their study of *Crestwood Heights*, Seeley et al. (1956) offer data that shed some light on the nature of family life in the upper and upper-middle classes. The family interaction and social activities as illustrated by these authors seem to indicate a "mixed pattern" in which differentiation and sharing existed in a complementary manner. The men generally performed tasks that required "physical strength" and made major family decisions. The wives decided, sometimes after discussion with their husbands, about several "small things", and took care of child socialization as well as of routined household chores (pp. 183-194). The social activities involving all family members were usually limited to religious observances and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

certain special events such as birthdays and anniversaries (pp. 203-216). The wives were less in evidence in other outside associational activities of their husbands. The children were often encouraged to participate in associations specifically meant for them. Seeley et al. (1956: 203-204) describe the general pattern as follows: "'Social activities' involve the Crestwood Heights family more with individuals *outside* the home circle than with those *inside* it".

Some major characteristics of the studies, including a description of samples and measures of SES, which generated these findings, are summarized in Appendix A. As may be noted, over half of the studies reviewed focus on one cross-section of the population with a specific class background. This makes comparison of classes at one time and place rather difficult. Furthermore, the placement of families in different categories of classes has been so varied that it raises the problem of comparability of findings from different studies. Recognizing these difficulties, the following two conclusions may be derived from the literature: a) that there is a curvilinear relationship between social class and the degree of jointness in internal and external family activities, and b) that overall the differences among classes with respect to these aspects of family life are not very large. This may be interpreted to mean that SES accounts for only a small amount of variance in family behavior. Both these conclusions warrant a critical look at the explanations[9] which have been explored in the reviewed studies.

Among the several explanations, the one that treats each class as a system of values and/or a subculture seems to figure prominently in most of the studies (see Rainwater et al., 1959; McKinley, 1964; Willmott and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Young, 1960; Crysdale, 1975). Within this broader subcultural framework, sometimes a special stress on the uniqueness of lower-class subculture is also placed (Gans, 1965; Rainwater, 1964). The decreasing differences in classes are attributed to a value transmission and conversion process, which, as the argument goes, has resulted from the modern affluence, and particularly from an increase in the income of working-class families (Rosser and Harris, 1965; Rainwater and Handel, 1965; Young and Willmott, 1973; Humphreys, 1966).

This emphasis on subculture-value aspect in class analysis has apparently rendered the variable of class more complex and complicated the analysis of its effects. Especially, the studies that turn to the effects of class-correlated value orientations in isolation from job circumstances provide only an incomplete index of the process by which values develop or influence behavior patterns.[10] The significance of class—and in a sense of occupation which is often seen as a reflection of class standing—has also been undermined by studies that have interpreted their low empirical correlations between SES and differentiation in terms of diminishing class and family distinctions.[11] The extent to which this is an artifact of variations in measures of SES or an outcome of actual structural changes cannot be assessed without having appropriate historical and comparative data analyzed by using identical methods.

It can be argued, however, that occupations and the settings in which they occur play an important role as socializers for people of *all* classes and can affect their family life in several ways. They not only give rise to a characteristic outlook on the world but generate views of appropriate life style and behavior (Moore, 1969). Hughes (1958), who has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

done a considerable amount of research in this area, makes a strong case for the predominant role of occupations in the formation of identity and an orientation to self and others. Occupational elements, such as interpersonal techniques, etiquettes, skills, and norms of conduct, tend to build into the personality of the wage-earner in the course of executing his work activities, and thereby arouse a set of feelings whose effects reach out in the family and community.

The question as to the medium through which SES affects family and other aspects of life, in one of the few attempts, has been explored by Melvin Kohn in his *Class and Conformity: A Study in Values* (1969). He shows that social class in and of itself has little effect on parents' values of self-direction and conformity for their children. Its relationship to values and orientation is almost entirely attributable to work conditions, such as "closeness of supervision", "the substance of work", that are determinative of *occupational self-direction*. Kohn reached this conclusion by "controlling" these variables singularly and jointly on the original relationship between class (measured by Hollingshead's two-factor Index of Social Position) and value orientation. It is important to note that a control on occupational self-direction "reduces the correlation of class to values and orientation in almost all instances by half and in several by two-thirds or more" (p. 183). The findings of this study cast a serious doubt on an *a priori* assumption of class-specific cultures and values. What is of crucial significance is the work related experience which enters into the process by which class affects values and orientation.

In the reviewed studies, such an experiment was seldom performed. Consequently, it is not possible to determine the independent contribution

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of occupation to variations in family modes of behavior. The role of occupation has been further concealed by the package nature of the SES Index. And as we previously stressed, this has partly resulted from the fact that most of the studies have tended to make SES-linked values and cultures the main focus of their argument.

Further problems arise from the contrasting ideological positions[12] on the nature of changes which are believed to be occurring in the class structure of advanced industrial societies. This means that one must look to the world of work for stronger and more defensible explanations. But in making such a move, one must not continue to feel captive to gross occupational classifications commonly used. The present study proposes to look at more acute aspects of the work world, which are distributed across different social classes.

Social Networks

Based on her exploratory study of 20 London families, Elizabeth Bott (1971) sought to explain differentiation in "conjugal roles" by looking at the degree of connectedness of the couple's social network. In her study, connectedness refers to "the extent to which the people known by a family know and meet one another independently of the family" (p. 59). A network is defined as "close knit" if many of the friends, relatives, and neighbours of the elementary family know each other and frequently interact with one another. It is considered "loose-knit" when only a few of the relatives, friends, and neighbours of the focal couple know each other and the interaction between them is relatively low. Put differently, the close-knit network involves "many relationships among the component units"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and the loose-knit network involves "few such relationships" (p. 59). These types are not "polar opposites"; instead, they represent degrees of network connectedness or "density"[13] of the elementary family. It is the connectedness of the network, which, according to Bott, accounts for the differentiation of conjugal roles. She summarizes her empirical findings in the form of the following hypothesis: "The degree of segregation in the role-relationship of husband and wife varies directly with the connectedness of the family's social network" (p. 60).

Before recognizing the importance of network as an explanatory variable, Bott first explored the impact of several variables, including social class, on family roles. Her data did not reveal any symmetrical relationships. This observation, she feels, was consonant with earlier studies which failed to reveal a consistent correlation between class position and role-differentiation (pp. 111-113). Second, she looked at the possibility of class having effects on family roles via network connectedness. Though families with close-knit networks and segregated roles were largely working-class, network connectedness could not be attributed to class as a single determinant. A lack of systematic correlation between SES and network and SES and family roles led Bott to concentrate on networks as the primary sources of variation in family roles.

The hypothesis of positive association between network connectedness and role segregation, often referred to as the "*Bott hypothesis*", has been tested in a number of subsequent studies with inconclusive results. A summary of the findings of these studies as well as their conceptualization of networks may be examined from Appendix B.

In her reconsiderations of the original hypothesis in the 1971

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

edition of *Family and Social Network*, Bott herself reviewed some of the "repeat studies" and concluded:[14]

> What, then, do all these studies add up to? Is the hypothesis established or disproved? Neither, I think. The weight of empirical evidence and conceptual argument is that the hypothesis holds in the case of dense networks and segregated conjugal relationships, but that, when networks become more loose-knit, the type of conjugal relationship becomes unpredictably variable. (p. 290)

Our review of some additional studies seems to confound this conclusion. For instance, studies conducted in Japan by Wimberley (1973: 127) and Vogel (1963; cited in Wimberley) have shown a correlation between loose-knit networks and role-segregation. Barbara Harrell-Bond's (1969: 78) data on Oxford families also disclose this type of "negative instances". In two more recent studies of Irish families, Hannan and Katsiaouni (1977: 168) and Gordon and Downing (1978: 589) have discovered a strong association between jointness of conjugal roles and an overlap in husbands' and wives' separate networks rather than total network density. Previously Turner (1967: 125), however, could not find any "distinctive pattern of conjugal role relationship" when the individual networks of husband and wife overlapped with each other. Toomey's (1971: 426) research in England, as that of earlier studies by Udry and Hall (1965: 394) and Aldous and Straus (1966: 579) in America, failed to show any strong correlation between network connectedness and family roles. These findings may be interpreted to raise serious questions about the importance of network connectedness.

It is not intended here to account for the discrepant nature of findings of the studies reviewed in the foregoing. Nevertheless, some comments on the usefulness of network as an explanatory variable and a framework for sociological analysis of family roles may be made in the following.[15]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bott's theory of the effects of network on role organization views networks and family as alternative sources of emotional support and concrete help. That is, the individuals who can derive this support from their respective networks are less likely to turn to their family for this purpose. She also makes another crude psychological assumption that there is a "limited fund of sociability" available to the individuals. This means that those who belong to close-knit networks tend to engage more in the activities of the network itself and this limits the fund of sociability available for spousal relations. Among the reviewed studies, Nelson (1966) based his analysis on this assumption while Harrell-Bond (1969) has strongly questioned it. She argues that the spouses are capable enough to maintain the *same* emotional investment to family and network without retarding their level of participation in the activities of these regions of life. Therefore, the explanation of segregation offered by Bott does not stand up. Toomey (1971) accepts this assumption of Bott and Nelson but feels that networks cannot be considered a primary source of emotional help; to him, "home-centredness" seems a more frequently used substitute and hence a better predictor of family roles. Fallding (1971) takes a more penetrating look at Bott's data and concludes that what in fact explains segregation is not the network *per se*, it is "a sharp cleavage by sex right across the network" that fosters segregation within the family (p. 342).

C. C. Harris (1969: 169-175) has elaborated Fallding's position. He argues that where husbands and wives belong to separate mono-sex groups they will tend to define the conjugal roles on a sex-linked basis, and this will foster segregation in the family. This seems truer in the case of close-knit networks. It is the mono-sex composition of these networks

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which makes possible the development and enforcement of consensus norms. Though Bott glossed over this *alternative explanation,* the Newbolt family, which combines close-knit networks and segregated roles, is a good example of this external sexual-segregation in each partner's network. Turner's (1967) analysis, which Bott has rated high among the repeat studies, also shows a close correspondence between sex-segregation within the total networks and the family roles.[16] It may be noted that Wimberley (1973), when he found himself unable to explain his findings in the framework of social networks, also turned to Harris' reinterpretation of Bott's data.

On the other hand, the "variability" of conjugal roles among loose-knit families seems to occur from the mixed composition of these networks where both males and females may be found in different proportions. Where such networks split along sex-lines, they too tend to produce segregation. The findings reported by Wimberley (1973) and Harrell-Bond (1969) stand in evidence.

This alternative line of explanation takes out much of the force from the network as an explanatory variable. A further look at Bott's conceptualization of network and her actual use of the term renders her analysis incomplete. For instance, her original hypothesis refers to "the connectedness of family's social network" but in large part her explanation comes from "personal" or "ego-centric" network, e.g., network anchored on particular individuals (cf. Barnes, 1969; Mitchell, 1969). In Bott's study these individuals were the husbands and wives; no attempt was made to take note of children's networks and the extent to which they may affect parental networks and family roles. One may exempt Bott from this criticism for all the couples in her sample had children under 10 years but the failure of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

later studies with older children (e.g., Udry and Hall; Turner; Toomey[17]) to include children in their measurement of networks cannot be ignored. It is perhaps this partial determination of "total networks" that may have partly generated discrepant results.

Another serious fault lies with the criteria by which Bott and others have tended to measure the density or connectedness of the network. The criteria consisted of the extent to which network members *know* and *interact* with each other. Neither Bott nor most of those who tested her hypothesis made any effort to combine the degree to which members *feel close* to each other—a subjective dimension of connectedness—with the actual interaction.[18] Moreover, the normative meaning assigned to network relationships or what Mitchell (1969) seems to call the *content* is no where clearly specified; it is only assumed that norms and values vary with the degree of network connectedness. These conceptual oversights weaken the central assumption regarding the development of consensus-norms in the (close-knit) network and their transmission to the focal family. It can be argued that interaction or knowing in itself does not make a network a norm-determining or norm-enforcing group. At a minimum level, one must know the extent to which members are *committed* to their networks and the nature or *substance* of their activities.

Bott also could not delineate what she later referred to as "network sectors" (1971: 291), e.g., whether a network is composed of kin, friends, neighbours, or people met in voluntary associations. Subsequent studies which obtained the relevant data by asking the respondents to list the name of persons they interacted with, have tended to lump together all these sectors to construct a network index.[19] This method not only deters

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

comparison between different studies, it also raises certain substantive problems of interpretation.

Following Max Gluckman's research in African tribes Bott insists that kinship stands "at the heart of total network density and general sex segregation" (p. 302). Irving (1977: 867-80), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969: 465-82) on the other hand, stress functional differentiation of primary groups in modern urban-industrial mobile societies. It is claimed and empirically demonstrated that kin, neighbours, and friends serve quite separate social purposes that show relatively little overlap. Studies of family life made by Young and Willmott (1957: 76-118; 131-46) in England, by Seeley et al. (1956: 159-339) in Canada, and by Komarovsky (1967: 205-19, 236-58) in the U.S., offer persuasive evidence which indicates that these network sectors affect internal and external family activities quite differently. For instance, external social activity is seen more open to the influence of friends while the internal family interaction to that of relatives. The correlation between segregation and loose-knit networks found by Wimberley (1973), who constructed his network index by looking at the frequency of interaction with *friends*, further illustrates these differences. It is perhaps also interesting to note that some of the husbands in his sample saw their leisure-time which they spent with wives and children as equivalent to performing a "family service" (p. 129). Apparently, they developed this attitude under the influence of their network friends.

These conceptual and operational problems, in the last analysis, seem to result from Bott's crude definition of network as "a set of social relationships for which there is no common boundary" and its rather

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

arbitrary classification into "loose" and "close" knit types. This conception, as we have shown, does not take into account several subtle analytical distinctions relating to the contents and composition of networks. The methodological procedures adopted by Bott may have suited her since she analyzed a small sample of families in a qualitative fashion but in larger samples the problems of quantification are felt seriously. As she correctly notes in reconsidering the empirical evidence which appeared after the publication of her book in 1957, her inability to set out clear guidelines for quantification of network and conjugal role variables may, in part, have contributed to unexpected results.

It is important to note that this new evidence has led Bott to change her position considerably. First, she seems to agree with her critics that social networks singularly considered do not sufficiently account for the organization of conjugal roles. Second, she now stresses the need for further research that must examine the *independent* effects of different dimensions of occupation[20] and work both on the connectedness of networks and family roles. The present investigation is an attempt in this direction.

Conclusions

The central concern of the foregoing pages was to present a critical analysis and evaluation of the state of research on family and its social context. Some of the major points disclosed by this detailed critique may now be recapitulated.

The contribution of past studies of large-scale, perhaps due to their preoccupation with social implication of industrialization-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

urbanization, has been largely peripheral to an understanding of family dynamics. On the other hand, the ideological notions spread by these studies have been less conducive to initiating studies of work-family linkages. A few studies of this latter type, that have tried to disentangle several crucial components of the world of occupations in order to link them with different aspects of family life, have tended to produce a somewhat inconsistent battery of findings and a rather disconnected set of approaches, often premised on weak and contradictory assumptions. The choice of work and family variables has also been arbitrary, and at times, guided by a consideration of replicating the findings of earlier studies. With respect to family, this "repeat character" has resulted in a narrow focus, which is conspicuously evident from a lack of research on family differentiation. Since the work variables are also chosen with this impetus, no attempt has been made to derive them from a systematic framework or to link them with their proper social structural sources.[21]

It seems also clear that as yet no systematic attempt exists that seeks to explain differentiation in family activities in relation to work experience.[22] The SES and network studies, which frequently addressed this problem, do not offer stable explanations. The massive research on the effects of SES leaves a large amount of variation within the same class as well as among classes unaccounted for. Likewise, network analyses have produced a considerable evidence that contradicts the original hypothesis which Bott developed. It is also important to note that as the measures of SES and networks have varied in the literature so has the conceptualization of family variables. No theoretical justification has been offered for analyzing a certain set of family activities or for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assigning a specific designation to a given subset.[23]

It is this state of literature that seems to justify an investigation of the problem of differentiation in relation to work experience. The outcome of this effort seems promising for several reasons. First, it will show how occupational constraints and value-orientations extend beyond the class and network boundaries into the family to alter modes of family activities. Second, a study of differentiation in itself is important for understanding the nature of family life in and outside the family. A simultaneous examination of these twin-facets of life would reveal how the "quality" of work experience articulates with the "quality" of family life.

In order that such an investigation takes on its real significance, it must be guided by an appropriate model that would overcome some of the problems we have encountered in the past research. The present study offers a tentative model that would hopefully allow a systematic look at the patterns of family activities in relation to the effects of different work conditions. In the following, we elaborate this model and derive relevant variables. These variables will be linked in the form of research hypotheses in the next section.

Work and Family Systems: The Theoretical Model

The model to be outlined here consists of a set of work and family variables with a specification of the process by which they interrelate with each other. These variables will be identified by viewing work and family as "social systems".[24] We may begin this task with a general conception of a social system.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Buckley (1967: 41) offers the following definition of the general concept: "a complex of elements or components directly or indirectly related in a causal network, such that each component is related at least to some others in a more or less stable way within any particular period of time." A social system understood as such has a *social structure* which may be defined as a set of roles and statuses interrelated in such a way as to constitute relatively patterned social relations among the interactants or system members. Since any empirical analysis of a social system is generally made possible by looking at the theoretical components or units of its structure, we shall focus on certain salient structural components of the work and family systems to derive a set of theoretical variables which will define the scope of our model.

The Structural Components of the Work System

A study of work as a social system may begin with examining the work role of the wage-earner. One sociologically significant problem area may be developed by exploring the effects of variation in work on other dimensions of the wage-earner's life. A major aspect of variation in work is the *content* of work, viz.; what the worker actually does. This content may be conceptualized according to its level of social complexity, e.g.; the extent to which it deals with people as opposed to objects. In this research this variable dimension of work will be referred to as *social complexity of work*, ranging from "low" to "high" on a continuum.

As in the case of general social systems, the "actors" perform their "roles" in a particular socio-cultural environment, so does the wage-earner carry out his work in some sort of environment. In the case

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the wage-earner, this environment is made up by the *organizational setting* of his workplace. In structural terms, this organizational setting consists of a specific set of social relations, rules and regulations and authority patterns. A conceptualization of these features according to the degree to which they are formalized (or bureaucratized) constitutes another important dimension of the structure of the work system. This variable will be called the *bureaucratization of work setting*.

Social systems are dynamic, subject to various internal and external constraints. To study this dynamic aspect, we shall examine the career of the actors over a span of time, e.g., from the time they become active members of the system, which may reflect the impact of certain structural constraints on them. However, it may be made clear that we are not concerned here with identifying the *source* of these constraints; rather, we are interested in the career patterns as a given fact. Thus, with respect to the work system, we will look at the patterns of work career of the wage-earner by conceptualizing them as to the *degree of orderliness*. In the present research, this structural property of work experience will be referred to as *orderliness of work career*.

These different aspects of a wage-earner's work experience constitute a set of *independent variables* in our theoretical model.[25] It is obvious that all these variables are qualitatively different: First of these tells us about the *work or job* itself occupied by the wage-earner, the second, about the *setting* where he performs his job, and the third, about his *work career*. This qualitative difference plus their derivation from a somewhat systematic frame of reference, gives us some confidence in the relevance of these variables.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Structural Components of the Family System

Family activities can be seen as part of two social systems: internal and external. The former refers to the family itself[26] and the latter to the larger community. Corresponding to these systems we may think of two types of activities: internal activities, those which occur within the family unit, and the external activities, which generally take place outside its immediate physical boundaries.

Since these activities occur in two distinct systems, they may be qualitatively different from each other. For instance, the activities which essentially relate to the internal structure of the family, would seem to present a "social setting" to the members, holding specific statuses and positions, to perform certain roles as well as to make certain choices having effects for the internal workings of the system. On the other hand, the external activities are likely to be of a "pure" social nature and may have implications for the family's integration in the community and society at large.

Likewise, a participation in these activities would generate two types of family interaction: internal and external; together this interaction reflects what may be called "family behavior". In this study the former aspect of family behavior or internal interaction will be referred to as *intra-family interaction*, and the latter aspect, e.g., external interaction, will be called *extra-family social activity*. These two may be considered as "global" dimensions of the family system. To be able to emphasize a specific aspect of family behavior, each of these two dimensions is further subdivided into two related types in the manner described below.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Analytically, we may conceptualize the activities constitutive of intra-family interaction into *family tasks* and *family decisions*. As it was indicated previously, in the sociological and social psychological literature both these concepts are frequently used but rarely defined and differentiated theoretically. Where the distinction is maintained, it is extremely arbitrary and is primarily based upon the empirical referents of these concepts (see Breer and Locke, 1965; Blood and Wolfe, 1963; Bott, 1971; Komarovsky, 1967). In this research, we adopt the distinction suggested by *Webster's Dictionary*, which defines the term task as "a piece of work to be accomplished" and the term decision as "a judgement arrived at after deliberation".

The activities which make up the extra-family social activity dimension of family behavior are generally of a social-recreational nature. Given the vastness of the external system in which they occur, the range of these activities would seem fairly broad. Nevertheless, it is possible, at least enalytically, to conceive of certain activities of "informal character" and others of "formal character". This customary distinction, among other criteria, is based here on a) the intensity of involvements, and b) the type of sources available for social interaction (cf. Rosenberg, 1965: 192).

Generally, the informal social activities involve an immediate source of identification, e.g., relatives, kin, and friends, which may provide greater opportunity for frequent interaction and for making direct personal contacts with others. We shall refer to this sub-dimension of extra-family social activity as *primary-level activity*.

Formal activities bring the members into the wider context of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

community where different social organizations may be found. These organizations, having somewhat more formal structures, are less likely to foster the development of intensive emotional ties among the members. These features would appear to set apart this sub-dimension of extra-family social activity from the primary-level activity, therefore, we may call it *organization-focussed activity*.[27]

In combination then, these four sub-dimensions constitute four theoretical possibilities of looking at the dynamics of the family as a social system. In the language of research these sub-dimensions are the *dependent variables* in our theoretical model. Here we may add that in recognizing these four types for analysis, we do not, by any means, imply that other possible types do not exist. But we do believe in theoretical importance and logical consistency of these types.[28]

Two of these variables, family tasks and family decisions, directly relate to what has been called the *interior* of the nuclear family, and the other two, primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity, relate to the *exterior* of family life (cf. Handel, 1971). Though each variable is shown to represent a distinct aspect of family behavior, in view of their closer theoretical affinity, they may be assumed to have a strong interrelationship with each other. (We shall examine this empirically in a later chapter.)

Given this common theoretical base of work and family variables, it is possible to see an intimate articulation and convergence between them. This may manifest itself in the manner by which family patterns its activities into a differentiated or a joint style. Before establishing this link, here we may delineate the meanings of these patterns and incorporate them in the model.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Differentiation and Jointness As Modes of Adaptation

We conceive of differentiation and jointness in intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity as *modes of adaptation.* The joint mode refers to a sharing of the activities involved in these dimensions and a differentiated mode means a segregated participation in these activities.[29] The present study will investigate the extent of variation in these modes in relation to the structural components of the wage-earner's work experience.

Clearly, the degree to which these patterns of adaptation may vary is an empirical question.[30] Expectation of such a variation, however, assumes some sort of relationship between work and family. This assumption derives some support from a theoretical orientation which views work and family as "adaptive systems". This means that they are characterized by *permeable boundaries, openness,* and *organized complexity*[31] (cf. Thompson, 1967; Buckley, 1967). Put simply, both work and family have an ability to cross their boundaries to optimize adaptation and to engage in close interchanges with each other. Their complexity enables them to continually shift their structures to make adjustments to new conditions, which may come to be encountered by certain planned or abrupt changes.

The interchanges between work and family are very subtle and complex indeed. They occur at both actual and symbolic levels (Bell and Vogel, 1968: 11-14). Likewise, the adjustments which work and family make to lend continuity to interchanges may be seen at both levels. It is also important to recognize that the adjustive efforts of work and family are of equal significance. But the structure of modern economy is such that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

it makes the family assume a more active role in this process. As Bell and Vogel (1968: 12) indicate: "In many modern industrial societies where there is a heavy emphasis on productivity, a relatively large adjustment has to be made by the family to the economy, compared to societies where economic productivity is not regarded as so important."

Thus, to play its part in this process of adjustment, the family may have to devise some mechanism to lend support to its wage-earners. One such mechanism is to adapt its internal and external activities to the world of work, e.g., to model them on the economic roles of its wage-earners. This may involve a structuring of activities in a differentiated or joint manner.[32] The occurrence of a given mode may depend upon concrete or symbolic help or certain "behavioral responses" exchanged within the family as it engages in transactions with the work. But these modes *per se* must be seen at a concrete level. This is not because they have certain tangible referents but that they reflect actual adjustive efforts of the family. Each mode, of course, may assume a certain symbolic value for the workers and their families.

Work and Family: The Process of Adaptation

As we have just mentioned, the work and family interact with each other in various subtle ways and on many levels to influence the process of adaptation. In the following, we will briefly describe one outcome of this interaction, e.g., the emergence of "work personality". In our latter analysis, where we develop specific hypotheses, we will draw upon this concept to link work and family variables.

The world of work, seen as a "microcosm" of the larger social

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

system, has its own distinct values, myths, customs, rules and regulations, certain conventions and styles. These characteristics constitute a "structured field"[33] or a social context where work socialization takes place. This socialization tends to influence attitude, behavior and the general personality system of a wage-earner which he brings to work (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1947; Presthus, 1962). In more concrete terms, the new socializing forces consisting of work peers and environmental constraints and inducements cause the wage-earner to learn and internalize work-related values and the catalogues of expected behavior. This may either necessitate some change in his earlier attitudes and behavior patterns or invoke him to reassess them so as to make them consistent with what is demanded of him in the work world.[34]

This continuous transaction between the worker and the ingredients of his social context facilitates the development of work behavior, which, according to Neff (1968: 72), "may be conceived of as the complex product of a long series of learned and habitual styles of perceiving and coping with the demands of the environment." As a result, part of his behavior—which may be a large part—with which he enters into the world of work, is likely to be colored by his work behavior. This behavior, then, tends to induce a marked change in the wage-earner's general personality system, which he develops through his socialization that occurs in the family, school, and other similar agencies. Consequently, there develops what may be referred to as *work personality*, consisting of a "concrete set of interrelated motives, coping styles, defensive maneouvers and the like" (Neff, 1968: 154).

Looking at this process in light of the context of work, the role

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

played by *bureaucratization, social complexity,* and *career* in the formation of work personality becomes plain, for these dimensions of work constitute an essential set of objective conditions that make up the social context in which work personality largely develops. Each dimension is a constellation of certain characteristics which continuously influence the personality of the worker in a particular way. Thus, Merton (1968) speaks of "bureaucratic personality" to indicate the pervasiveness of bureaucratization which instills its distinct values and codes of behavior in the wage-earner. This evokes other images of personality types, e.g., "mechanical" or "social personality" to show the impact of work complexity on the wage-earner, and "anomic personality" to signify the effects of an unstable work career.

It is this work personality which mediates between work and family systems. Before elaborating this point further, here we may add that the work personality is not an entity in itself and should not be construed completely separate from a more generalized conception of personality. Indeed its formation may be seen closely linked with the family socialization and the general personality which it produces.

Obviously, the family of orientation provides initial training, certain basic skills, and motivation to work, to its members. Before he launches into the world of work, the prospective worker himself tends to tune his orientation to the expected occupational role through a process of "anticipatory socialization". Whether or not he seeks out his expected occupation is a different question,[35] but both family and anticipatory socialization interact to induce some flexibility in his general personality so that it becomes amenable to further modifications and alterations in consonant with the demands of the work world. This same interaction

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

between these facets of socialization tends to prepare or even psychologically predispose him for *occupational socialization*. Perhaps because of certain obvious economic considerations the wage-earner's integration and identification with his occupation is further facilitated by the support which he derives from his family of procreation (cf. Parsons and Bales, 1955). His occupational identity, which is one important segment of his work personality, largely develops from these reciprocal effects of complex forces. However, the more significant role seems to be played by the work world and the family of procreation of the wage-earner.[36]

To restate the earlier argument more clearly, the work personality stands as a *structural link* between work and family worlds. In this capacity, it generalizes or carries over certain modes of behavior and coping mechanisms to the family. We may repeat here to stress that what it carries over to the family is not the concrete elements of objective conditions of work but their *effects* which the worker tends to experience. According to the sociology-of-knowledge perspective, it is the cognitive style of the organization of knowledge of these elements and their subjective meanings and experience which tends to be transferred to the family (see Berger et al., 1974: 30).

Work personality may link family and work systems in another sense too, e.g., compensatory. That is, the worker may compensate his work pressures and difficulties by seeking "substitute gratification" in the family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1965; Edgell, 1970). But the carry-over or generalizing tendency of the worker seems more pronounced for the following reasons. First, it tends to obtain consistency in the overall behavior patterns of the worker. This has the effect of decreasing interpersonal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

strains which may result from an inconsistent and incongruent behavior (Grathoff, 1975). Second, since this tendency makes human behavior more or less patterned and predictable, it is likely to lend stability to interchanges between work and family systems. Both consistency and stability are basic to the continuity of interchanges.[37]

A recognition of these forms of work-family linkages via work personality does not contradict the thesis that proposes segregation between work and family at the institutional level (e.g., Smelser, 1959). But it does temper the exaggerated picture of this thesis. For the work personality, which emerges from a reciprocal interaction between the external objective conditions of the work and the subjective experience of the worker, tends to root itself in his structure of consciousness. At this level, it seems to permeate the worker's behavior in different contexts which he encounters.

In conclusion, work personality is a medium which carries over work experience, its pressures, patterns of behavior and coping mechanisms to the family. The family absorbs these effects into its internal and external activities by changing them to differentiated or joint modes. This might involve crossing intra-system boundaries to obtain a given pattern. For this, the family seems to cultivate willingness in its members to correlate their behavior with that of the wage-earner's. The intra-family behavioral consistency, which follows from this, tends to stabilize modes of adaptation.[38] The efforts which a family makes to facilitate this process may be viewed as an "adaptive response".

Analytically, work personality is considered as an "intervening variable" between the original set of work and family variables. Though

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(as we have already emphasized) it develops from an interaction of subjective experience and concrete conditions of social context, it is seen as an "objective variable" since its socially significant elements can be *shared* with other members. In the subsequent analysis we will treat work personality as a relatively more distinct aspect of the general personality system for the following two reasons: a) to indicate the significance of work experience in the lives of wage-earners, and b) to show the extent to which our argument departs from those based on the variables of SES and networks.

Research Hypotheses

As we have tried to establish, it is an ongoing transaction between work and family, mediated by work personality, which tends to shape the modes of adaptation. The actual occurrence of a given mode may, therefore, vary with bureaucratization, social complexity and orderliness of career for each affects personality in a distinct way. In the following section, we will develop hypotheses which we suggested in chapter one. Wherever possible, we shall *interpret* some relevant empirical findings from previous research for an elaboration and initial verification of these hypotheses.[39]

Bureaucratization of the Work Setting

> Already now . . . rational calculation is manifest at every stage. By it, the performance of each individual worker is mathematically measured, each man becomes a little cog in the machine and, aware of this, his own preoccupation is whether he can become bigger. . . . [This] passion for bureaucracy . . . is enough to drive one to despair. . . . The great question is therefore, not how we can promote [bureaucracy] . . ., but what can we oppose to this machinery in order to keep a portion of mankind free from this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

parcelling out of the soul, from this supreme mastery of the bureaucratic way of life.

Max Weber*

Intra-Family Interaction

Working in bureaucratic organizations is seen by a number of analysts as having important effects on the personality, attitude and behavior of the wage-earners. According to the Bergers and Kellner (1974: 47-50), it tends to instill bureaucratic principles of specialization and gradation of roles and duties in the personality and cognitive style of the worker. This produces a specific type of coping mechanism which systematically shapes his response to his official and extra-official aspects of life.[40] Presthus (1962) and Bensman and Rosenberg (1960) claim that bureaucracies generate power-seeking tendencies and authoritarian attitudes among their participants. To Merton (1968: 252), bureaucracies exert constant pressures upon workers to be conformist, "methodical, prudent and disciplined". It has been noted further that bureaucratic rationality tends to create a strong sense of legalism and greater adherence to a consistent use of standardized procedures and regulations inside and outside the office (Mills, 1972). Several other critics seize upon these structurally induced pressures and strains as the main source of conflict between organizational demands and the personality system[41] and familial roles of bureaucrats (Argyris, 1957; Katz and Danet, 1973).

A few descriptive studies are available that throw some light on

* Quoted from a speech delivered by Max Weber, which is partly excerpted by Katz and Danet in their reader, *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York Basic Books (1973: 12).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the possible influence of bureaucratic situations on family life. Among their other concerns, these studies also looked at the adaptations made by wives to their *husbands'* occupational roles, who worked in large bureaucratic corporations. Though not directly related to the problem explored here, the findings of these studies may be interpreted to show that in such families the members are more likely to adapt to a differentiated mode of family tasks and decisions.

Helfrich (1965), in her study of wage-earners holding different managerial positions, reports data on the modes of role adaptations for 50 wives. About half the wives (23) in this study were found to be "family centred". In their families, roles were highly differentiated, with the wife taking responsibility for home, children, and often the financial matters. Helfrich attributes this pattern to the husband's greater commitment to the affairs of his bureaucratic organization and the corresponding demands of time and work pressures. Yet the husband, despite these strains, tended to control the major decisions in the family. This specialization is interpreted as an adaptive response on the part of the wife who is expected by her husband and his organization to look after household chores more deligently.

Findings of Pahl and Pahl (1971), based on their English data, show a somewhat similar pattern. Of 57 wives, 26 which they called "domestic wives", practiced a pattern in which husbands and wives performed separate but complementary activities. In a relatively small number of families (16) both partners were equally involved in almost all aspects of family life (p. 226). The authors feel that their data on British managers reveal a less intense interaction between work organization and family as compared

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to the close linkages shown by American studies (e.g., Helfrich, 1965; Whyte Jr., 1951). Yet many wives in their sample reflected a great deal of antagonism towards their husbands' firms and resented the heavy demands made on them because this led to keeping them busy with feeding and cleaning most of the day (p. 196).

The findings of these studies seem to confirm the picture drawn by William Whyte Jr. (1951) in his well-known study of "the wives of management". This study was based on 230 interviews with corporation officials, industrial consultants, managers and their wives. From Whyte's extensive analysis of organizational life, two sources of differentiation may be identified. First, there are organizational pressures, strains and frustrations, which tend to reflect in the family by the husband's job which he brings home either in his briefcase or in his head. Second, it is his somewhat authoritarian attitude, revamped by his internalization of rules and organizational procedures, which enables him to demand a great deal of deference and compliance from his wife.

Two other studies seem to make similar observations. Warner and Abegglen (1956) and Steiner (1972) in their analyses of the married life of employees of large organizations report several instances of role-differentiation. According to their descriptions, the major reason of this differentiation lies in husbands' actual or psychological non-availability at home. Even those husbands who manage to spend some time with wives and children, often fail to get rid of official worries and pressures. These realities of the husband's life tend to impel the wife to make the familial roles as her main concern and a primary source of gratification.

Generally, these studies indicate that differentiation in family

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

interaction may emerge due to bureaucratic pressures and strains. In part, the likelihood of this pattern seems to reside in its consistency with the socialization that occurs in a setting where authority, rank, power, and status are clearly differentiated. Perhaps this tends to shape the perception and orientation of wage-earners in such a way as to make compartmentalization of family activities a rather easy process. This line of reasoning in conjunction with the literature suggests the following hypotheses which we shall examine empirically in the present study. *There is an inverse relationship between the degree of bureaucratization of the wage-earner's work setting and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks and b) family decisions.*

Extra-family Social Activity

In large measure, the main sources of differentiation in extra-family social activity issue from bureaucracy's distinct social and psychological climate which it provides to its participants. Impersonality, restricted sociability, individualism, anonymity, tensions and strains are some of the significant elements that seem to characterize this environment (Crozier, 1964; Whyte Jr., 1957; Bensman and Rosenberg, 1960). These elements and the structural features of bureaucracy which produce them act upon the personality of the worker, and in this way, tend to reflect into his family. This evokes certain specific patterns of adaptation to social activity. These patterns are likely to be congruent with his orientation and attitudes formed in a bureaucratic organization which pressures him to "act, and to a good part think and feel *organizationally*"[42] (Schneider, 1969: 75).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As we indicated in the previous section, the pattern of adaptation which appears to be a more likely outcome of bureaucratic socialization is the one in which family tasks and decisions tend to be differentiated. Findings of some earlier studies may be brought together here to suggest that this is equally true in the case of extra-family social activity.

In a fairly old study of junior and middle-level managers, Whyte Jr. (1951) observed a pattern of social activity where the wife was primarily devoted to community activities, e.g. clubs and local organizations, and the husband to his corporation. "With a remarkable uniformity of phrasing, corporation officials all over the country", according to Whyte Jr., were able to sketch the ideal of a wife as the one who not only meets her "community obligations" but "realizes [that] her husband belongs to the corporation" (p. 86). Almost all the managers whom he interviewed wanted to see the same characteristics of sweetness and adaptability in their wives which their corporations demanded from them.

Helfrich's (1965) data, cited in the foregoing, confirm this differentiated pattern of extra-family social activity. Like Whyte Jr., she too reports a greater involvement for wives in organizations, social and civic affairs as well as in primary activity, e.g. bridge playing, bowling and neighbourhood get-togethers. The husbands, on the other hand, were relatively fully submerged in their work organizations. This segregated involvement occurred on behalf of the husband and his organization. As one wife explains: "My husband expects me to represent the family in the community. He is busy with his work, therefore, I joined some civic organizations in the community". And another wife remarks: "One has the feeling that the company expects this of you—to participate in civic and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

social affairs and, if possible, to be a leader in the community . . ." (p. 55).

A somewhat overstated picture of the effects of working in competitively-oriented big corporations on family life is presented by Seidenberg (1973). He sums up his observations as follows: "All commentators on the corporate wife seem to agree that her principal disease is loneliness. . . . [Similarly] corporate men are lonely, both in their travels and in their offices. Caught up in what David Reisman has called the 'antagonistic' cooperation of big business, they secretly yearn for more trust and genuine friendship, which are absent both from competitors on the outside and inside the organization. . . . Despite his success, there is no one such a man can confide in concerning the vital issues that may plague him. He never knows when some conversation or memo may be used against him. Ultimately he must keep his own counsel, he may not talk about certain matters, even with his wife, for she might inadvertently betray him. This obviously leads to isolation and loneliness" (p. 95).

As a part of their larger survey, Young and Willmott (1973: 239-62) also provide data on the nature of married life of 190 managing, deputy managing, and assistant directors of large companies. The extent of interference between work organization and the interests of home and family reported by this group was about 50% higher than the amount mentioned by self-employed businessmen. This interference was especially pronounced with respect to their leisure life. Most of the directors found themselves restricted in adapting to a joint pattern of social activities involving other family members. A considerable number of those who rationalized their total dedication to their companies encouraged their wives to be on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

their own to keep themselves busy with their independent and separate social activities. Apparently, these wage-earners saw this pattern as a partial "solution" to their conflicting allegiance to their work organizations and families.

Kanter (1977b) in her book, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, makes similar observations. Based on her data on the behavior and life style of wives and husbands who worked in a big "Industrial Supply Corporation" with its labor force over 50,000, she reports a very intense carryover link between job setting and family life. According to her analysis, the pressures of conformity, loyalty, trust and accountability, which the bureaucratic climate puts on the husbands, severely constrain the choice and plans of wives and other members regarding their extra-family social activity. Like several previous researchers, she found an active engagement in community activities among the wives as a motivational support to their husbands. But this rarely converted into a full companionship for the majority of wives tended to see themselves as largely isolated or only peripherally involved in the social activities of their husbands. In one review essay, Kanter (1977a: 17,36) cites Renshaw's study of 128 managers and wives in a large multinational corporation in support of her position. In this study, almost all of the respondents experienced disconnections in their social relations with family members, friends and relatives. With a great deal of reluctance, they attributed their inability to adapt to a joint social life to the nature of their work setting and organizational policies, which they viewed as highly programmed and individuating in their effects.

It is evident from this review of the literature that several

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

complex forces, all issueing from the structure of bureaucratic organizations, impinge on the personality of the wage-earner, and consequently produce circumstances leading to a differentiated social life. We may summarize this analysis in the form of these research hypotheses: *There is an inverse relationship between the degree of bureaucratization of the wage-earner's work setting and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity and b) organization-focussed activity.*

Social Complexity of Work

> . . . Work (primarily performed with tools and machinery) exhausts the nervous system to the uttermost, it does away with many-sided play of the muscles, both in bodily and intellectual activity. . . . Along with the tool, the skill of the workman in handling it passes over to the machine. . . . Thereupon, the individual machine, that we have hitherto been considering, sinks into a mere factor of production of machinery.
>
> Karl Marx*

Intra-Family Interaction

The socially complex jobs—which involve a high degree of parallel and reciprocal interaction for their completion—are likely to foster a relational orientation and a spirit of working together in the personality of the wage-earner. These characteristics tend to cultivate an accommodative style that entails a greater use of mutual consultation, compromise and negotiations. An interchange of these resources within the family is shown to contribute to cooperative and consensual relationships among family

---

* These quotations are from Chapter XV, "Machinery and Modern Industry", in Karl Marx' *Capital*, Vol. I: Progress Publishers, Moscow. The first quotation is taken from p. 398; the second from p. 396; and the third from p. 357.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

members, which in turn, sharpen their role-taking abilities (Veroff and Feld, 1970: 20-22). Second, since such jobs primarily deal with people and their problems, they are more apt to provide some material for discussion and sharing of work experience among family members (Blood, 1972). This closeness leads to a sort of "information companionship" which enhances marital communication and psychological intimacy. Consequently, a belief of sharing other family activities including family tasks and decisions is likely to develop.

This link between social complexity and a joint participation in family activities derives some strength from a few preliminary observations made in the literature. McKinley (1964: 144), for instance, feels that workers in people-serving jobs are likely to become "more familial and domesticated in their general orientation" than those in technological jobs that do not allow any substantive amount of social interaction. This seems to imply that service-oriented jobs tend to soften the traditional sex-role typing and consequently reduce differentiation in family roles. Rapoport and Lauman (cited in the Rapoports, 1965: 385) found scientists more than the "hardware" engineers to engage in joint decision-makings with their wives. They based their interpretation of this finding on the wider diffusion of universalistic norms among the scientists.

Findings of other studies may be presented here to suggest that the wage-earners with less complex jobs—those dealing with data and things or objects[43]—are likely to adapt to a differentiated mode of participation in family tasks and decisions.

Rubin (1976) in a study of working class families attributes differentiation to occasional domestic conflicts and dissatisfactions

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

resulting from their financial difficulties. Since a large majority of workers in her study held object-oriented jobs, it seems that a conspicuous absence of "human factor" from their job activities is an important element in the process leading to family differentiation. Perhaps these were the strains and tensions of "dull, routine and deadening jobs", experienced by her mail sorters, mechanics, truckers, warehouse men, and auto workers, which rather independently contributed to their removal from an active involvement in their domestic activities (pp. 160-161).

Similarly, in Komarovsky's (1967) earlier and more detailed study, in a large number of families who reflected an extremely differentiated style of family tasks and decisions, the wage-earners held one of the following jobs: truck driver, carpenter, metal worker, pipelayer, sash fitter, sanitation worker, fish cleaner, and construction worker etc. Part of the reason lies in the monotonous quality of these jobs as well as in their socially impoverished contents. This tended to reduce conversational possibilities and marital communication, which in turn, detered the development of common interests in the family. Also, some of the workers reflected their work role prescriptions and orientations in the family which further contributed to a clear-cut division of roles.

In another study, Rosser and Harris (1965) attribute, in part, Welsh workingmen's inability to share domestic activities to their jobs which tended to deplete much of their physical energy. Hawthorn and Paddon (1971: 611-28) based on their data on work and family life of skilled workers in five industries in England and Wales, reported a relatively high degree of "sex-role segregation" for the miners and the truckers and lorry-drivers. It was the physically arduous nature of the mining job and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the long trampings and relative isolation of drivers which accounted for this differentiation of their internal family activities.

This evidence is of a sensitizing value only. Nevertheless, it provides some justification to state the following hypotheses: *There is a direct relationship between the degree of social complexity in the wage-earner's job and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks and b) family decisions.*

Extra-Family Social Activity

As we have indicated above, the volume, intensity, and frequency of interaction involved in socially complex jobs by definition goes well beyond the amount entailed by less complex jobs.[44] This interaction generates several conditions which may enable the wage-earner to learn social skills, develop a high level of confidence, and affiliative motives. An articulation of these features with the family is likely to elicit an adaptive response from other members which may increase the probability of a joint social activity.

Social skills, e.g., intelligence and judgement, affect work personality in two important ways. First, they contribute to the development of a growing awareness of the complexity of social relationships in concrete phenomena. Second, they tend to produce congeniality and a sense of co-existence in the work personality by socializing the wage-earner in such a manner where yielding to others does not undermine one's own self. The wage-earner equipped with these skills is likely to show greater concern with leisure needs and interests of other family members. This may expand social activities to the family-level, and motivate the members

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to integrate their individual activities with the interests of the family group. The process by which this orientation seems to facilitate jointness is aptly summarized by Roethlisberger (1954) who uses the term "human-relation-skills" to refer to "the capacity of a person to communicate his feelings and ideas to others, to receive such communication from others and to respond to their feelings and ideas in such a manner as to promote congenial participation in a common task" (p. 143).

On the other hand, the jobs which tend to be more repetitive, routined and mechanically-paced,[45] seem less likely to integrate into the totality of the wage-earner's social life. The effects of these less complex jobs are often criticized for causing a diminished capacity for work and leisure (Blauner, 1973; Fox, 1971). Kornhauser (1965: 186-207) feels that such jobs tend to narrow the world view and outlook of workers; this shrinks their interest in active mental and social life and renders their spare time activities highly tenuous. Numerous other critics from "the self-actualization school" have argued that these jobs place severe limits on the opportunities for self-expression and a sense of involvement in work and related activities (see Herzberg, 1968; Maslow, 1965; Fromm, 1959). According to Wilensky (1964: 307), the less complex jobs are likely to produce "a spillover of leisure routine in which alienation from work becomes alientation from life". The studies which looked at the influence of these and other similar job-conditions on family life indicate the occurrence of a differentiated mode of primary and organization-focussed activities in families where the wage-earners hold less complex jobs.

In one study, Slater and Woodside (1951) found English workers, who held strenuous and physically taxing jobs, manifest a lack of interest in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sex with their spouses; only on weekends or holidays, could some of them assume sexual activity. This very nature of their jobs is also partly held accountable for the differentiation which they reflected in their leisure life. Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter's (1956) study of coal miners in "Ashton", Yorkshire, reveals a rather more direct link between differentiation in leisure activities and the nature of the job. These miners who, despite their considerable work involvement, saw their work as uninteresting, dull and boring, tended to have an uninspiring and empty social life at home. "It [was] very unusual for an Ashton family to arrange some sort of social event in their home and jointly entertain friends" (p. 182). The authors feel that the "rhythm of domestic life" of these workers was in fact a mirror image of the "rhythm of their working-day".

Further evidence on the process by which less socially complex jobs contribute to a differentiated extra-family activity is provided by Lillian Rubin (1976). In describing the job experience of machine operators, night watchmen, iron workers and steam fitters, which she studied, she writes: "For the men in such jobs, bitterness, alienation, resignation, and boredom are the defining features of the work experience" (p. 159). She argues that the impact of these characteristics of the job on the worker is so strong that he cannot prevent them from intruding upon family life. It is perhaps this interrelation between work and family that seems to partly account for a differentiated social life.

These findings confirm those of Mira Komarovsky (1967). She explained social segregation mainly in terms of the low socio-economic status of her blue-collarites and partly with reference to their specific job characteristics. In regard to the latter, she particularly noted the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

impact of mechanical nature of jobs, which neither require "social entertaining" nor do they serve as "sources of new contacts", on the social life (p. 312). Fatigue was another important characteristic of less socially complex jobs which contributed to a differentiated pattern of extra-family social activity as the following angry remarks of a pipefitter seem to indicate: "Oh, for Christ's sake! . . . companionable! Let her work in a factory eight hours and be companionable" (p. 117).

Concluding this review, we may suggest the following hypotheses for empirical investigation: *There is a direct relationship between the degree of social complexity of the wage-earner's job and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity and b) organization-focussed activity.*

Orderliness of the Work Career

> A person "loses his (her) job, and seeds of dissension are planted. Tensions course through the family as hardships increase; irritations chafe once smooth relationships and suppressed hostility crackles momentarily into view. The interplay with the family builds towards an emotional climax, and as the climax nears, bitter antagonisms creep from hiding and gnaw at the ties that bind the members.
>
> Hansen and Hill*

Intra-Family Interaction

An orderly work career seems likely to operate as a stabilizing, integrating, and ego-satisfying force in the life of a wage-earner. This may be attributed to the fact that an orderly career lends strength and

---

* Donald A. Hansen and Rubin Hill, "Families under Stress," in H. T. Christensen (ed.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, Chicago: Rand McNally; 1964, p. 782.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

durability to interchanges between the family and the work system. A continuity in these interchanges may afford the wage-earner and his family to experience the reality of their lives in a more continuous manner. As a result, the members are likely to develop clearer and more uniform perceptions of marital relations.

Second, by producing some degree of satisfaction in marriage, this continuity of interchanges tends to draw members closer to each other (Levinger, 1970). This may increase their mutual significance, and in this way, enable them to develop a feeling of "meaningful existence". This seems to lend some strength to the "nomos building" character of marriage which, according to Berger and Kellner (1970: 50), "creates for the individual the sort of order in which he can experience his life as making sense". Since the durability of this process rests on a continuous and consistent correlation between definitions of reality held by married partners, "most of each partner's actions" are likely to be "projected in conjunction with those of the other" (Ibid.: 58). It is perhaps this mutual definition of a given problem, which the orderly career families may arrive at relatively easily, that seems to increase the likelihood of jointness in intra-family interaction.

A chaotic experience of the work career, by contrast, is likely to split the "self" of the wage-earner, in that he either develops a tendency to blame himself/herself and/or other individuals who may be seen as primary sources of this type of career. The proclivity to blame oneself tends to foster feelings of self-defeat, pity and indignation (Komarovsky, 1971). By way of blaming actual or perceived others, the wage-earner is likely to be led to question the value of their presence in the family and may hold

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

them partly responsible for his troubles, failures and the consequent psychological crisis (Bakke, 1940). This state may generate a series of overt conflicts in the family or it may lead to serious marital doubts. In either case, this is likely to result in a complete or partial withdrawal, at least in the social-psychological sense, of the wage-earner or other members from internal family activities. This may render the development of a joint mode of participation in family tasks and family decisions very unlikely.

Almost all studies of a sudden discontinuity in work career, made at the time of the Depression of the 1930s (Angell, 1966; Stouffer and Lazarsfeld, 1972; Cavan and Ranck, 1938; Bakke, 1933, 1940; Komarovsky, 1971; Morgan, 1939), have emphasized its several disparaging consequences for the personality and attitude of the wage-earner. Though these studies focus on extreme cases which happen to fall prey to somewhat unusual economic conditions, the general pattern of family life described by the authors, with some caution, may be considered an approximate reflection of the families where the wage-earners may have less orderly work careers in the present situation.

Cavan and Ranck (1938: 1-9) consider economic depression, brought by career disruptions, as "a family crisis", and hold it partly accountable for personality disorganization of the members. "This disorganization may be evidenced by worry, 'nervous breakdown', excessive fears, or demoralization" (p. 6). Bakke (1940) regards it as a "disturbing irritant" which acts to thwart emotional stability by increasing tensions, worries, and a self-reproaching tendency (p. 228). A more thorough examination of the linkages between personality and a punctured work experience is offered by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Komarovsky (1971: 66-83) in her classic, *The Unemployed Man and His Family*. According to her observations a disorderly career may lead to a deterioration of personality: "loss of emotional stability, breaking down of morale, irritability, new faults, such as drinking, unfaithfulness to the spouse and so on" (p. 66). She further notes that the spouse "may become panicky . . . and lose his sense of security and dignity . . . he may become apathetic or he may become over-dominant or difficult to live with" (p. 40).

It would seem that all these personality attributes and attitudinal outcomes are likely to generate differentiation in family interaction in several ways. First, the wage-earner may simply fail to meet his/her role demands in the family and consequently may leave them to other members. Second, he/she may become overpossessive and thereby may tend to obstruct the participation of other members in family tasks and decisions. These speculations are consistent with those of Goode's (1971: 517) who feels that the wage-earner may be "psychologically crushed" by an interrupted work career "especially as this continues over time". In an extreme form, the individual might become a "pathological case" in that the resultant behavior is likely to deter him from "effectively carrying out his role obligations". This implies that an inadequate or ineffective participation in intra-family interaction may lead to differentiation by causing some sort of gap between mutual expectations of members, which may tend to impair reciprocity and mutual sharing.

As implicit in the above discussion, the wage-earner whose work career lacks orderliness is more likely to develop an "anomic personality". Though originating from certain structural sources, as Durkheim (1951) has argued, once an anomic state becomes visible, it tends to leave profound

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

effects on one's "state of mind" and personality orientation. In a somewhat overstated fashion, MacIver (1950: 85) describes the anomic person as "pulled up by his moral roots, who has no longer any standards but only disconnected urges, who has no longer any sense of continuity, of folk, of obligation. The anomic man [is likely to become] spiritually sterile, responsive only to himself, responsible to no one. He derides the values of other men. His only faith is the philosophy of denial".

The wage-earner, who, because of a low degree of orderliness in the work career, elicits this type of orientation in the family is less likely to promote jointness. In fact, as evidenced by a large number of studies of the effects of depression, this orientation may contribute to some sort of "domestic anomy".[46] Due to the resultant role confusion and mistrust, disagreements would mount, which eventually might lead to differentiation in family tasks and decisions.

In recapitulation, the effects of work career for the nature of intra-family interaction may be viewed at two levels. First, in more concrete terms, it may be assumed that the wage-earner whose career has been less orderly, is likely to invite some degree of nagging, criticism and withdrawal of certain customary services. This means that he would tend to perceive a loss of prestige, respect, mutual affection, trust and love. As a consequence, his overall importance will decrease which is likely to squeeze his level of participation in internal family activities rather markedly. If due to certain other reasons these concrete changes do not take place, the perception which family members have had of the wage-earner seems highly likely to change negatively[47] (Koos, 1946). This second outcome of a less orderly career is likely to generate a situation

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of "changed conception of roles" (Angell, 1966). Consequently, the roles are likely to be played without much zeal and enthusiasm (Hill, 1949: 14). This may further tend to increase marital tensions and produce extremely strained relationships, and in this way, may enhance some degree of friction in their expectations of each other. The members, as a result, are likely to show a reduced interest in family tasks and decisions, which may lead to differentiation in these aspects of intra-family interaction.

The studies of economic depression, perhaps due to their broader concern with several aspects of family life, present only a limited analysis of interaction patterns. Since these studies, in order to understand the intensity of family reaction to depression, make several assumptions regarding the nature of "family organizations", it becomes difficult to disentangle the causal variables that account for a given pattern. However, a careful scrutiny of their detailed case studies do indicate some connection between differentiation in family tasks and decisions and a disorderly work career.

The studies made by Angell (1966) of 50 families and by Cavan and Ranck (1938) of 100 Chicago families reveal a moderate relationship between disorderly career and family differentiation. Both these studies offer a very complex analysis of family life, where work career *and* the degree of family organization before the depression interact together to induce differentiation. Thus, differentiation was more visible in Angell's moderately integrated and moderately adaptable or unadaptable families and Cavan and Ranck's not so well-organized families as compared with highly integrated and organized families. One reason was that such families felt utterly defenceless to the crisis brought by a discontinuity in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work career. Second, a "change in role position" served as an easier excuse for family members to direct their criticism on the wage-earner. Consequently, marital tensions and discord increased to split the family into different groups.

Komarovsky (1971: 23-48) also reports few instances of a differentiated family interaction. Typically, the husbands experienced a substantial reduction in terms of their participation in family decisions. This, in turn, resulted in their lack of sharing of family tasks with wives and children. Komarovsky attributes these changes to a complex of causes, which operate in a circular and cumulative character. The "loss of the provider's role in the family" and "economic failure with its prestige implications", resulting from a disorderly work career, were the more important reasons of this differentiated mode of interaction.

Bakke's studies of English workers of Greenwich (1933: 155-176) and of American workers of New Haven (1940: 109-152; 201-215) present a somewhat similar picture. The economic privations are held accountable for triggering a series of psychological consequences which tended to enhance tensions in the family. The bitterness, irritation, nervousness and anxiety that characterized the wage-earner's personality contributed to deteriorate his relationship with other family members. Constant disappointments and worries about work career which tended to result in the wage-earner's withdrawal from an active family life, according to Bakke's analysis, eventually led to a differentiated pattern of family tasks and decisions.

The findings of these earlier studies are generally consistent with the results obtained by more recent research on the unemployed families. Aldous (1969a, 1969b), for instance, reports data on white and black

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

families that lend strength to "Moynihan Thesis", which argues that the unemployed wage-earners are apt to have differentiated conjugal roles.[48] Disorders in the work career, she feels, tend to impair marital communication and role-reciprocities. The negative attitudes of family members further stimulates feelings of inadequacy in the wage-earner. This lessens his overall family involvement, which in turn, decreases his participation in household tasks and decision-makings.

The specific hypotheses which follow from this analysis of the effects of work career on family interaction may be stated as follows: *There is a direct relationship between the degree of orderliness of the wage-earner's work career and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) family tasks and b) family decisions.*

Extra-Family Social Activity

The patterns of social activity seem to be closely linked with the nature of career evaluation and the type of attitude which a wage-earner forms in light of this evaluation. An orderly career worker, perhaps due to an enormous emphasis which the modern industrial society places on success and achievement in the economic sector (Mizruchi, 1964; Chinoy, 1955), is likely to obtain a positive appraisal from his family and the larger community. The feelings of dignity and fulfillment which may accrue from this, tend to promote an integrated and coherent picture of self and the social environment. The families who perceive their social milieux in a favorable light are likely to put greater value on companionship and a sharing of social activities (Scanzoni, 1970: 66-67).

A disorderly career, on the other hand, may be seen as a threat

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to a positive sense of selfhood for it fosters a damaging rather than an affirmative occupational identity and the total identity of the wage-earner (Tiffany et al., 1970; Wilensky, 1961). This tends to lower his self-esteem and makes him vulnerable to a rather harsh criticism from friends, relatives, and co-workers (Wadel, 1973: 110-111). Moreover, a disorderly career seems to heighten a sense of anticipating disapprovals from others by making the worker aware of his failures. This indicates that a disrupted work experience is less likely to encourage strong attachments within the family and in the external social systems.[49] Some findings from the previously cited literature may be reviewed here to hypothesize that a less stable progression over the worklife would more likely give rise to a differentiated mode of participation in primary and organization-focussed social activities.[50]

An earlier detailed analysis of "spare-time relations and practices" or "leisure life" of workers, subjected to irregular job-changes, frequent layoffs, and eventual unemployment, is offered by E. Wight Bakke. His New Haven and Greenwich data show that families of such workers are more likely to adapt to a restricted social life, in which husbands, wives, and children tend to involve themselves in different cliques, neighbourhood associations, and community-sponsored sources of recreation. For instance, when employed, 66% of the New Haven families visited their friends frequently together, while 29% could do so after their experience with work discontinuity (1940: 14). Bakke (1933: 177-201) also observed a similar degree of differentiation in the social life of Greenwich families; this differentiation was more visible in club-membership and going to movies (p. 180).

Komarovsky's (1971: 122-125) intensive analysis of 59 families also revealed differentiation in informal activities, visiting friends, relatives,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

neighbours, and "the organized social life of the church and clubs". According to Komarovsky, the primary reason of this resided in the "humiliations of comparisons" and the "fear of being snubbed" by families with secure jobs.[51] The stress and anxiety, which a disrupted work career deepened in the wage-earner, also played their part in producing this differentiated style of social activity.

Angell's (1966) data indicate that except for the evening meals and other similar events, a large number of families adapted to a differentiated mode of social life. In the most common pattern, the husbands, who happened to experience disorders in work career, tended to withdraw from clubs, informal associations, and community organizations. The wives, on the other hand, developed a more active interest in PTA, church, music programs, and informal get-togethers with female friends—perhaps to "be away from the family difficulties". The children, due to this parental segregation, found it more easy to engage in peer group activities. Angell feels that an irritable and scolding attitude of other family members towards the wage-earner partly led to this pattern. The workers who came to define these other members as "accusing symbols" of their failure, tended to isolate themselves from extra-family social activity. This pattern was more typical of moderately or less integrated families, where the adjustment to career disruptions was seen as more problematic.

In a slightly different study, Wilensky (1964) also reports a much weaker social integration for disorderly career workers. In his sample of 108 blue and 38 white-collar workers, the medium number of jobs held since completion of education came out to be 6. About 45% of them showed an extremely inconsistent and interrupted mobility pattern (p. 315). These

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

workers whose careers lack orderliness, according to Wilensky, tended to experience a loss of occupational identity and order in personal life. This tended to enhance a lack of interest in family activities which, eventually, led to an individuated pattern of social life.

These research findings are largely consistent with the theoretical link between work career and family differentiation which we have tried to develop in the preceding pages. In summarizing this discussion, we may suggest the following hypotheses: *There is a direct relationship between the degree of orderliness of the wage-earner's work career and the degree of jointness in his/her family's mode of participation in a) primary-level activity and b) organization-focussed activity.*

Concluding Remarks on Research Hypotheses

As can be seen from our theoretical formulations, in developing these hypotheses, we have followed more widely recognized frameworks of looking at the effects of bureaucratization, work complexity, and work career. In doing so we have not been able to pay attention to certain competing theoretical orientations which may have suggested somewhat contrasting hypotheses. We shall address this question in chapter six where we will review our research findings.

Here it may be concluded from the literature reviewed in the foregoing that the proposed hypotheses amply stand the test of our preliminary examination. Now we are in a position to test them further with the data from our sample of East York families. We will perform this test in chapter five. After a first order exploration of the predicted relationship between work and family variables we shall

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

re-examine this relationship by introducing SES and networks as "*test variables*" into our analysis. This procedure will help determine the extent to which the explanation of variation in family interaction and social activity patterns offered here is stronger than the one suggested by SES and network studies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See for instance, Durkheim's *Division of Labor* (1964) and Weber's *General Economic History* (1950). Later studies that explored the relationship between industrialization and family in greater detail include those of Ogburn's *Technology and the Changing Family* (1955) and *On Culture and Social Change* (1964); Zimmerman's *Family and Civilization* (1947), Burgess et al.'s *The Family: From Traditional to Companionship* (1971); Smelser's *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution* (1959), and McDonald's *Automation and the Changing Family* (date of publication not given).

For a critique of several descriptive accounts and passioned polemics on the effects of industrialization-urbanization, see Goode's *World Revolution and Family Patterns* (1970) and Edwards' reader, *The Family & Change* (1969b). Goode has argued strongly that much of the past research which seeks to correlate "family forms" with different stages of industrialization has failed to determine "the exact points of impact" between these two events (1970: 11-22).

[2] A large number of studies of maternal employment, where the mothers defined their jobs as salient, perhaps out of economic necessity, have reported several harmful effects of the mothers' work involvement on the socialization of their young children (some of these studies may be found in *The Employed Mother in America*, edited by Nye and Hoffman (1963). But more recent evidence seems to contradict these earlier studies. In fact, it is argued that the mother's contribution (both in terms of income and status) to the family is likely to produce a more comfortable atmosphere in the family with positive effects on personality formation of their children (Pleck, 1977). Similarly, the studies which found no inherent connection between the mother's outside employment and marital adjustment, have predicted that the future family is likely to be a two-person career family with both husband and wife equally involved in work and family activities (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Holmstrom, 1972; Young and Willmott, 1973; Safilois-Rothschild, 1976).

[3] Looking at the details of their findings, increase in the husband's work-time did not reduce his availability for "therapeutic roles" nor did it affect his "sex role competency". Additionally, the husband's greater work-time did not bring any visible reduction in the wife's marital satisfaction. Only "recreational role" showed a substantial decrease in sharing. Clark et al. (1978) suggest that the effects of the husband's work-time on family role-performance largely depend upon his role priorities and the wife's expectations from the husband. They believe that the failure of the previous research to control these important intervening variables may have produced an inverse relationship between work involvement and the amount of family participation (p. 10).

[4] It may be pointed out that the studies reported by Aberle and Naegele (1968) and Seeley et al. (1956) offer more complex analyses of the linkages between family and the occupational world. In addition to work-related orientations, there are several other variables, e.g., the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

objective social standing of the family, the way family sees its status in the larger community, and family values and beliefs, that are shown to influence the nature and the quality of relationship between family life and the economic system.

[5] Mortimer (1976) reports findings from his study of students at the University of Michigan which lend further support to Kohn's thesis that parents do internalize their work values and transmit them to their children to influence their socialization and vocational orientations. According to his findings, the freshmen from *business families* showed a strong "extrnisic reward value orientation" and those whose fathers were classified as *professionals* (e.g., doctors, dentists, lawyers, scientists, teachers and professors) adhered to "intrinsic person-oriented reward values". This close connection between parental occupational values and students' vocational values, Mortimer believes, throws some doubt on the argument which suggests that more salient, demanding, and intrinsically gratifying occupations engender parental withdrawal and isolation from the family (p. 247).

[6] In this particular literature, the term "social class" is used in a non-Marxian sense or what Gilbert and McRoberts (1975: 93) call, "the distributive sense". This usage reveals "group differences in styles of living, wealth, income, education, occupation, and esteem or prestige". We shall use the term socio-economic status (SES) to refer to similar differences. Also, since most of the studies to be reviewed here employ the term social class, we will use both terms interchangeably.

[7] For instance, joint roles were characteristic of 88% of the upper-middle class couples, and differentiated roles of 72% of the lower-class couples (Rainwater, 1965: 32). With respect to decision-making, in 62% of middle-class families, both partners had an "equal voice". This was true of only 35% of upper-lower class families (p. 53).

[8] According to Young and Willmott's data, 15% of professionals, 7% of clerical workers, 13% of skilled and 12% of semi-skilled and unskilled workers helped their wives in washing up at least once a week. In regard to cleaning, cooking, and child care, etc., the respective percentages of these classes were as follows: 70, 80, 73, and 64 (1973: 95). The same level of jointness was found in family decision-making areas.

[9] Our comments will be limited to the explanations offered by studies which we have reviewed. Methodological and theoretical problems involved in the current conceptualization of SES are extensively discussed by Otto (1975), Bland (1979), and Osborn and Morris (1979). Basically, these problems arise from using a variety of SES indicators which make comparison of research findings exceedingly difficult.

[10] Since this line of analysis tends to put the major burden on early socialization in the childhood family as a mediating link between class and family behavior (see Gans, 1965; Rainwater, 1964), it largely drifts away from an examination of the effects of objective conditions of classes. This seems to mitigate the social psychological impact of occupation—an important component of SES Index—on the additudes and orientations of wage-earners.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[11] The studies that belong in this category derive their explanations from a perspective known as the *embourgeoisement thesis*. It holds that due to a general affluence experienced by advanced industrial societies, the differences between classes in close proximity (e.g., working-class and middle-class) are decreasing in regard to life style, attitudes, and outlook. In other words, the working-classes are taking on the values and behavior patterns of the middle-classes (Goldthorpe et al., 1969). Young and Willmott, who have often accounted for their data in line with this thesis, feel that an emphasis on equality, once a mark of middle-class families, is now trickling down to working and lower-class families. This is occurring through what they call the *principle of stratified diffusion*, meaning "that many social changes start at the top and work downwards" (1973: 23).

[12] Some of those who adhere to the *embourgeoisement thesis* (see note 11 above) have often argued for the renunciation of SES as a predictor of life style and behavior patterns (e.g. Nisbet, 1959). The Marxian sociologists, on the other hand, attack this position rather forcefully.

Charles Anderson, for instance, in his *The Political Economy of Social Class*, writes: "The proletarianization of white-collar workers, including the professional strata, is the dominant fact . . . rather than the embourgeoisement of the blue-collar worker" (1974: 168). Several other sociologists take a similar position. In one paper Rinehart (1971: 159) concludes: "When the bureaucratization of office work is considered with the progressive narrowing of manual, non-manual earnings, it makes more sense to speak of the proletarianization of white-collar employees than of the embourgeoisement of the working class". Messey (1975) also criticizes the embourgeoisement thesis for rendering the conditions of work to a marginal importance in class analysis. He states: "The class situation of workers involves not only their level of remuneration but the kinds of work they perform, the demands of that work, the structure of authority workers are subject to, the degree of security of job and income, the social definition of the job, and the possibilities for advancement either to another job or to a job that is significantly different" (p. 602).

[13] Bott (1971: 321) adopts the term "density" from Barnes (1969)—a graph theorist who prefers this term over "connectedness".

[14] The empirical studies reviewed by Bott include the following: Udry and Hall (1965); Aldous and Straus (1966); Nelson (1966); Turner (1967); Harrell-Bond (1969); and Blood (1969). Because of several conceptual differences between the family and network variables employed by Blood and Bott, we decided not to include Blood's study in the present review. However, Blood's findings are not completely consistent with those of Bott's. For instance, he observes that role segregation tends to reduce when kin helpfulness increases but it tends to increase when help from kin is least available. Blood's measure of "network closure" is largely derived from the amount of interaction between the elementary family and the kin.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[15] Our critical remarks on the concept of network would be directed to its specific use in studies of family role relationship. Broader and more thorough crituques can be found in Barnes (1969); Mitchell (1969); and Boissevain and Mitchell (1973).

[16] Turner (1967: 125) reports, for example, ". . . when kinfolk are excluded, thirty-two couples could be unambiguously identified for whom the husband's friends constituted a close-knit *male* network, and the wife's friends a close-knit *female* network. These thirty-two couples also demonstrated a high degree of conjugal role segregation. In each instance a strict division of labor within the home was accompanied by a sharp division of leisure interests".

[17] Udry and Hall's (1965) middle-aged couples had at least one child of college age; Toomey's (1971) sample consisted of families with at least one school-leaving age child, and Turner (1967) studied "couples at all major phases of the developmental cycle". Though the precise information on family life cycle is not clearly presented by Nelson (1966) and Gordon and Downing (1978), it appears that they could obtain some relevant data on children's networks. Nelson's respondents, whose ages ranged from 33 to 48 had at least one child *over* five years and Gordon and Downing's rather larger sample (e.g., 686 married women) consisted of families with one primary school age child.

[18] Turner (1967) claims to combine "positive affectional ties" with regularity of social contacts but it seems that he determines this dimension from the actual relationships with his kin (and friends) rather than from how the respondents *feel* about their relationships. Among the reviewed studies, only Gordon and Downing (1978) had data on the extent to which their respondents felt emotionally close to the six persons they listed in their networks.

[19] Though Gordon and Downing (1978) were able to construct separate indexes of networks for different categories of relatives, they too do not report data on social contacts with friends and neighbours.

[20] She notes: "Many aspects of *occupation* are likely to be relevant, for example: Is the occupation 'entrepreneurial' or 'bureaucratic' . . . . Does it require or encourage cooperation among colleagues or workmates? Or among members of a family's network or kin network? Does it encourage workmate/colleague solidarity against some outside group? Does it encourage competition among workmates/colleagues? Is it a career, and if so, does it involve geographical mobility? . . . Does it promise security? Is it boring or absorbing? Can it be done on behalf of the family, or can it be treated as a legitimate excuse to escape family commitments? Can it be shared, talked about at home, seen by one's wife and children? Does it confer wealth, or high status, and in whose eyes?" (1971: 304-305).

[21] One notable exception in this regard is Miller and Swanson (1958) who attempted to trace the origin of bureaucratic and entrepreneurial

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

settings to several structural changes experienced by America in its recent past. However, their views on the emerging forms of these two facets of "integration settings" are not widely shared by serious critics of American society.

[22] There are few studies, that we will review in the next part of this chapter, which indicate the relevance of work experience to family differentiation. But as we shall note, these studies are highly descriptive and are not specifically designed to test the type of hypotheses that we wish to investigate in this thesis.

[23] Though most of the studies addressing the problem of differentiation seem to make a distinction in terms of "internal" and "external" activities, the areas included in each dimension vary from one study to another. For instance, in the domain of internal activities a myriad of activities, classified under such titles as "family decisions", "household tasks", and "conjugal roles", have been analyzed by a large number of studies. Similarly, with regard to external activities the research focus has ranged from an examination of patterns of visitation among family friends, relatives and distant kin to modes of participation in "informal groups", and voluntary associations. Most often the choice of these activities has been arbitrary and their division into subtypes has been based on their apparent differences or similarities (cf. Edgell, 1972; Platt, 1969).

[24] In the course of reviewing the literature, we have tried to locate the variables of this study in the existing research. Our choice of work variables, for instance, has been largely influenced by the writings of Kohn (1969), Miller and Swanson (1958), Wilensky (1961), Moynihan (1965), and Raymond Smith (1956). Similarly, most of the SES and network studies have indicated the possibility of classifying family activities into two broad dimensions of "internal" and "external" activities. But there are two considerations which may justify this recasting of work and family variables in the context of this perspective. First, this will make it possible to suggest more clear distinctions between different dimensions of work and family. Such distinctions are necessary to determine the more likely points of interaction between work and family systems as well as to form their appropriate operational definitions. Second, this procedure seems useful for the specification of theoretical process by which work and family spheres of life affect each other. This specification will provide a base for the development of research hypotheses.

[25] Here this designation of work variables as "independent", and in the next section (see text) of family variables as "dependent" is somewhat arbitrary, and is done to marshal empirical data in an orderly and systematic way.

Apparently, this distinction might seem inconsistent with our emphasis on close interchanges between work and family systems but it is not quite so. In discussing "the problem of causality in social theory", Buckley (1967: 66-80), who advocates the use of an "adaptive systems model", maintains that any model which fails to suggest the primacy of certain variables is a futile one. In fact, this is one

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

serious shortcoming in several other models on which Buckley has based his criticism: "No doubt the major difficulty with . . . *mutual interactionism*, one which has done the most to reduce its import in current science, is its failure to allow that some variables or factors in the system may have primacy or priority over others. Translated into practical, or applied terms, this means a lack of a point of application of purpose or planned effort" (p. 75). The same problem exists with traditional *functionalism* where all parts of a system are assumed to be interdependent in an equivalent sense. Buckley states: "Functionalism, like mutual interactionism, has often been charged with the inability to deal with the causal priority of some parts of a system over others, and consequently, with an ability to handle problems of development or change" (p. 76).

Buckley does not suggest any strong criterion to determine the primacy of one set of variables over the other. However, he directs attention to the following prescription by Karl Deutsch: "One test of importance for determining whether some component of a system is more critical than another is the answer to the question, 'Which part of the system gives you the maximum over-all change in system performance for the least change or smallest change in the subassembly structure?'" (p. 79). This suggestion may have some merit but in calling the work variables "independent", we have been influenced by the existing literature in this area.

We may stress here that this distinction is not a denial of the reciprocal influences of work and family on each other. Indeed the relationship between work and the family is much more complex in that various *emerging* and *step effects* may operate as "independent" and "dependent" variables. Our introduction of the concept of *work personality* (see text) as an "intervening variable" between work and family variables testifies to our recognition of the complexity of work-family relations. This work personality, which develops from the reciprocal effects of work and family on the wage-earner, operates as a "feedback mechanism" between the two systems in the course of their mutual adjustment.

[26] Such a distinction can also be maintained by considering the family as a (larger) social system, and its internal and external activities as two *sub-systems*.

[27] This contrast seems to make it clear that the term primary-level activity, in the sense used here, refers to *non-organization-focussed activity*.

[28] Though these variables are rarely derived from a systematic framework or specified for the range of activities included in them, numerous studies that implicitly or explicitly view family as a "social system" or a "small group" seem to recognize them as empirically relevant points of analysis.

The variable of task-performance, for instance, formulates one of the fundamental problem areas for the elementary family in Bell and Vogel's (1968) analysis of internal family activities. Family decision-making is a key variable in Turner's (1970) explication of interaction

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

patterns. Turner regards the processes involved in decision-making of crucial value for they help in understanding the nature of bondedness, conflict and harmony in the family group. Several empirical studies of smaller scope consider the variables of tasks and decisions pertinent to their analyses of the social structure of family (see Herbest, 1960; Gold and Slater, 1958; Levinger, 1964). Taken together, these variables according to Blood and Wolfe (1963: 10), "are the most basic things [one] can say about a family. They . . . provide the framework within which the family functions."

With respect to extra-family social activity, the empirical focus shows a rather marked variation but it does point up the relevance of sub-dimensions which we have identified. For example, often under such headings as "social participation", "leisure-time pursuits", and "social life", primary activities such as visiting kin, relatives and friends, and neighbourhood get-togethers, and organization-focussed activity, including particupation in formal clubs, professional organizations, and voluntary associations, have been examined in most of the studies (see Robin, 1976; Harry, 1970; Lenski, 1956; and the review of literature in the text). The extent to which a family participates in these activities is frequently regarded as a rough index of its *social integration*. Bell and Vogel (1968) suggest that a participation in community via these activities tends to connect the nuclear family in a set of other social systems, which in turn, integrate it into the society. Some other sociologists consider primary and organization-focussed activity as some sort of "social instruments" which may be utilized to enhance the career or to attain certain other personal goals (e.g., Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969).

[29] In reality, however, these modes do not seem to formulate a clear-cut dichotomy; rather they reflect a range of family behavior marked with "high" or "low" differentiation (or jointness). This point is central to our conceptualization of these modes and is kept in view while giving them operational definitions (see chapter four). It is only for the sake of analytic convenience that we consider them as relatively distinct.

[30] Perhaps the most appropriate answer to this question would need longitudinal and time series data. Though these data are not available to us, we are fortunate enough to have an access to a systematic set of data, which by permitting the derivation of strong measures of relevant variables, would shed some light on the modes of adaptation at a given point in time (for data to be used in this study see chapter three, and for the derivation of measures refer to chapter four).

[31] We do not intend to give a full exposition of this model or its complete application to the problem under investigation. However, we feel that in order to talk about "interchanges" or "linkages" between work and family, it is theoretically fruitful and perhaps essential to view them as "open" systems.

A more general and detailed exposition of this model may be found in Buckley (1967), Deutsch (1963), Thompson (1967), Hall and Fagen (1956), and Loomis (1960). Perhaps because of certain methodological difficulties inherent in the model and of a rather underdeveloped nature of statistical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

techniques available to sociologists, very few have attempted to show its application to concrete empirical problems. Some notable exceptions include Watzlawick et al. (1967), Bell and Vogel (1968), and Kantor and Lehr (1975). These studies are important for suggesting guidelines to look at the internal dynamics of the family as well as its linkages with other social systems in the framework of this model.

[32] Even though it is the family that structures its activities in response to the work world, it seems appropriate to think of differentiation and jointness as *mediating processes* that stand between work *and* family systems. For these modes perform the operation of adjusting *both* work and family to their mutual exigencies, and in this way, maintain the continuity of interchanges between them. In this sense, we may regard differentiation and jointness as *inter-system modes of adaptation*.

[33] The term "structured field" is from Presthus (1962: 135); for him, it is constituted by a "bureaucratic situation" which, in turn, is an outcome of big organizations.

[34] As we frequently pointed out in the context of SES and network studies, a fairly large number of writers have tended to draw upon the assumption regarding the continuity of early socialization in the family to formulate explanations of segregation or jointness. In arguing for the predominant impact of occupational socialization, we do not intend to assume a complete discontinuity in the early training. Instead, we view socialization as a developmental process where each successive phase is seen to expose the individual to new forces (e.g., work) which tend to introduce changes in early patterns of behavior. This view is also in agreement with Erikson (1968) who argues that although the period through adolescence ordinarily results in the formation of the individual's "core identity", the adult experience may further develop this identity or modify it in important ways.

We may note, in passing, that the age-old controversy over the continuity or discontinuity of early socialization has not been resolved as yet. In fact, this controversy was revitalized with the publication of Talcott Parsons' (1942) influential paper, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States". In this paper, Parsons introduced the term "youth culture" to show the discontinuity of adolescent socialization with the preceding socialization of childhood and the succeeding socialization of adulthood. Later, with the publication of James S. Coleman's (1961) study, *The Adolescent Society*, which lends empirical support to Parsons' discontinuity thesis, this debate became rather more heated.

Those who favor continuity of socialization have also assembled a great deal of evidence to stress that discontinuity has been exaggerated rather extremely. Studies by Johoda and Warren (1965) and Elkin and Westley (1955) express this point of view. It is also interesting to note that Bennett Berger (1963) by reinterpreting Coleman's findings, reached conclusions opposite to those of Coleman's.

The more moderate position accepts the continuity of certain fundamental values but notes a discontinuity with respect to behavior and outlook as the demands of the situation change (Brim Jr., 1966;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moore, 1969). Our argument which stresses the importance of occupational socialization is consistent with this position.

[35] Individuals may seek out jobs consonant with their early training, for ascriptive factors do operate in the process of stratification (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Porter, 1965), or they may mold jobs to meet their needs and values, but this does not mean that the job itself has no part to play in shaping the job incumbent. The question as to what extent men's adult occupational experience affects *or* reflects their "psychological functioning" is an important one and has been extensively explored empirically by Kohn and Schooler in two thorough studies (1973, 1978). Their data reveal that occupational experience "has a substantially greater impact on men's psychological functioning than the reverse". This conclusion is interpreted to cast some doubt on the thesis of social selectivity in occupation recruitment and retention, and wage-earners' job-molding abilities etc. Findings reported by Mortimer and Lorence (1979) are consistent with those of Kohn's and Schooler's.

[36] Throughout these pages we have stressed the significance of socializing effects of work on the wage-earner and *his* family. As it is implicit in note 34 above, by attaching greater importance to the role of family of procreation in this regard *than* that of the family of orientation, we obviously want to join with other non-Freudians who aptly criticize Freud for putting all the burden on early childhood experience. In a new "Preface" to *The Lonely Crowd*, David Riesman wr[redacted]: "In my opinion, Freud and many of his followers had assumed too readily that they knew what is basic or 'primary' in a particular culture, and they fixed man's fate too early in assuming it to be solely the playing out of psychosexual experiences mastered or suffered in the early years of childhood" (1968: xv). Similarly, Becker and Strauss (1956: 262-63) observe that "Freudian and other psychiatric formulations of personality development probably overstress childhood experiences. Their systematic accounts end more or less with adolescence, later events being regarded as the elaboration of, or variations on, earlier occurrences. Yet central to any account of adult identity is the relation of change in identity to change in social position; for it is characteristic of adult life to afford and force frequent and momentus passages from status to status."

Unlike Reisman et al., who largely neglected the impact of adult experience by limiting their analysis to the role of the peer group and the school in the formation of character, Becker and Strauss (1956) looked at the development of personality by placing it in "the changing world of work". This enabled them to conclude that "adult identity is largely a function of career movements within occupations and work organizations" (p. 253).

In another study, which seems more relevant to the point we wish to make, Furstenberg Jr. (1971) attempted to determine the extent of direct transmission of family attitudes to their children with respect to mobility orientation. Interview data on a total of 466 parent-child pairs showed very weak association between their mobility orientations. This lack of consensus is held accountable for hampering the transmission of family values and attitudes (in this specific area, e.g., mobility) to the children. Furstenberg Jr. feels that "previous research may have exaggerated the extent to which attitudes are transmitted in the family".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[37] That some degree of consistency is essential to the continuity of interchanges between different systems is evident from the failure of the Soviet Communist Party's early efforts (1917-34) to co-opt the family system to the needs of newly designed economic and political systems. The severity of the resultant problems of child socialization not only made the Party wary of its unbalanced programs of economic alterations but pressed it to introduce various changes in the late 1930s to the middle 1940s to restore a positive attitude towards the family (see Geiger, 1968). Another study that shows the importance of consistency in the behavior of different systems is reported by Eckstein (1966). He attributes instability of governments to a lack of congruency in *authority patterns* of political and other social systems including economy, education, family, and the community.

According to Buckley (1967), communicational acts leading to consistency in orientation are so important in human life that they tend to acquire a "secondary reward value" in exchange relations. By constrast, it would seem obvious that work-family linkages developing from compensatory behavior are less likely to stabilize for a compensatory tendency entails serious discrepancies in the interpersonal matrices of social relations. And as argued by Lennard and Bernstein (1969), the psychological burden of these discrepancies is heavy for the personality of the worker, which in turn, may strain his relationship with other system members.

[38] Highly stable modes of adaptation seem to develop into what Loomis (1960: 12) has called *systemic linkage* in that "the elements of . . . two social systems are articulated in such a manner that [they] in some ways and on some occasion may be viewed as a single unit." Theoretically, it is possible to think of this extreme integration between work and family. In reality, however, one must view intra-family behavior consistency and the resulting stability of work-family interchanges as variable phenomena.

[39] Here it must be made clear that the findings to be reviewed in this section in support of our research hypotheses are highly fragmentary, and therefore, must be considered tentative at best. For none of the previous studies was undertaken with an explicit purpose of explaining differentiation by specific occupational conditions of our interest. This leads us not only to draw upon studies with other research objectives and which are cast in varying theoretical perspectives but also to rely heavily on the process of work-family linkages as described in the text. We feel that until we examine the findings from the current analysis, it is appropriate to set our hypotheses in the available literature, and where the relevant evidence is lacking, offer some provisional theoretical rationale for the predicted relationships.

[40] Berger et al. (1974: 47-48) write: ". . . there are individuals . . . who try to organize their households and families as far as possible along the same lines as those of a bureaucratic office. A graphic illustration of this is the bulletin board hung in the kitchen or near a telephone in many middle-class American families with the express purpose of allowing family members to write memoranda to each other or to themselves. It is not uncommon to see posted on such bulletin boards standard

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

operating procedures (i.e., for getting the family shopping done or for getting ready for a party) that would reflect favorably on the management of a medium-sized office".

[41] The tensions of bureaucratization are not personal aberrations or personality idiosyncracies to be eliminated by some sort of simple catharsis; they are consequences of a collision between bureaucratic structural demands and a complexity of human personality needs. Almost all the writers who stressed dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy have directed their attention to this problem. But Whyte's (1957: 156) attack seems more forceful: "As long as our organizations remain dynamic—which is, of course, only a hopeful premise—the organization will still be a place in which there is a conflict between the individual as he is and wishes to be, and the role he is called upon to play. This is a perennial conflict and the sheer effort to exorcise it through adjustment may well intensity it".

Thus, Whyte Jr. writes of "the bureaucratic neurosis", and Merton (1968) of "occupational psychosis" which seems to develop from "demands put upon the individual by the particular organization of his occupational role" (p. 252). Thompson (1961) has coined a special term, *bureaupathology* to describe a whole set of tensions, strains, frustrations and anxieties inherent in the authoritarian and unyielding nature of the bureaucratic hierarchy.

Of course, these terms dramatize the effects of bureaucratization. But it is hard to deny that the pressures for conformity and the rigid routines found in bureaucratic organizations do stifle individual freedom, creativity and imagination. A convincing analysis of "the conflict between system and the individual" is offered by Chris Argyris (1957) in his book, *Personality and Organization* (esp. chapters 2 and 3).

[42] Here the tense of this quotation is changed; in the original text it reads as follows: ". . . he acts, and to a good part thinks and feels, *organizationally*".

[43] Our criterion by which we distinguish less socially complex jobs from those which are more complex, is based upon the classification of work-functions as outlined in *Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations* (1971: 1169-1171) and *U.S. Dictionary of Occupational Titles* (1965: 649-650). The operational definition of the concept social complexity is offered in chapter four.

[44] The interaction that may be found in less complex jobs is generally of an ancilliary and optional nature; it may occur from the physical adjacency of other workers but it is not essential to the completion of the job. This distinction between less and more socially complex jobs may be illustrated by a contrast between the machine-shop operator and the retail store salesman or between an engineer and a social worker.

[45] Though these features of less socially complex jobs more closely depict the assembly-line work in an automobile industry, this type of work is not a prototype of less complex jobs. Robert Blauner's (1973) analysis

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of four industries, printing, textile, automobile and chemical, shows the presence of these characteristics in varying degrees; especially in the latter three, the job activities tend to become more routined, mechanical, standardized, subject to minute division of labor and automation (p. 7). These characteristics may also cluster in blue-collar occupations but there is no reason to consider white-collar jobs exempt from their impact. In fact, there is persuasive evidence to believe that both blue-collar and white-collar workers are subject to the same "tyranny of work" (Rinehart, 1975, see chaps. 4 and 5). There are several other more general types of studies which show the existence of these characteristics in a variety of occupations. See, for instance, Studs Terkel, *Working*, New York, Avon Books, 1975; Ronald Fraser (ed.), *Work: Twenty Personal Accounts*, vol. 2, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1969; Kenneth Lasson, *The Workers: Portraits of Nine American Jobholders*, New York, Grossman Publishers, 1971.

[46] The effects of depression on personality are almost identically reported by researchers of that time. There is a good deal of agreement among them that a sudden disruption in career was seen by the wage-earners as a personal and family crisis. Also, the immediate response shown by a large number of families was pretty much similar. But the long-term effects of the depression and the type of eventual adjustment varied in complex ways.

In order to explain these variations, some of the researchers looked at the nature of family organization *prior* to the depression. Cavan and Ranck (1938) distinguished two family types as to the nature of family organization: "well-organized families" and "disorganized families". The latter group of families saw the depression as a serious catastrophy and responded with more panic and nervousness. In an earlier study, Angell (1936, rep. 1966) introduced two variable characteristics of family in his analysis of 50 families: "integration" and "adaptability". These characteristics, he argues, must be taken into account to understand the degree of "family vulnerability" to different levels of pressures, produced by shifts in roles that resulted from depression. A relatively more elaborate set of intervening variables was used by Bakke (1940: 231-241) to explain differential reactions to depression and the consequent economic insecurity. In a somewhat different study, Koos (1946) also distinguished three family types by looking at the "adequacy of family organization": "better-than-average", "average", and "below-average". These families varied in their responses to internal and external "troubles" according to the adequacy of their organization.

Since the model which guides our analysis does not make such assumptions regarding the nature of family organization, our interpretation of the findings of depression studies remains somewhat partial. This interpretation is one-sided yet in another respect. That is, we have ignored that aspect of these earlier studies which notes integrating and unity-promoting effects of depression on family life. This was done for two reasons. First, to highlight the differences in the behavior of orderly career and less orderly (or disorderly) career families, this method was felt necessary. Second, we feel that the number of families who manifested greater unity as a result of depression was too small to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be of any significance in altering the much more pronounced tendency that we have emphasized.

Thus, Koos (1964: 110) from an investigation of 62 "families in trouble" concludes: "The fact that only one family benefitted from its experience with trouble is possibly a denial of that school of thought which regards a family's troubles as something beneficial—as something that tests a family's mettle and welds it together". He further remarks: "The constricting demands of the culture are such as to nullify family interaction rather than to develop it".

In sum, it can be said that even a cursory look at the studies made of the depression would show that this partial interpretation does not distort, in any measure, the finding of these studies.

[47] Talking of her husband, one of Koos' (1946: 103) respondents remarked: "Maybe it's too bad, I don't know, but when somebody in the family gets you in a jam, you lose your faith in them a little and they don't seem as important in the family—but there is something else too. What they did before doesn't seem the same, even if it hasn't changed".

[48] According to the findings of Aldous (1969a) and Moynihan (1965), this segregated pattern is more typical of unemployed or "underemployed" black families. Rainwater's (1971) data suggest that this pattern of role-relations may be true of *both* white and black families who are subject to similar economic conditions. However, none of these studies, it may be pointed out, provides data *directly* relevant to our hypotheses.

[49] Tiffany et al. (1970) from their review of literature on unemployment conclude: "In general, the unemployed group shows avoidance of interpersonal relationships and lack of involvement with societal institutions. . . . [They are] more likely to be fearful of the world in their ability to meet its demands, to reject relationships with the opposite sex, to experience anxiety, to be self-depreciative. . . . [They are] generally 'loners' with few friends, and [do] not take part in community activities" (pp. 96-97). This may be because the unemployed workers tend to "see themselves as undesirable, doubt their own worth, often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy, and have little faith or confidence in themselves" (Ibid., p. 92).

[50] The limited number of empirical research in this area leads us to draw heavily upon the studies of depression. As can be seen from the text, a fair number of these studies indicates a tendency towards social segregation as a consequence of work disruptions.

However, there are two exceptions to this generalization which may be noted. Stouffer and Lazarsfeld (1972: chap. 3) set forth the following hypothesis: "A depression tends to increase the proportion of recreational activities indulged in jointly by husband and wife". This hypothesis, which obviously contradicts our own hypotheses, was not supported by any strong empirical evidence by these writers. Referring to certain "unpublished case studies", Stouffer and Lazarsfeld suggest that this jointness would be more visible "if we choose to count such activities as listening to the radio at home as recreational". It seems

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

probable that any set of different and broader activities, as will be used in the present study, would lead to opposite conclusions.

In another study, Morgan (1939: chap. VIII) offered some data to show that the couples, which he studied before and during depression, spent "more time together" as a result of work loss.

This conclusion and the hypothesis suggested by Stouffer and Lazarsfeld are based on the assumptions of greater availability of time that becomes possible once the work is gone. The question of why should this time be necessarily used in joint social activity is not answered by these writers. For there are instances in other studies which clearly indicate that both husband and wife can be *physically present* in the home without having any genuine degree of social companionship.

[51] Bakke was also given similar reasons by his respondents. Note, for instance, the following answer: "Every time I go to the home of one of my friends, they will say, 'Well, how about it? Do you have a job yet?' and constantly I'm being reminded of the fact that I am out of work. I hate to go even to see my relatives because I know that they're thinking, 'So-and-so has a job; why can't Jim get one?' Perhaps this is only all in my own mind, but it keeps me from enjoying these relationships with them just the same" (1940: 12).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER THREE

THE FAMILY DYNAMICS STUDY: DESCRIPTION OF EAST YORK FAMILIES AND THE SUB-SAMPLE

This chapter has the following aims: First, it describes the sampling strategy and the data gathering techniques utilized in *The Family Dynamics Study*. Second, it outlines the criterion by which the *sub-sample* of 105 single-earner families—having *one* primary wage-earner—was obtained to test the research hypotheses. Third, it presents a brief comparison on several socio-demographic and structural characteristics between the sub-sample and the main sample of 211 East York families from which it was drawn. The chapter ends with a short introduction to the type of data which will be used in the present analysis.

THE FAMILY DYNAMICS STUDY AND THE EAST YORK SAMPLE

1) Derivation of Sample

The Family Dynamics Study consisted of a representative sample of families drawn from the Borough of East York. The data were collected under the direction of Dr. Norman W. Bell of the Department of Sociology and The Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Ontario.†

† Financial support for *The Family Dynamics Study* was provided by The Laidlaw Foundation, The Clarke Institute Research Fund, and The Vanier Institute.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The formative phase of the study commenced in the Spring of 1968. After a pre-test of the research instruments in December 1968 and January 1969, the actual data gathering took place between February and April of 1969. The interviewing was done by the Survey Research Center of York University. The interviewers from the Center were given an extended training in data collection techniques by the staff of the project at the Family Studies Section of the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry.

The Borough of East York was chosen as a site of the study for several reasons. At the time this project was initiated, two other studies were in the phase of completing data-analysis on the Borough (Gillies, 1968; Coates, 1970; cited in Turk, 1970:39). These studies yielded a considerable amount of demographic and social-structural data on the Borough. Thus, the primary reason to base this study in the Borough was to form an ongoing research relationship between the East York community and The Clarke Institute.

There were two other considerations for choosing the Borough of East York. First, the Borough showed a variation of families on socio-economic features typical of Metropolitan Toronto as a whole and it was felt that a sample representative of the Borough would reflect fairly well the general population of the greater Toronto. Second, the size of the Borough was small enough to be considered practically manageable for interviewing purposes.

The Family Dynamics Study aimed at compiling detailed information on families at all stages of life-cycle. Therefore, a stratified random sampling technique—using life-cycle as the stratifying criterion—was employed to select research families from the total population of East York.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A listing of the families was drawn from the Tax Assessment Roles maintained by the Toronto Municipal Data Processing Section. A "family household" was defined as either a married couple or one parent and one child.[1] Of 36,116 households in the East York, 28,023 met this definition of a family household. This number was then statified according to the stages in the family life-cycle, as indexed by the ages of the wife/mother[2] and the youngest or only child. Twelve life-cycle categories, obtained through this procedure, and the distribution of cases in each category, are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Distribution of East York Families
by Life-Cycle Stages

Age of youngest or only child	Age of Wife/Mother			N
	-30	30-45	45-65	
No child	2553	1862	7419	11814
Under 5	1475	1667	2212	3363
5-11	512	2848	874	4234
11+	5	1608	6999	8612
N	4525	7985	15513	28023

To assure an adequate representation of cases from all categories, a procedure of selecting from within each category was adopted: 25 cases per life-cycle category were considered the minimum number and 30 as the optimum. Table 3.2 shows the sampling ratios yielded by this method.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Except for the cell containing 5 cases—which were included in the study as a whole—from all other cells, the 45 families were selected as eligibles for interviewing; of these, the first 25 families were to be approached by the interviewers.

Table 3.2

Number and Sampling Ratios for Standard-Sized Samples of East York Families

Age of youngest or only child	Age of Wife/Mother			N
	-30	30-45	46-65	
No child	25 (1.0)	25 (1.3)	25 (0.3)	75 (0.6)
	30 (1.2)	30 (1.6)	30 (0.4)	90 (0.8)
Under 5	25 (1.7)	25 (1.5)	25(11.3)	75 (2.2)
	30 (2.0)	30 (1.8)	30(13.6)	90 (2.7)
5-11	25 (4.9)	25 (0.9)	25 (2.9)	75 (1.8)
	30 (5.9)	30 (1.1)	30 (3.4)	90 (2.1)
11+	5 (100)	25 (1.6)	25 (0.3)	55 (0.9)
		30 (1.9)	30 (0.4)	65 (1.2)
N	80 (1.8)	100 (1.3)	100 (0.6)	280 (0.9)
	95 (2.1)	120 (1.5)	120 (0.8)	335 (1.2)

At least three problems were encountered in the course of interviews which reduced the number of families who were otherwise eligible for participating in the study according to the criteria outlined above. These include lack of fluency in English, residential mobility and refusals to take part in the project.

Especially, the group discussion sessions and the completion of self-administered semi-structured questionnaires made it almost impossible for the non-English speaking families to participate in the study. In view of problems resulting from a translation of the questionnaires into

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

different languages, a decision to drop about 5% of such families from the original sample was made.

A high rate of mobility (over 25%) restricted the size of the sample a bit further. However, an attempt was made to interview those families which moved in the greater Metropolitan area. The families for which there was no forwarding address were replaced by the families living at the address of the families that moved, regardless of the former's stages in the life-cycle. Of course, this caused some deviations in the original stratified random sampling, but it helped avoid the bias which would have resulted from an exclusive sample of relatively less mobile families.

A considerable reduction in the size of the sample resulted from refusals. Of the total families (536) who were approached by our interviewers, 336 (62.7%) completed phase one of the interview study. Twenty-two of these families could not be interviewed because of language problems. Of the remaining (314), 211 participated in phase two of the study. Thus the final sample, consisting of 211 families, represents 41.0% of the eligible families (514) contacted initially.[3] The distribution of these families over the life-cycle stages is presented in Table 3.3.

2) Techniques of Data Collection

The data on the East York families were collected through questionnaires, consisting of structured and open-ended questions, and family group discussion sessions. Data collection was completed in two

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.3

Life-cycle Distribution of East York Families Completing Both Phases of Study: The Larger Sample

Age of youngest or only child	Age of Wife/Mother			N
	-30	30-45	46-65	
No child	22	15	17	54
Under 5	32	29	8	69
5-11	7	22	15	44
11+	1	20	23	44
N	62	86	63	211

different phases; in the first phase, only the wife/mother was interviewed, and in the second, all members of the family were interviewed.

Shortly before the first phase, contact with the family was made by a letter from Professor Norman W. Bell. Then, the interviewer called on the wife/mother to make arrangements for the interview. The first phase, which was relatively short in duration (about 30 minutes) was designed to obtain some basic demographic data on all members of the family whether or not they were living in the household. The factual nature of this information led us to rely upon the answers of one person. The first interview with the wife also helped acquaint her with the objectives of the research project and in this way, enabled her to decide whether the family would be willing to participate in the second phase which was to consist of *all* members of the immediate family.

Though not unusual for this type of study, the second phase was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

very lengthy; it lasted for two to five hours with an average time close to three hours. This session consisted of group discussions, filling out separate questionnaires by husbands, wives, children 8 to 11, children 12 and over, and other individuals living with the family,[4] considered as part of the family by the focal couple. The family discussions were tape recorded as was conversations which took place while the self-administered questionnaires were completed.

Thus, the data consisted of an interview with the wife/mother, a questionnaire filled out by *each member*, and a tape recording of family interaction and discussion focussed on specific topics. These data covered several aspects of family life. Specifically, the questionnaire data consisted of attitudes and opinions on the nature and quality of life, and experience in the immediate family, intra-family relations, and the relationship with the kin-networks, other social groups, institutions and the community at large. The group discussion generated information about family health behavior, spending patterns and the extent of involvement in the work. In addition, these discussion sessions provided data on family member's reaction to certain real and hypothetical situations having implications for family life.[5]

The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families

The sub-sample of single-earner families, on which the present study is based, was derived from the larger sample of 211 East York families. Our definition of single-earner families required sampling

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

those families where *only one spouse*, either husbands *or* wives worked full-time. The nature of our investigation led us to superimpose another consideration on this definition: that such families must be *intact* in order to be included in the sub-sample. Consequently, about 7% of the families in which the husband and wife were divorced or separated were dropped from the original sample. Of the remaining families, there were 105 single-earner families.

In this sub-sample of 105, the wives worked as the primary wage earner in 6 cases (6%) and the husband was the primary wage-earner in 99 (94%).[6] These 105 working individuals are called the *primary wage-earners* who represent their respective families in the world of work.

Comparison of Sub-Sample with the Larger Sample of East York Families

As noted above, with respect to the sex of the wage-earner, the sub-sample contains a higher percentage of working husbands viz: 94%. In the original sample, in 172 families (81.5%) the husbands held full-time jobs, and in 87 (41.2%) the wives were working full-time at the time of the study. Another 12 (5.7%) husbands and 29 (13.7%) wives worked on a part-time basis. And about half the families in the larger sample had both spouses working full or part-time.

A more systematic comparison on other variables will be presented shortly. Before that, a brief introduction to our methods of comparison is in order.

Two related methods will be employed to determine the statistical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

significance of closeness or differences between the sub-sample and the larger sample. These include the difference of proportions test (Z) and the chi-square test (χ^2).

For each table two different chi-square tests were computed. First, we computed χ^2 as a one-sample test, and second, a χ^2 was computed as a test for two-samples. In the first sense, it is a test of "the goodness of fit type" in that it shows whether the sub-sample represents the larger sample with respect to the frequencies of a given property that occurred in it using our criteria of sampling the single-earner families (Siegel, 1956, p. 43). As a test of two-samples, the χ^2 was computed in the following manner. We subtracted the frequencies of a given attribute which fall in the sub-sample of 105 from the larger sample of 211. The remaining sample of 106 was treated as an independent sample[7] and the χ^2 computed. This value of chi-square indicates the extent to which empirically observed frequencies of two samples deviate from those frequencies that would be expected if the null hypothesis of no difference were true (Siegel, 1956, p. 104). In the comparisons that follow we will choose to test the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

In our second method of comparison, we have calculated a Z score as a difference of proportions test. As in the case of chi-square test of two-samples, the computation of Z is also based on a proportionate comparison of each category of a given attribute in both the samples. In using the Z test, we make essentially the same null hypothesis that there is no differences in the proportions of families with certain characteristics in these two samples. A Z value greater than or equal to 1.96 will be used to reject the null hypothesis of no differences at the .05 level (see Loether and McTavish, 1976, p. 553).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1) Family Life-Cycle

The distribution of sub-sample families in life-cycle stages is shown in Table 3.4. A comparison with the larger sample (see Table 3.3) reveals some inconsistency in the pattern of distribution. As can be seen, out of 29 families with children under 5 years and mother's age between 30-45, the sub-sample contains 23 families; and out of 22 families where mothers in this age group have children between 5-11 years, 18 families fall in the sub-sample. Similar over-representation of families where the mother's age ranged between 46-65 with children 5-11 years and

Table 3.4

Life-Cycle Distribution of Single-Earner Families: The Sub-Sample†

Age of youngest or only child	Age of Wife/Mother			N	Z	P
	-30	30-45	46-65			
No child	4	2	2	8	5.95	.001
Under 5	11	23	1	35	0.20	N.S.
5-11	4	18	14	36	4.78	.001
11+	1	6	19	26	1.41	N.S.
N	20	49	36	105		

†† $\chi^2 = 46.0$, df = 3, P = <.001 ††† $\chi^2 = 23.11$, df = 3, P = <.001

† The values of chi-square and Z scores for this table were computed by constructing a separate table of the *joint* frequencies of sub-sample and the large sample; the frequencies were arranged according to the age of the youngest or only child.

†† The chi-square value appearing under the left-hand corner of the table is from a two-sample test and that listed in the right-hand corner is from a one-sample test of the goodness of fit type. In all the subsequent tables the chi-squares are recorded in this manner.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

above may be noted in the sub-sample. On the other hand, it under-represents families having no children or children under 5 when the mother's age was less than 30 or between 56-65 years.

Both values of the chi-square test, $\chi^2 = 46.0$ as a two-sample test and $\chi^2 = 23.11$ as a one-sample test, show statistically significant differences between the sub-sample and the larger sample. This leads us to reject the null hypothesis which suggested that these samples are similar in regard to the distribution of families in life-cycle stages. Likewise, the Z test shows that the families with no children and those with children in the age group 5-11 are disproportionally represented in the two samples.[8] Obviously, we cannot claim the comparability of sub-sample to the larger sample on this particular family property.

2) Family Size

The data on family size are presented in Table 3.5. The average size of the immediate family in the household is 4 persons. The average household contained about 3.5 residents who were members of the immediate family.[9] The same pattern is reflected by the sub-sample.

With respect to the size of the immediate family in the household, the sub-sample contains almost one-half the families of each size (see Z scores). The value of chi-square as a test of the goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 2.29$), which fails to reach significance at the minimum .05 level, indicates a marked homogeneity between the sub-sample and the larger sample. This means that we shall reject the alternative hypothesis of the distinctiveness of these samples. But with respect to the total

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.5

Size of Families and Number of Family Members Living in Household

Size	Total Immediate Family						Immediate Family in Household					
	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families				The Larger Sample of East York Families†		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P	N	%	N	%	Z	P
2	61	28.9	8	7.6	6.80	.001	38	18.0	17	16.2	0.72	N.S.
3	56	26.5	20	19.0	2.37	.05	44	20.8	22	21.0	0.0	—
4	51	24.1	37	35.2	3.73	.001	61	28.9	37	35.2	1.97	.05
5	25	11.8	24	22.8	4.93	.001	39	18.4	16	15.2	1.25	N.S.
6	11	5.2	9	8.6	2.19	.05	15	7.1	7	6.7	0.25	N.S.
7	6	2.8	6	5.7	2.50	.05	10	4.7	5	4.8	0.0	—
8	1	0.5	1	1.0	0.92	N.S.	3	1.4	1	1.0	0.62	N.S.
N	211	99.8	105	100.0			210	99.3	105	100.0		
	χ^2 = 80.79 †† df = 5 P = <.001		χ^2 = 40.59 †† df = 5 P = <.001				χ^2 = 4.58 †† df = 5 P = N.S.		χ^2 = 2.29 †† df = 5 P = N.S.			

† Missing Observation = 1

†† Due to small frequencies, families of size 7 and 8 were combined.

immediate family, as shown by both types of chi-square tests (χ^2 = 80.79; χ^2 = 40.59) and Z scores, statistically significant differences exist between the two samples. However, since the present study is primarily concerned with the internal dynamics of the immediate family living in the household, these differences are of little substantive importance.

3) Family Religion

In about 60% of families in the total sample, both husbands and wives were Protestant as shown by the data in Table 3.6. The second largest group consisted of Catholic couples. Nearly 2% of families belonged to other religions. In about 10% of families either one spouse or both did not claim any religious affiliation.

Table 3.6

Family Religion

Religion	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P
Both Protestant	127	60.2	68	64.7	1.35	N.S.
Both Catholic	39	18.5	17	16.2	0.84	N.S.
One Protestant/ One Catholic	21	10.0	10	9.5	0.06	N.S.
Both Other	4	1.9	2	1.9	0:0	—
One or Both None	20	9.5	8	7.7	0.92	N.S.
N	211	100.0	105	100.0		

χ^2 = 2.12
df = 4
P = N.S.

χ^2 = 1.06
df = 4
P = N.S.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As can be seen from a comparison of the frequencies, the sub-sample shows a distribution as to the religious background of the families consistent with the larger sample. None of the Z scores bounds the critical region of .05. This, in conjunction with the statistically insignificant χ^2 tests, justifies a rejection of the alternative hypothesis in favor of the null hypothesis of similarity of the two samples.

4) Family Ethnicity

The ethnic composition of the two samples is shown in Table 3.7. As in the case of family religion, the index of family ethnicity is constructed by combining the answers of both the husband and the wife. However, unlike religion, ethnicity was determined by the ethnic origin of the respondent's *father* as is done in the Census of Canada.

According to the data in Table 3.7, the dominant ethnic background of families is British. As shown by a Z score of 2.69, the proportion of this group is clearly larger in the sub-sample. About 25% of families in the larger sample and 19% in the sub-sample are of mixed British and European origin; this difference of 6% does not produce a statistically significant Z score. Though χ^2 as a two-sample test reveals moderate differences between the two samples, as a one-sample test, the insignificant χ^2 (4.82) shows that on the whole the sub-sample has a very close relationship with the larger sample in regard to the ethnicity of the families.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.7

Family Ethnicity

Ethnic Group	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P
Both British	111	52.7	65	61.9	2.69	.01
Both European	31	14.7	15	14.3	0.143	N.S.
Mixed British and European	52	24.6	20	19.0	1.87	N.S.
Both Asian	3	1.4	1	1.0	0.58	N.S.
Other	7	3.3	1	1.0	1.93	N.S.
N.A.	7	3.3	3	2.8	0.41	N.S.
N	211	100.0	105	100.0		

$\chi^2 = 9.65$
†df = 3
P = .05

$\chi^2 = 4.82$
†df = 3
P = N.S.

† In computing χ^2 for this table the ethnic group categories "Both Asian" and "Other" were combined and 7 "N.A." cases were deleted from the calculations.

5) Generation in Canada

A measure of the family's generation in Canada was developed by looking at the place of birth of each spouse. Individuals born outside Canada were considered first generation Canadians. Table 3.8 presents a classification of families by generation in Canada. Twenty-two percent of families in the larger sample are first generation Canadians, and in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the other 16%, either the husband or the wife was born outside Canada. Nearly 62% of the families were second generation Canadians.

Table 3.8

Generation in Canada

Generation	Parent's Generation in Canada: The Larger Sample of East York Families† N	%	The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families N	%	Z	P
Both First Generation	46	22.0	17	16.2	2.04	.05
Either Husband or Wife First Generation	34	16.3	16	15.2	0.04	N.S.
Both Second Generation	129	61.7	72	68.6	2.05	.05
N	209	100.0	105	100.0		

$\chi^2 = 4.98$
df = 2
P = N.S.

$\chi^2 = 2.48$
df = 2
P = N.S.

† Missing Observations = 2

Comparing these percentages with those of the sub-sample we note a slight under-representation of first generation families and an over-representation of second generation families in the sub-sample. However, overall these two samples may be considered similar to each other since both chi-square tests fail to reveal any statistically significant differences.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6) Level of Education

The data on the level of education are presented in Table 3.9. Almost an equal number of husbands and wives in the larger sample attended "part of high school". About 17% of husbands and 12% of wives had education up to the eighth grade or less; however, the percentage of wives (20%) with high school graduation was slightly higher than the husbands. Nearly 20% of husbands reported having attended University.

Except for the lower proportion of husbands with education up to the eighth grade or less in the sub-sample, the distribution of families in all other categories of education is almost identical in both the samples. As can be seen from the values of chi-square tests and Z scores, the differences are meager and statistically insignificant. Therefore, we reject the alternative hypothesis in order to accept the null hypothesis that assumes a similar distribution of husbands and wives in each education group in the sub-sample and the larger sample.

7) Family Income

Table 3.10 summarizes family income into broader categories. The median income of the families in the larger sample was $10,650, and in the sub-sample the figure was about $10,000. This slight difference may be attributed to the fact that the sub-sample consisted of families with one person as the primary source of income while the larger sample had several dual-earner families (about 50%).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.9

Level of Education

Level of Education	Educational Background of Husbands						Educational Background of Wives					
	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families				The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P	N	%	N	%	Z	P
Eighth Grade or Less	35	16.6	12	11.4	2.07	.05	26	12.3	14	13.3	0.44	N.S.
Part of High School	62	29.4	28	26.7	0.94	N.S.	64	30.3	27	25.7	1.45	N.S.
Part of Technical/Trade School	15	7.1	9	8.6	0.78	N.S.	16	7.6	9	8.6	0.55	N.S.
Technical/Trade School Graduate	14	6.6	10	9.5	1.64	N.S.	9	4.3	4	3.8	0.32	N.S.
High School Graduate	27	12.8	14	13.3	0.17	N.S.	42	19.9	21	20.0	0.03	N.S.
Technical/Trade School after High School Grad.	10	4.7	5	4.8	0.0	—	26	12.3	15	14.3	0.86	N.S.
Part of Undergraduate University	14	6.6	7	6.6	0.0	—	8	3.8	4	3.8	0.0	—
Undergraduate Degree	9	4.3	5	4.8	0.35	N.S.	10	4.7	5	4.8	0.03	N.S.
Part of Graduage Univ.	6	2.8	3	2.9	0.0	—	1	0.5	0	0.0	0.92	N.S.
Graduate or Professional Degree	17	8.1	12	11.4	1.74	N.S.	9	4.3	6	5.7	1.03	N.S.
N.A.†	2	1.0	0	0.0	—	—	0	0.0	0	0.0	—	—
N	211	100.0	105	100.0			211	100.0	105	100.0		
$\chi^2 = 9.04$ †† df = 6 P = N.S.			$\chi^2 = 4.48$ †† df = 6 P = N.S.				$\chi^2 = 2.76$ †† df = 6 P = N.S.		$\chi^2 = 1.39$ †† df = 6 P = N.S.			

† Excluded from the calculations of Z and χ^2.

†† Because of small frequencies, the following categories were combined: "Part of Technical/Trade School" with "Technical Trade School Graduate"; "Part of Undergraduate University" with "Undergraduate Degree"; and "Part of Graduate University" with "Graduate or Professional Degree".

Table 3.10

Family Income

Yearly Income of Families						
Amount	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P
Under 5,000	13	6.2	5	4.7	0.81	N.S.
5,000 - 8,999	55	26.1	33	31.4	1.77	N.S.
9,000 - 10,999	39	18.4	26	24.8	2.34	.05
11,000 - 14,999	55	26.1	23	21.9	1.37	N.S.
15,000 +	38	18.0	17	16.2	0.68	N.S.
N.A.†	11	5.2	1	1.0	2.78	.01
N	211	100.0	105	100.0		
$\chi^2 = 8.82$ df = 4 P = N.S.			$\chi^2 = 4.23$ df = 4 P = N.S.			

† These 11 families were excluded from the calculation of χ^2.

Neither the one-sample chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 4.23$) nor the two-sample test ($\chi^2 = 8.82$) is significant at the .05 level with 4 degrees of freedom. This lends support to our assumption that both the samples are comparable with respect to the distribution of income.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8) Occupation

A classification of the husband's occupation into blue-collar and white-collar categories is presented in Table 3.11. We arrived at this broader distinction by combining major occupational groups which were previously obtained by individually classifying the husband's occupation according to the procedure outlined in the Canadian Census. The white-collar category includes professional/technical, administrative/managerial and sales/clerical occupations. The distribution of these major groups in the larger sample was about 20%, 17% and 22% respectively. Service/recreational, transportation/communication and mechanical/craftsmen occupations with an approximate distribution of 9%, 7% and 23% respectively, made up the blue-collar category.

In the sub-sample a highly consistent distribution of these major groups of occupations was observed. A regrouping of these categories into blue- and white-collar types, as shown in Table 3.11, reflects the extent to which both samples are similar. It is clear from $\chi^2 = .70$ that the observed frequencies of white- and blue-collar families in the sub-sample do not differ from those which fall in the remaining sample which may have more than one wage-earner.

Conclusion

The data presented in Tables 3.5 through 3.11 clearly show that the larger East York sample is composed of predominantly white, middle and lower-middle class families.[10] These characteristics of the sample families are believed to reflect the general nature of the Borough of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.11

Occupational Status

Classification of Husband's Occupation Into Blue-White Collar Types†						
Occupation Type	The Larger Sample of East York Families		The Sub-Sample of Single-Earner Families			
	N	%	N	%	Z	P
White Collar	121	59.1	57	57.6	0.82	N.S.
Blue Collar	79	38.5	42	42.4	0.82	N.S.
N.A.††	5	2.4	0	0.0	—	—
N	205	100.0	99	100.0		
$\chi^2 = .70$ df = 1 P = N.S.			$\chi^2 = .35$ df = 1 P = N.S.			

† Since this comparison between the two samples is based on the husband's occupation, six female wage-earners are not included in the sub-sample; they are also taken out of the larger sample. Of these, 5 females held white-collar jobs and one blue-collar. This distribution is similar to the larger sample where 97 (83.6%) of wives out of a total of 116 working wives were in white collar types of occupations, and 19 (16.4%) held blue-collar jobs.

†† These 5 cases were excluded from the computations of Z scores and chi-squares.

East York.[11] Earlier partial analysis of these data have shown the comparability of the larger sample and the general population of the Borough (see Turk, 1970; Maidman, 1971; Butler, 1974). In one paper, Turk and Bell (1972:216) conclude as follows: "In short . . . the data are from a good-sized sample representative of a total community—a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

stable, fairly homogeneous lower-middle-class to upper-middle-class community."

Except for the sex of the wage-earner, life-cycle, and size of the immediate family not living in the focal household, on all the variables the sub-sample seems comparable with the larger sample. This indicates the extent to which sub-sample may be considered representative of the general population characteristics of East York. Finally, the overall comparability of the larger sample and the sub-sample may be taken to mean that our criteria to select single-earner families was relatively unbiased.

Data for the Present Study

The sub-sample data which we will use to investigate the modes of adaptation between the work and family systems are taken from the structured and open-ended questions administered in the first and second phase of the larger project. Except for the size of the workplace—our measure of the bureaucratization of work setting—all other data were available from *The Family Dynamics Study*. The data on size were collected from several sources including *Scott's Ontario Industrial Directory, Canadian Trade Index, Annual Reports* of individual organizations and, a direct correspondence with the employer.

For other data, relevant questions were selected from the original questionnaires which were then coded following the coding scheme used in earlier analyses. The procedure adopted to classify the responses to open-ended questions slightly differed from the one employed in the larger study.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In order to create composite measures of family group properties, based on multiple indices, this study will use the answers given by all family members. Especially, this will be done in the case of family variables. Where the answers of one individual are used their reliability will be established by correlating with the responses of another person. For work variables, the information obtained from the primary wage earner will be utilized. The measurement of these and other variables is presented in the next chapter.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

[1] It may be noted that Tax Assessment Roles did not record information on parent and child, but only on sex and age. The classification of "family households" was based on a guess about the relationship of people given specific ages and age differences. The household was assumed to contain a parent-child combination when there was a fifteen year age difference between two residents who were not joint owner/tenants of opposite sexes. In order to draw a random sample of "family households" from the listing, all one-person households and households with two or more same-sex, non-parent-child inhabitants were dropped (see Turk, 1970, p. 39 and p. 57).

[2] In those cases where there was no mother, the age of the father was used as the basis of classification.

[3] Of the families who could be *located* and who *spoke English*, the per cent who completed both phases of the study, was well over 60. For studies of this kind, i.e. involving the *whole* family unit, this completion rate may be considered above average.

[4] In this research a separate questionnaire was designed for each family member. The nature of the questions varied according to the age and social position of the members. To make it certain that each member would get the proper questionnaire without any confusion, the question-booklets were printed into different colors.

[5] A word on the coding of these data. Most of the questionnaires, those filled in by the respondents and those administered by the interviewers, were precoded to reduce data-processing errors, and were punched on the I.B.M. cards as such. The open-ended questions were coded after the whole set of data was gathered. Part of the family group discussions and verbal conversation was coded using Bales' (1950) scheme of Interaction Process Analysis (I.P.A.) and its extended version referred to as Social Interaction Scoring (S.I.S.) which was developed by Turk (1970). In large part, the data were made available for computer analysis by January 1970. Some of the data generated by family discussion sessions on health and illness, work pressures and "family issues" are sitting on tapes uncoded as yet.

[6] Of 105 families defined as single-earner, in 29 families one other member—generally the school-age child or occasionally the wife—worked less than 5 hours a week or over but not exceeding 14 hours. Since these part-timers did not constitute the *primary* source of family income, we feel to have some justification in considering their families as single-earners.

[7] Apparently this procedure may seem a violation of the assumption of "independent random samples" but this is not quite true in this case. For instance, according to the logic of the principle, one can draw an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

almost infinite number of random samples using different criteria and with proper replacements of individuals or elements of the larger sample. Theoretically there must be independence *within* each sample as well as independence *between* samples. In this sense our sub-sample of single-earner-intact families and the remaining larger sample must be comparable on all other characteristics except for the sampling criteria—e.g. being *intact* and having a *single person working* in the labor force. Referring to a similar situation Blalock Jr. (1972:220) states: "If the overall sample is strictly random, and if one is comparing two subsamples selected from a single larger sample, this assumption of independence between samples will automatically be met since all cases in the total sample will have been selected independently of each other. For example, if one compares males and females, then he will also have a random sample of all males, and an independently selected sample of all females."

[8] The Z scores for Table 3.4 and for some of the other tables presented in the text may "contradict" with our decision to reject or retain the null hypothesis. However, it may be remembered that since χ^2 is a summary test of the differences in *all* the observed and expected frequencies in the table and the Z score shows the differences in the proportions of *one* category in two samples at a time, this discrepancy is likely to occur. To resolve this seeming "contradiction", we must eventually rely upon the χ^2 as a test of goodness of the fit. The Z scores are presented here to have a quick summary of the differences in the proportion of each category of a variable in the two samples.

[9] With respect to the generation *in the household*, 67% of the families in the larger sample had two generations in the household; 26% and 7% lived in two and three generation households respectively. Ninety percent of the husbands and 95% of the wives had been married only once. The average age at marriage for husbands and wives was 27 and 24 years respectively.

[10] Additional information on the residential arrangements of these families may reflect their socio-economic standing. For example, about half the families (51%) in the larger sample lived in detached and semi-detached houses. The remaining were living in apartment buildings and multi-household complexes. In the sub-sample, 61% of families had 5-6 rooms in their homes, and an equal percentage (17.1%) reported to have 7-8 and 4 or less than 4 rooms in their dwellings.

[11] The socio-economic characteristics of East York population, which we have described in the text, are also consistent with those reported in the YorkLea Study—an independent research project carried out approximately during the same time when *The Family Dynamics Study* was undertaken. In a partial analysis of YorkLea data, Shulman (1972) compared socio-economic and religious-ethnic composition of East York with Metropolitan Toronto and found the following differences: 71.7% of the population of East York compared with 60.7% of Metro Toronto were British in ethnic origin, and 72.1% of East Yorkers compared with 60.9% of Torontonians, were Protestant (these figures are based on *Census of*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Canada D.B.S. 1961). In addition, the population of East York showed a somewhat higher level of education and income than the population of greater Toronto.

It appears as if the Borough slightly under-represents the lower-class families compared to the total population of Metro Toronto. This is also shown by the main sample and to some extent by the sub-sample of this study.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF WORK AND FAMILY SYSTEMS: MEASUREMENT PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

The primary objective of this research is to investigate the modes of adaptation between the work and family systems. *Differentiation* and *jointness* in family activities are conceptualized as two modes of adaptation. The theoretical position taken in this research enabled us to develop a general proposition that these modes emerge from a two-way articulation of the structural components of the work and family systems. Following from this, we identified a set of important components of each system for an empirical analysis.

In the case of work system, we decided to concentrate on three components which are as follows: *bureaucratization of work setting, social complexity of work,* and *orderliness of work career.* These are the *independent variables* in our theoretical model. Each variable is considered continuous, and is conceptualized as to the degree of presence of certain theoretically relevant attributes.[1]

With respect to family activities, we identified two theoretical dimensions, the internal—*intra-family interaction*—and the external—*extra-family social activity.* These two dimensions are considered the components of the family system. To make them researchable, four theoretically possible subtypes are suggested. Two of these, *family tasks* and *family decisions,* relate to intra-family interaction, and the other two, *primary-level activity,* and *organization-focussed activity,* bear a close affinity with the extra-family social activity dimension.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Together they make up *the dependent variables* of the study.

The activities covered by these family variables are considered more responsive to the work sphere of life, and constitute the main locus of adaptation. The occurrence of any given mode of adaptation is seen as an outcome of the *primary wage earner's* working in a given work-setting, holding a particular job, and having gone through a certain career experience. Specific research hypotheses predicting the nature of adaptation are developed in chapter two. The source of data to test these hypotheses is described in chapter three.

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to replace our theoretical model with an "empirical model". Stated otherwise, this chapter does two things. First, using empirical indicators, it provides operational definitions to theoretical concepts. Second, it specifies the meanings of operationalized concepts so as to make them equivalent to their theoretically assigned attributes; this is done by establishing appropriate cutting points.[2]

An Empirical Assessment of Differentiated and Joint Modes of Adaptation

We recognize *differentiation* and *jointness* in family activities as two distinct styles or modes of adaptation, which of course, in reality may exist in varying degrees in the families. With a minor change we have adopted Bott's (1971: 52-54) definitions of these concepts which she employed to analyse her data on family role relationships.[3] The usefulness of her definitions as analytical tools has been shown by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

various authors who either sought to test her original hypothesis linking role-segregation to network connectedness (Turner, 1967; Udry and Hall, 1965; Aldous and Strauss, 1966) or who suggested some other conditions of segregation (Rainwater, 1965; Morwer, 1969).

Based on her intensive analysis of family behavior, Bott (1971) depicts the joint mode in this manner: "Husband and wife carry out many activities together with a minimum of task differentiation and separation of interests. They not only plan the affairs of the family together but also exchange many household tasks and spend much of their leisure time together." This may be contrasted with the behavior shown by the segregated families, where "husband and wife have a clear differentiation of tasks and a considerable number of separate interests and activities. They have a clearly definite division of labor into male tasks and female tasks. They expect to have different leisure pursuits, and the husband has his friends outside the home and the wife has hers" (p. 53).

In light of this description of families, we may define a joint mode as a relationship in which the "predominant" style of marital life with respect to intra-family interaction (consisting of family tasks and family decisions) and extra-family social activity (primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity) is that of togetherness and mutual sharing. By contrast, the differentiated mode would refer to a relationship in which the "predominant" style of marital life in its domains of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity, would show a marked degree of segregation and separateness.

To be able to define these modes in quantitative terms, each subtype of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

seen as ranging along a continuum from a *relatively* joint to a relatively differentiated one: The extent to which one mode is predominantly or markedly joint or differentiated—as we called above—will be decided by looking at the total scores of each index. The median score will be used to establish cut-off points. In the following section, first we will list the indicators of each variable and second, we will specify the "upper" and "lower" limits of composite indices and their operational meanings.[4]

FAMILY VARIABLES

Intra-Family Interaction

i) *Family Tasks*

As an ongoing system, the family encounters a multitude of tasks which directly relate to its internal workings. It is very unlikely for an outside viewer of family dynamics to determine even the number of "important" family tasks. Nevertheless, it seems possible to conceive a range of tasks in that some frequently concern the members as taking care of small children, preparing meals, washing, and repairing etc., while others may be relatively less frequent as exchanging visits with friends and relatives, doing shopping, and maintaining equipment of family possessions, e.g., car, T.V. or other property.

In this research, the task dimension of the intra-family interaction variable would include the following four items: i) household chores, ii) contact with friends and relatives, iii) shopping, and iv) child care. Data on these items were collected in the second phase

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of interviewing sessions which consisted of the entire household. The specific questions asked by the interviewers read as follows:

i) There are many things which families have to take care of. These range from household chores, to child-rearing and to social activities. First, let's talk about household chores. Who does what tasks?

ii) Who does what to keep in touch with relatives and friends?

iii) Now let's talk about shopping for things for the whole family. Who does what?

iv) If ever had children: Who (does/did) the different things involved in taking care of and bringing up your children?

On a separate sheet, where these questions were recorded in an abbreviated form, the interviewers were directed to use these response categories to probe the usual pattern: "Who; Who Else Does This; If Two or More, Is This Usually Done Alone or Together? (probe for most common)". In addition, the interviewers were asked to note on the same sheet *all* tasks mentioned by the respondent under these four major types.[5] This elicited a comprehensive set of information, which facilitated an identification of the most prevalent mode of family task performance.

An Assessment of Jointness and Differentiation

In the course of recoding these data to make it suitable to the purpose of this study, we employed the following categories to classify the answers to each question:

1) Only one person, either husband or wife or child, always performs a given task.
2) Husband-child or wife-child or child-child both involved but always work separately (alone).
3) Husband-child or wife-child or child-child both involved but the most common pattern is unclear.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

4) Husband-wife both involved but always or usually work separately (alone).
5) Husband-wife-child all involved and sometimes work separately and sometimes together.
6) Husband-wife both involved and always or usually work together (includes answers such as "family affair").
7) Husband-wife-child involved and always or usually work together (family affair).
8) Husband-wife or husband-wife-child involved but the most common pattern is unclear.

Of these 8 categories, 1, 2, 3†, 4 and 8† indicate a relatively differentiated style of participation in family tasks, and categories 5, 6 and 7 show a predominantly joint style. In order to construct a standardized multi-item index of family tasks a score of "0" was assigned to the former set of categories and a score of "1" to the latter. The summated scores over four items ranged from 0 to 4. To determine differentiation and jointness, this range was dichotomized on the basis of theoretical median of 2—which is extremely close to the observed median score of 2.03. Sixty-seven (63.8%) families from a total of 105, who obtained either a score of "0" or "1" or "2" are considered to have a differentiated mode of participation in family tasks, and the remaining 38 (36.2%), a joint pattern.

As noted previously, though differentiation and jointness are

---

† There were few families where the usual pattern was not clear. Corresponding to each task however, the names of two or more than two persons were given under "who" or/and "who else does". This, coupled with our assumption that the families would generally tend to exaggerate jointness even if this was only rarely present, provided us with some justification to class then as differentiated.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

seen as two distinct modes of adaptation, in practice they may be viewed on a continuum showing an increasing tendency towards jointness or differentiation depending upon the end from where we look at it. Thus, another way to label this dichotomy would be to call 67 families "low" and the other 38 "high" as to the extent of jointness in family tasks. Conversely, we may treat 38 families as "low" and 67 as "high" in terms of differentiation.

Despite our reference to differentiation and jointness as distinct patterns—which may be of some analytic utility—we must remember their continuous nature since it clearly shows the ordinality of our indexed data and qualify the data for statistical manipulation with reasonably strong and powerful associational tests. This will be true in the case of other family level variables to be discussed shortly.

Reliability of Family Task Index

Several different but related methods were used for an empirical estimation of reliability. First, as a measure of *internal consistency*, we computed *zero-order correlations* between the individual four items and the main index (which is a summation of scores on these four items). According to this inter-item correlation analysis, if all the items correlate with each other and with the index, it is legitimate to aggregate the items to construct one unitary index (Guilford, 1954). The correlations presented in Table 4.1 lend a considerable support to our decision of including all four items in the index. With one exception of a negative correlation (e.g., -.04) a consistent and positive relationship between the items and the index points out the presence of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.1

Family Task Index

An Inter-Item Zero-Order Correlation (Pearson r) Matrix						
	i)	ii)	iii)	iv)	Index A	Index B	Index†
i)		.23	.15	.27	.62	.30	.50
ii)			.37	.25	.34	.73	.66
iii)				-.04	.67	.22	.45
iv)					.20	.53	.52
Index A	Coefficients of reliability:					.41	.67
Index B	††Standardized Item Alpha = .51						.68
	†††Spearman-Brown Split-Half = .58						

†This is the main index of family tasks to be used in this study; it consists of 4 items. Index A and Index B each includes 2 items: Index A is composed of odd-numbered items (viz: i, iii) and Index B of even-numbered items (ii and iv). These two indices provide us a measure of reliability referred to as split-half method.

††The Alpha Coefficient was computed by using the mean inter-item correlation of the test (e.g. Index) corrected for the length of the test by the following formula:

$$rkk = \frac{k\ rij}{1 + (k-1)\ rij}$$

Where k is the number of items in the test and rij is the mean inter-item correlation (Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory*, 1967:193). [The Alpha coefficient of reliability in this and other tables is estimated from intercorrelations among *individual items* and does not include correlations between items and indices.]

†††To obtain the reliability of main (or whole) Index from its separate parts (e.g., Index A and Index B) the correlation between Index A and Index B was corrected by the following formula:

$$rkk = \frac{2r12}{1 + r12}$$

where r12 = correlation between two half tests (or Index A and Index B) and rkk = reliability of the whole test (Ibid: 194).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a unidimensional phenomenon which we referred to as family tasks.

Second, from an average of all possible inter-item correlations (r = .205), an *alpha coefficient of reliability* was computed. Psychometrician Nunnally (1967) recommends alpha as the single most meaningful measure of reliability. Its superiority lies in its ability to show rather clearly the measurement errors resulting from a poor sampling of items and/or the content of items. Thus, if the alpha coefficient is extremely low, one must pause to reconsider the items before adding them to form an index. With respect to our index of family tasks, a standardized alpha coefficient of .51 indicates a moderate level of reliability of the whole index (Nunnally, 1967:226).

Third, we used a *split-half* approach to compute a reliability coefficient from an addition of even and odd numbered items. Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959:174-75) suggest that the split-half method may be seen as a special case of the "method of alternate forms" of a test administered at the same time. In this sense, the correlation between these forms provides an estimate of the extent to which they are *equivalent in content*. Using this method two separate indices, viz. Index A and Index B, each consisting of two items, were developed. The correlation between these indices was .41, which produced a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of .58. Since, theoretically, the indexible items are assumed to be amenable to any type of addition, the split-half approach lends further credence to the main index of family tasks.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ii) *Family Decisions*

This dimension of intra-family interaction is measured by an eight-item index. The items (see below) are taken from Blood and Wolfe's (1963: 282) Detroit Area Study. Blood and Wolfe and many others have frequently used these items to study "family power" (for review see Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Turk, 1970). It may be noted that the usefulness of these items as *measure of family power* has been questioned by Turk and Bell (1972). Since our interest is not to measure power but to know the *mode* of participation in internal family activities, including family decisions, we feel that these items are useful. The data were obtained from the wife/mother in the first phase of interviewing, who answered the following questions.

> In every family someone has to decide such things as where the family will live and so on. Many couples talk such things over first, but the *final* decision often has to be made by the husband or the wife.
>
> i) For instance, who usually makes the final decision about the job the husband should take?
>
> ii) Who usually makes the final decision about what car to buy?
>
> iii) Who usually makes the final decision about whether or not to buy life insurance?
>
> iv) Who usually makes the final decision about where to go on vacation?
>
> v) Who usually makes the final decision about what house or apartment to take?
>
> vi) Who usually makes the final decision about whether or not the wife should go to work or quit work?
>
> vii) Who usually makes the final decision about what doctor to have when someone is sick?
>
> viii) Who usually makes the final decision about how much money the family can afford to spend per week on food?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Answers to these questions were classified as follows:

1. Husband because there is no wife.
2. Husband always.
3. Husband more than wife.
4. Husband and wife exactly the same.
5. Wife more than husband.
6. Wife always.
7. Wife because there is no husband.

An Assessment of Jointness and Differentiation

A composite index of family decisions was formed by giving a new score of "1" to answers 3, 4, and 5 and "0" to answers 2 and 6; answers 1 and 7 did not occur in the sub-sample since it included only *intact* families. The total score on this index ranged from 0 to 8. Using theoretical median of 4 as the cutting point the families were divided into two groups: 54 families (51.3%) who fell in the score-range of 4-8 were defined as joint with respect to members' participation in family decisions, and 42 families (40%) with a score-range of 0-4 were considered differentiated. The remaining 9 families (8.6%) were dropped because of missing values on one or more than one item.

As in the case of our index of family tasks, here too, the first two groups of families (e.g. 54, 42) may be defined according to the degree of jointness in family decision; this would make 54 families "more" joint and the other 42 "less" joint.

Reliability of Family Decisions Index

The intercorrelations among eight items and the index are shown in Table 4.2. With two exceptions (e.g., -.09 and -.01) all correlations

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.2

Family Decision Index

An Inter-Item Zero-Order Correlation (Pearson r) Matrix

	i)	ii)	iii)	iv)	v)	vi)	vii)	viii)	Index A	Index B	Index†
i)		.26	.19	-.09	-.01	.15	.10	.14	.41	.22	.28
ii)			.34	.20	.22	.21	.11	.22	.44	.67	.43
iii)				.23	.26	.16	.27	.24	.69	.38	.49
iv)					.31	.18	.25	.17	.23	.41	.40
v)						.15	.22	.31	.42	.31	.43
vi)							.17	.16	.18	.54	.47
vii)								.40	.55	.35	.53
viii)									.36	.54	.61
Index A		Coefficients of reliability:								.44	.70
Index B		Standardized Item Alpha = .66									.76
		Spearman-Brown Split-Half = .61									

†This is the main index of family decisions and would be used in the current analysis. This index involves all eight items, while Index A and Index B each consists of 4 items. Index A is composed of odd-numbered items and Index B, the even-numbered items. For computation of reliability coefficients see formulas in the note under Table 4.1.

between paired combinations of items are in the expected direction. This means that the *internal consistency* of the index of family decisions is reasonably strong, and therefore, we may assume the presence of a common core in these items.[6] The average correlation produced by 28 non-redundant pairs of eight items was .198, which generated a *standardized item alpha of .66*. This may be interpreted to mean that all items measure the same underlying characteristic and that random errors of content are relatively minimum.

The *split-half* approach yielded a zero-order correlation of .44 between the two halves of the main index, e.g. Index A and Index B. After correcting it with the Spearman-Brown formula of equal length, a reliability coefficient of .61 was obtained. This coefficient, being fairly close to the summary coefficient (.66), increases our confidence in the reliability of family decision index.

This might have established the reliability of our index as a measure of some common dimension but it does not indicate the *reliability of the wife's answers* and consequently the question of using them as representative of family group arises. In view of earlier studies which have cast serious doubts on the wife's reports of other members' behavior (Turk, 1970, Turk and Bell, 1972) we felt it necessary to determine the extent of concordance between the answers given by the wife and other family members, especially the husband.

For this purpose information obtained from husbands and wives on the same eight items, at the second phase of interviewing, was used. In this phase, instead of providing structured response categories, the respondents were asked to write down the name of a person or persons who

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

usually make(s) a given decision. Using categories somewhat similar to the above, the independently obtained answers from husbands and wives were classified and a composite index for each was developed. After dichotomizing these indices into joint and differentiated style they were cross-classified with the aforementioned index based on the wife's first-phase responses.

Goodman and Kruskal's (1963) gamma measure of association (G) was used to assess the concordance between the husband's second phase and the wife's first phase reported patterns. The value of gamma was .57; when converted into a Z score,[7] this value was significant at the .05 level ($Z = 2.20$; $P < .05$). This indicates a fairly strong consistency between the husband's and wife's reports, which clearly legitimizes our use of either one's answers. The gamma association between the wife's responses at two different times was substantially higher ($G = .77$; $Z = 4.38$; $P < .001$).

In another similar reliability check, we constructed a "master index" of family decisions by combining separate answers of husbands and wives which they provided at the second phase of the study. This index was then cross-tabulated with our previous index based on the wife's phase one reports. These indices associated at a gamma value of .72 ($Z = 3.14$; $P < .001$). It is this consistency between these reports of husbands and wives recorded at two different occasions that partly motivated us to construct the index of family decisions from the wives' answers. However, a more compelling reason was a relative completeness of these answers which were obtained from the wives in the beginning of the project.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The importance of this latter consideration can be seen from the size of missing information from the "master index". For instance, 17 wives (16.2%) and 23 husbands (21.9%) left one or more than one of the open-ended questions on family decisions unanswered. A pairwise deletion of these cases in order to obtain an even number, which is necessary for a systematic statistical analysis of the relevant variables, would have eliminated 35 families (33.33% of the total). This obviously would have reduced the size of our sample rather severely. Therefore, despite our preference to use the "master index", a decision was made to retain the wife's response to the above listed structured questions.

Extra-Family Social Activity

i) *Primary-Level Activity*

The range of primary activities of a "pure" social-recreational nature would seem a very broad one. However, a recognition of the major sources of such activities, which are generally intimate and informal in character, e.g. relatives, friends and kin, may delimit their scope for analytical purposes. These activities might also be defined according to a relatively less institutionalized physical locale where they ordinarily take place, such as movie houses and picnic sites etc.

With these considerations, we used 10 items to measure the variable of primary-level activity. These items (see below) have the advantage of being "diverse" and therefore, able to measure various sub-dimensions of primary-level activity; at the same time, they share certain common features which allow them to be indexed. Data on these 10 items were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

derived from two self-administered questionnaires independently completed by husbands and wives at the second phase of the study. The questions include:

i) How often does your *whole family* go to movies and plays?

ii) How often does your *whole family* go to sporting events?

iii) How often does your *whole family* go on picnics or family outings?

iv) How often does your *whole family* play indoor or outdoor games?

v) How often does your *whole family* have discussions?

vi) How often does your *whole family* go out shopping?

vii) How often does your *whole family* visit friends?

viii) How often does your *whole family* visit relatives?

ix) How often does your *whole family* have meals together?

x) How often does your *whole family* go to church together?

The respondents could answer these questions using one of the following choices: 1) very often; 2) fairly often; 3) not so often; 4) not at all.

An Assessment of Jointness and Differentiation

Our assessment of joint and differentiated pattern of primary activity was a bit different from the previous indices. Two steps were taken to determine these patterns. In the first step, answers 1 and 2 to each question were combined and a score of "1" was assigned to the new values and answers 3 and 4 were recoded and the combined value was given a "0" score. This scoring scheme helped dichotomize each answer roughly into "yes"-"no" categories. By summing the scores across 10 items, two separate indices, one for wife (Index 1) and another for husband (Index 2) were constructed. On each index, the score showed a range of 0-10.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Using theoretical medians of 5, Index 1 and Index 2 were dichotomized: a score range of 0-5 was coded 1 and 6-10 as 2. These coded values of 1 and 2 point out respectively the differentiated and joint ends of Index 1 and Index 2. An extremely close association between these indices (Gamma = .89; Z = 8.21; $P < .001$) indicated the possibility of constructing a composite index based on the answers of both husbands and wives.

With these crude definitions, in the second step we rank ordered these values of both indices. Next, by doing a case-wise comparison, a concordance in Index 1 and Index 2 was determined. In 36 (34.3%) families both husband and wife agreed that the usual pattern of family activity was differentiated; in 11 (10.5%) families, the husband reported a joint pattern but the wife disagreed; and, in another 9 families (8.6%), the wife's answers indicated a joint pattern but the husband reported a differentiated style. These three categories were combined to define differentiated mode of primary activity which comes to a total of 56 (53.4%) families. Forty-three families (41.0%) where both husband and wife agreed to a joint pattern make up our second group of families having a predominantly joint style of primary activity.[8] Six families (5.6%) are excluded from the analysis because of missing information on one of the 10 items.

Reliability of Primary-Level Activity Index

Table 4.3 presents an item-to-item correlation matrix of ten items on which the index of primary-level activity is based. These correlations were computed from an aggregation of scores obtained by husbands and wives on each item. Though ranging from low to moderate, all 45 inter-item

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

correlations are positive. Also the correlations of individual items with the main index and the two 5-item indexes are positive and substantially strong. These correlations may be interpreted as an indication of the *internal consistency* of this domain of items. In other words, all items may be considered *homogeneous* and therefore, measuring a common attribute in a consistent fashion.

The average correlation between these 10 items was .176. This produced an *alpha coefficient* of .68, which is very strong and shows the possibility of constructing an index with a low risk of measurement errors.

As in the case of other indexes, here too our decision to construct a composite index partly rested upon the *split-half* method. First, this method indicates whether or not the two halves measure the same thing. Second, the method answers the question that "given two equally reliable halves, how reliable would the whole be if they were combined into one" (Nie and Hull, 1977:67). As may be seen from Table 4.3, the correlation between index A and Index B was .46, which may be taken to mean that these indices measure the same attribute. This correlation generates a Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient of .63. Comparing this with the standardized item alpha .68, it may be concluded that: a) all items are indexable, and b) that they tap a single property which we call the primary-level activity.

ii) *Organization-Focussed Activity*

This dimension of extra-family social activity refers to participation in groups and associations of "secondary character" having more

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.3

Primary-Level Activity Index

An Inter-Item Zero-Order Correlation (Pearson r) Matrix

	i)	ii)	iii)	iv)	v)	vi)	vii)	viii)	ix)	x)	Index A	Index B	Index†
i)		.13	.17	.19	.19	.10	.28	.23	.06	.12	.56	.27	.22
ii)			.23	.30	.18	.13	.20	.24	.11	.10	.29	.61	.44
iii)				.43	.26	.08	.23	.32	.10	.04	.63	.40	.48
iv)					.22	.19	.18	.18	.13	.11	.40	.63	.52
v)						.20	.26	.13	.21	.08	.68	.29	.40
vi)							.34	.17	.04	.10	.28	.55	.31
vii)								.39	.19	.05	.70	.40	.52
viii)									.18	.06	.42	.58	.48
ix)										.10	.32	.20	.13
x)		Coefficients of Reliability:									.11	.45	.27
Index A		Standardized Item Alpha = .68										.46	.63
Index B		Spearman-Brown Split-Half = .63											.70

†This is the main index of primary activity which we shall use in the present study. Index A comprises the odd-numbered items and Index B the even-numbered items; the main index includes all 10 items (see note to Table 4.1).

formal nature, as for example, school clubs, work clubs and professional organizations, generally known as "voluntary associations". In the second phase of our study, the family members were asked whether or not they held membership and/or officeship of any or all of the following broad categories of clubs and organizations: Community Clubs (Y.M.C.A.; Lions, Canadian Legion, Community Centre, etc.), Work Organizations (Unions, Professional Associations, Company Bowling League, etc.), School Clubs (French Club, Soccer Team, Home and School Association, Alumni Association, etc.), Ethnic or Nationality Clubs (United Empire Loyalist Association, Sons of Scotland Benevolent Association, Italo-Canadian Club, etc.), and Church Clubs or organizations (including church or synagogue membership). Initially, we decided to compare the membership of each family member in each club-organization to identify a joint and differentiated pattern but the diverse nature of smaller organizations, as listed in parenthesis, led us to change this decision and look for a different measure. Consequently, we decided to use the following questions as a measure of organization-focussed activity.

> "About how many clubs and organizations does your *whole family go together*?"

The responses to this question were classified as follows: 1) none; 2) one; 3) two; 4) three; 5) four; 6) five; 7) more than five. This question appeared immediately after a set of questions on the individual membership-officeship of the above mentioned organizations. An extremely high correlation (r = .66) between husbands' and wives' answers establishes the reliability of this question and justified our choice.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

An Assessment of Jointness and Differentiation

For our purpose the number of organizations one belonged to was of little relevance, since we are interested in the *mode* of organization-focussed activity, whether the family as a group participates or separately. Therefore, to develop a family level measure of this variable, we gave a score of "0" to answer "none" and a score of "1" to answers of one or more clubs and organizations. This procedure was repeated to recode the wife's answers to the same question. Sixty-one (58.1%) husbands and 68 (64.8%) wives did not name any organization in which the family held a joint membership. Forty-three (41.0%) husbands and 36 wives (34.4%) reported a joint membership/attendance of one or more than one organization.

Using the procedure described above in the case of primary activity index, we attempted a concordance between the patterns reported by husbands and wives. In 31 (29.5%) families both spouse reported a joint pattern; in 5 (4.8%), the wife mentioned a joint style but the husband reported a differentiated one; in another 12 (11.4%) families, the wives disagreed with their husbands' reports of a joint mode of organizational activity. These latter 3 categories were combined which make up a total of 72 (78.6%) differentiated families; 2 families with incomplete information were dropped from the index.

Reliability of Organization-Focussed Activity Index

Since this index consisted of husbands' and wives' answers to the same question, the determination of reliability was rather a simple matter. Only Spearman-Brown *split-half* coefficient could be computed.[9] As shown in Table 4.4, the zero-order correlation between the responses of husbands

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and wives was .66; this resulted in a split-half coefficient of .79. Both these correlations indicate a fairly high agreement between husbands and wives as to the nature of their organizational activity.

Table 4.4

Organization-Focussed Activity Index

Zero-Order Correlation (Pearson r) Matrix of Husband-Wife's Answers			
	Wife	Husband	Index of Concordance†
Wife		.66	.77
Husband	Coefficient of Reliability: Spearman-Brown Split-Half = .79		.89

†This Index of Concordance will be used in the present study.

The Relative Independence of Components of the Family System

The theoretical perspective which permitted the derivation of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity dimension suggested a close association between them and their sub-dimensions which in the case of the former, include family tasks and family decisions, and for the latter, primary level activity and organization-focussed activity. The method by which we formulated the research hypotheses was primarily based on these assumed correlations. At the same time we believed in their independence since each sub-dimension was conceptualized to measure a distinct property of the family system. These expectations were examined by computing intercorrelations between these four sub-types (Table 4.5).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.5

Intercorrelations (Zero-Order) between Sub-types of Intra-Family Interaction and Extra-Family Social Activity†

	Intra-Family Interaction		Extra-Family Social Activity	
	Family Tasks	Family Decisions	Primary-Level Activity	Organization-focussed Activity
Family Tasks		.29	.33	.42
Family Decisions			.30	.27
Primary-Level Activity				.46

†All correlations are statistically significant at the .01 (or better) level of significance.

A strong and consistent positive relationship among these variables indicates that they measure a set of related aspects of family behavior.

To determine the extent to which these dimensions vary together, both first-order and second-order partial correlations were computed (cf. Blalock Jr. 1972). Controlling for the individual effects of primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity, produced respectively the first-order partials of .21 and .20 between family tasks and family decisions. When we partialed-out the influence of these two dimensions of extra-family social activity simultaneously, a second-order partial of .18 was obtained. These partials show a considerable reduction in the original zero-order correlation of .29. Similarly, when we removed the joint effects of the sub-types of intra-family interaction, the zero-order correlation between organization-focussed activity (r = .46) reduced to a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

second-order partial of .35. This interaction makes it clear that these four sub-types of family behavior vary with each other. However, since none of the correlations disappears or reduces to a negligible size with first or second-order partials of either set of variables, our assumption of their relative independence sufficiently stands the test of empirical validation.[10]

WORK VARIABLES

1. Bureaucratization of the Work Setting

The bureaucratization of a work setting refers to the extent to which it contains the elements of "bureaucracy"—as formally defined in the sociological literature. Max Weber's (1973) conceptualization of bureaucracy as an "ideal type" allows the analyst to determine the degree to which a given organization is bureaucratized, since it would depend upon the *extent of presence* of certain essential elements which constitute the ideal type. These include: size, hierarchy of authority, division of labor, rules, procedures, impersonality and technical competence. Obviously then, this formulation of bureaucracy views it as a continuous variable in the theoretical sense. An empirical assessment of the process of bureaucratization may, therefore, be achieved by using its elements singularly or in various combinations.

In the present study, we decided to use *size*—the total number of employees—as a measure of bureaucratization of the work setting. The justification of our choice comes from Weber's (1973) original analysis of bureaucratic organizations and its empirical documentation by Michels

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(1968), Blau and Schoenherr (1971), and Presthus (1962), whose research seems to establish the causal primacy of size in the chain of bureaucratic elements.

This position argues that an increase in size of a given organization leads to its greater complexity, which in turn necessitates an elaborate administrative apparatus, which then generates a need for vertical differentiation with a more complicated hierarchy structure. The cumulative effects resulting from a constellation of these and other features, require a rather rigid formalization of rules and regulations which tends to foster impersonality in order to increase "efficiency" of the organization. We do recognize the *crudeness* of size as a measure of the degree of bureaucracy but its obvious causal priority seems to disqualify any substitute indicator, which might turn out to be its own product.[11]

Several sources were used to obtain the number of employees for those organizations where our 105 primary wage-earners worked. In phase one interviewing, the respondents were asked to provide the name of the firm, industry, business concern and any organization etc., they were working for. Some supplementary information was available from a slightly different question asked at phase two of the study. From this, a list of 105 work-organizations was prepared. Forty-five names were located in *Scott's Ontario Industrial Directory* (1969) which lists the number of employees. Since this *Directory* records information on manufacturing industries, for other types of work organizations we looked into some other sources including *Annual Reports* of business concerns and *Canadian Trade Index* which together provided the data on size for seven organizations. For the remaining 53, these and various other sources, listed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

no information on size.

Consequently, we decided to write the headquarters of these organizations. To do this, first we looked into the telephone directory of Metro Toronto and its vicinities for their mailing addresses. A list of 42 addresses could be compiled from the directory where about 49 respondents worked. Professor James L. Turk prepared a letter—which after briefly introducing the research objectives, asked for the required information (see Appendix C)—that was sent to 42 organizations along with a stamped self-addressed envelope. Forty organizations supplied the requested information. For the remaining 5—three of them were not listed in the telephone directory, which either ceased functioning or merged into other organizations, and the other two which did not answer our letter—an approximate number of employees was used. These 5 were retail stores and of relatively small size. All this information was collected as of 1969 when the larger study was conducted.

The total number of employees ranged from 3 to 84,388 with a median score of 841. In order to differentiate "more" and "less" bureaucratic organizations, the median was used as a cut-off point. This divided 105 organizations respectively into two groups of 52 and 53.

2. Social Complexity of Work

The variable social complexity indicates the nature of job or its *content*, e.g., what a wage-earner actually does on the job. In this research, the content of work is seen in terms of its social complexity—the extent to which it deals with people as opposed to data and things. Since the work with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

people provides greater opportunities for direct and indirect social interaction of reciprocal and parallel type, it is defined as more socially complex as compared to work with objects—data and things—where the interaction is tengential to the completion of job activities. A distinction of work functions in relations to Data, People and Things, maintained by *Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations* (1971: 1169-71) permits an empirical assessment of this conceptualization. The present study had the necessary data which enabled us to utilize this distinction.

In the first phase of the study, detailed information was obtained from the wife/mother regarding the job of all working members of the family. Three standard Census questions were asked:

1. What kind of business did he (she) work in last week?
2. What was the name of the firm, department, branch, division or section?
3. What were his (her) specific duties for this company?

In addition, the second phase of interview included another question which was completed by all family members 12 years old and above. This question reads as follows:

> "Please write the different types of jobs you have worked at on a full-time basis—also, write down the years in which you did this type of job."

These questions enabled us to compile a full description of the jobs held by the primary wage-earners at the time of interviewing. The job-titles and a description of job contents was then compared with the job-title and description given in *Canadian Classification* . . . (1971). Before this comparison could be made, a close correspondence between occupational codes used by *Canadian Classification* and the occupations

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which occurred in the sample was determined. This insured greater accuracy of our classifications. A case-wise comparison identified 50 jobs which predominantly related to people; these jobs are assumed to be more socially complex. The remaining 55 showed various combinations of data-people-things; 7 relatively exclusively to data, 6 to things, 3 to data-things with a very weak relationship to people. Together these 55 make up a group of jobs which are considered less socially complex.

Since every occupation requires a worker to function in relation to data-people-things in varying degrees, our distinction into "more" and "less" social complexity is a relative one, and indicates the continuous nature of this variable. This point is kept in view in *Canadian Classification* which characterizes a job as dealing with data, things or people by looking at the extent to which the worker has "*an occupationally significant relationship*" to one of these three categories.[12]

3) Orderliness of the Work Career

This variable looks at the patterns of work career to determine the extent to which the career experience of a job-holder has been orderly (or disorderly). In the current analysis, the orderliness of work career is viewed in terms of the *degree of continuity* in the primary wage-earner's career over his working life.

Ideally, to identify the precise nature of career, longitudinal studies, conducted over different time periods, of a given population of workers, are needed. However, detailed information on one's encounters with unemployment, if recalled fairly well, may be used as a crude substitute measure. Some previous studies of work career, reported in a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

different context (cf. Wilensky, 1961, 1964), followed a variant of this procedure. This gives us some confidence to base our measure of work career on the number of reported interruptions in the working life of the wage-earner. The following open-ended question asked in the second phase of the study provided this information.

> How many times since you left school, have you been without work for at least three weeks?[13]

The responses to this question were classified in terms of the actual number of work interruptions. The wage-earners whose answer was "never" or "none" were considered as having a more orderly career. There were 54 such workers. Those who have been without work for 1 to 7 or more times were grouped to form the category of workers who experienced a less orderly career; their number was 44. The remaining 8 wage-earners who gave incomplete information or who did not answer this question were deleted.

The Relative Independence of Components of the Work System

These three work variables, bureaucratization, social complexity, and work career were conceptualized to represent three qualitatively different structural components of the work system. No theoretical assumption as to the *nature* of intercorrelation among them was made. The empirical correlations presented in Table 3.6 lead to some interesting observations.

An examination of the zero-order correlations shows that the association between bureaucratization, social complexity, and work career

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.6

Intercorrelations between Structural Components of the Work System

	Bureaucratization of Work Setting	Social Complexity of Work	Orderliness of Work Career
Bureaucratization of Work Setting		.028	.004
Social Complexity of Work			.205†
FIRST-ORDER PARTIALS			
Bureaucratization and Complexity controlling for Career = .028			
Career and Bureaucratization controlling for Complexity = -.002			
Complexity and Career controlling for Bureaucratization = .205†			

†Significant at .05.

is almost non-existent. This means that irrespective of the extent to which work setting is bureaucratized, a person has an equal probability of working in a less or more socially complex job, and an equal probability of experiencing a high or low orderly work career. A moderate positive correlation between work career and social complexity (r = .205) which indicates that the wage-earners holding socially complex jobs are more likely to have a relatively orderly career, is unexpected. Nevertheless, it seems consistent with empirical observations that less socially complex job holders, e.g. those working for manufacturing and construction industries, are more vulnerable to job interruptions and eventual unemployment (Ostry, 1968: 15-19).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

On the other hand, the lack of association between work career and bureaucratization does not support the long held view that "bureaucracy" assures a stability of career to its personnel as a motivation to secure their commitment and loyalty.[14] However, the insignificant association of bureaucratization with social complexity and work career does not mean that these variables do not relate to *the work system*; it only indicates that they measure its qualitatively different components.

The relative independence of these dimensions of work may also be seen from the fact that two out of three partials fail to alter the zero-order correlations. Only a control on social complexity converts the negligible positive correlation between bureaucratization and career into a negative value. Thus, both zero-order correlations and the first-order partials lead to the same conclusion that except for the close link between career and work complexity, there are no visible interconnections between these aspects of the work system.

TEST VARIABLES

1. Socio-Economic Status

The variables of socio-economic status was measured by an average score of its three standard indicators, e.g. income, education, and occupational prestige. Blishen's revised socio-economic index (Blishen and McRoberts, 1976), which provides mean weighted scores for about 480 occupations, was used. A complete listing of job titles and their description compiled from several questions asked at the first and second phase of the study (cf. the variable social complexity of work) facilitated

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a proper location of 105 jobs on the Blishen Index from where we selected the most accurate scores.

The coded scores of 105 jobs ranged from 26 to 75. Using the median score of 50 as the cut-off point, we classified this variable into "high" and "low" categories. Fifty-three families, where the wage-earner's scores on the Index were above 50, are defined as high socio-economic status families, the other 52 families, for whom the score ranged from 26 to 50 are designated as low socio-economic status families.

2. Social Networks

As the conceptualizations of social networks vary in the literature so do the measurement procedures (for review see Bott, 1971:243-330; Mitchell, 1969). However, at a broader level, the concept of "network" is used to describe a set of social relationships between various social systems. In micro-level studies of family behavior, the general concept is given more limited meanings in that it refers to family members' ties with friends, relatives and the kin at large. The *nature* of ties or of external involvement is conceptualized on some sort of a scale of "connectedness". The families who are highly connected with their networks and where the network members are in turn linked to each other, are called "close knit" families, and where connectedness is minimally present, are labeled as "loose knit" families (Bott, 1971).

A varient of this method was used in the present study to determine the "connectedness" of the social networks of research families. The extent to which a family's network was "close" or "loose" was defined

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

by looking at the number of friends and relatives known by one family member independently of the family group, plus the regularity of interaction with them. In the second phase of the study all family members were presented a fairly large battery of questions on their respective self-administered questionnaires. The questions which we shall utilize are listed as follows:

ia) Who are the five relatives or friends outside your immediate family who you have the *most contact* with, in person, by telephone, or by mail? How often are you in contact with them?

ib) How many *other* friends do you have?

iia) Who are the five friends or relatives outside your immediate family who you *feel the closest to*?

iib) How many *other* people, not counting your family, do you feel close to?[15]

In order to develop a family level measure, the data obtained from all family members, aged 12 years and over, are being used. Two separate charts of names, one from contact-data (Q ia, b) and the other from closeness-data (Q ii a, b) were prepared. First, an *Index of Family Contacts* was constructed. To do this, we compared the names listed by all members and a percentage of *common names* as of total names was computed. This procedure was repeated on closeness-data, and an *Index of Family Closeness* was generated. Because of a strong association between these two indices (gamma = .67; Z = 3.41 : P < .001) a decision to combine them was made. Consequently, a new percentage of *all* common names as of total names mentioned by a family was computed, which ranged from 0 to 53.

The median score (10%) was used to develop two categories of family networks: Forty-nine families with 0 to 10% scores were considered

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

loose knits, and 55 who scores about 10% are characterized as close knit; one case with.incomplete information was excluded from the index. This combined index assoeiated with the family contact index at a gamma value of .97 ($Z = 18.30 : P < .001$), and with closeness index at .86 ($Z = 6.80 : P < .001$). These strong internal associations indicate the presence of common dimension of family network where both contact and closeness dimensions tend to converge with each other.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

[1] All the variables in the model are viewed as *theoretically* continuous. This characteristic would allow us to make use of more powerful statistical techniques specifically meant for interval level of measurement. Empirically, however, these variables may show a discrete distribution.

[2] The cutting points which we will indicate in the text will be used in the course of data analysis, especially when we would apply the Multiple Classification Analysis. For the calculation of zero-order correlations and the regression coefficients all the variables would be given their metric values (see chapter five).

[3] Unlike Bott (1971) we restrict our characterization of research families to two modes viz. differentiated and joint; and omit the third one, e.g. "the intermediate mode". This is done for the sake of simplicity as well as to maintain clarity in our analysis, since the defining characteristics of intermediate type seems to be somewhat ambiguous.

[4] Perhaps a longitudinal analysis of family behavior may reveal the precise nature of exchange processes and negotiations regarding the execution of family activities. Also such analysis might reveal the manner by which the family members define a task or activity as "feminine" or "masculine" as well as the number of sex-specific activities. In this study, our reliance upon the reported patterns does not enable us to look into these and other subtle processes which very likely influence the occurrence of a particular pattern. Second, our method of indexing family activities using multiple indices precludes any assumption to sex-specificity of activities.

At best, all activities, or especially those relating to intra-familial interaction, are assumed to be interchangeable; the categories employed to classify responses to the questions asked in the interview, are flexible enough to take care of this element. In view of these considerations, we will work with somewhat simple and straight-forward operational definitions.

[5] The number of tasks listed under these four *major* areas was fairly large; few families reported more than 20 tasks. In the case of these and other families who mentioned a wide range of tasks, the decision as to their classification was made by looking at the most predominant pattern.

[6] Item i) is retained in the index because of its moderately strong positive correlation with the main index and the other two indices based on even and odd numbered items. Had it not positively correlated with those indices it would have been dropped from the main index. This rule of thumb guided our decision as to the inclusion (or exclusion) of items in all other indices of family variables.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[7] As such, the gamma measure of association does not have a level of significance. This means that one has to set up arbitrary limits to determine the extent to which a given numerical value is strong (or not strong). If the gamma is computed from a 2 × 2 cross-classification it is equivalent to Yule's Q, and its strength may be determined by the same limits which Davis (1971:49) has suggested for Yule's Q in his *Elementary Survey Analysis*. [For an extensive discussion of gamma, see Mueller et al., *Statistical Reasoning in Sociology* (1977), and for its relationship with other measures of association see Costner's paper "Criteria For Measures of Association" (1965:341-353).]

The second method to determine the strength of gamma (that we have used) is to compute the Z scores from the joint frequency distribution of cross-classified variables, which may have more than two categories, and then enter the Z score in the critical regions of the Normal Curve to find out its level of significance.

In their 1963 paper, Goodman and Kruskal have worked out a normal approximation of the sampling distribution of gamma (G) which makes it possible to test the null hypothesis. They suggest the following formula for converting gamma to a standard score (e.g., Z):

$$Z = (G - \gamma)\sqrt{\frac{Ns + Nd}{N(1 - G^2)}}$$

where Ns = the number of pairs of cases ranked in the same way on both variables (concordant pairs), and Nd = the number of pairs ranked in the opposite way on the two variables (discordant pairs). N stands for the size of the sample. Assuming that null hypothesis is true, the γ in the formula will be 0 (zero).

[8] This somewhat stringent criterion for classification of families seems to have certain merits. Since the original response categories can be interpreted to be measuring the *extent* rather than the *mode* or style of primary-level activity, our method as described above, solves this problem. Second, by classifying those families where either husband or wife disagreed on the pattern, with those who reported a differentiated pattern, we have shown a *degree* of differentiation and jointness which makes this index equivalent to our previous indices.

In other words, with respect to this latter point, we are assuming some degree of jointness in those families where one spouse reports a joint pattern and the other a differentiated one, which of course, is lower than the families having greater agreement on a joint pattern of primary-level activity.

[9] In any index consisting of two items, Spearman-Brown split-half, Guttman's split-half (Lambda 4) and alpha coefficients are equivalent. In this type of situation it is preferable to compute either Spearman-Brown split-half or Guttman's Lambda 4.

[10] The following table gives a summary of first-order partial correlations between sub-types of Intra-Family Interaction and Extra-Family Social

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Activity. The control variables are listed in parentheses:

Matrix of First-Order Partials

	Intra-Family Interaction		Extra-Family Social Activity	
	Family Tasks	Family Decisions	Primary-level Activity	Organization-Focussed Activity
Tasks (Decisions)	—	—	.27	.37
Tasks (Primary)	—	.21	—	.32
Tasks (Organization)	—	.20	.17	—
Decisions (Tasks)	—	—	.23	.16
Decisions (Primary)	—	—	—	.15
Decisions (Organization)	--	—	.21	—
Primary (Tasks)	—	—	—	.38
Primary (Decisions)	—	—	—	.41
Primary (Organization)	—	—	—	—

[11] There is a large body of literature which seems to suggest the use of size as a measure of bureaucratization (see Heydebrand, 1973; Hall, 1972; Parkinson, 1957; Tsouderos, 1955; Grusky, 1961; Simmel, 1950; Pugh et al., 1968). But still there is no complete concensus on a standard measure; various combinations of bureaucratic elements are being used in empirical investigations of the phenomena.

Hall employed the following six variables: hierarchy of authority, division of labor, rules, procedures, impersonality and technical qualifications, and found moderate to strong intercorrelations among them. Except for the sixth characteristic viz. technical qualifications, the other five, according to Hall, may "be combined into a single scale of bureaucratization" (1972: 77).

However, in a more rigorous study of all employment security agencies in the U.S., Blau and Schoenherr (1971) treated most of these variables as *consequences* of size. In some cases, when they controlled size (as an antecedent variable) the original correlation between certain consequent variables disappeared. They note, for instance: "the division of labor and the number of hierarchical levels in employment security agencies are correlated but the correlation is spurious owing to the dependence of both factors on agency size, as indicated by the finding that the correlation drops to close to nil when agency size is controlled" (p. 25).

A more direct use of size as a measure of bureaucratization is made by Stuart Chapin (1951). Miller and Swanson (1958) also used size (along with certain other indicators, viz.: the status of working for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

someone else for a salary and the number of persons below and above the respondent in his work organization) to arrive at a dichotomy of work setting into "bureaucratic" and "entrepreneurial" setting. Kohn (1971) also measured bureaucratization by using size in conjunction with levels of supervision; the correlation between size and hierarchical structure was 0.71 (p. 463).

Robert Presthus, whose operational definition of bureaucratization rests on the size concludes: "Although all the characteristics of the bureaucratic model are mutually reinforcing, size is among its most significant features" (1962: 28).

[12] *Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations* (1971: 1169-71) gives the following general description of these concepts:

DATA: "Information, knowledge and conceptions related to Data, People and Things, obtained by observation, investigation, interpretation, visualization and mental creation; incapable of being touched. Written data take the form of numbers, words and symbols; other data are ideas, concepts and oral verbalization". *PEOPLE:* "Human beings; also includes animals dealt with on an individual bases". *THINGS:* "Inanimate objects as distinguished from human beings; substances or materials; machines or tools, or equipment; products. A thing is tangible and has shape, form, and other physical characteristics".

With these broader definitions, workers' functions are designated by certain verbs; in the case of *Data*, these include: synthesizing, co-ordinating, analyzing, compiling, computing, copying, comparing; for *People*, the functions revolve around mentoring, negotiating, instructing, supervising, diverting, persuading, speaking-signaling serving; and for *Things*, the work functions are described as setting-up, precision working, operating-controlling, driving-operating, tending, feeding-off-bearing, handling. These functions are further sub-divided into several smaller categories.

[13] It was possible from the available data to perform a test of *pragmatic validity* of this question. The question which served as a "criterion variable" was the following: "How many employers have you had since you left school?" We assumed that the wage-earners who have had more than three employers in their working life would have a less orderly career than those who had less than three. Consistent with the approach to pragmatic validation, we felt that if the scores on these two items were compatible, the item on work interruptions would be a reasonably valid measure of the variable orderliness of work career (Selltiz et al., 1959: 157). The zero-order correlation (Pearson r) between these items was .50 ($P < .001$), which being extremely strong, documents the validity of the question that we have suggested as a measure of work career.

Granted that this is a valid measure, yet there is some reason to suspect the number of work interruptions to be relative to the time at risk. This means that if the wage-earner is young and has a short working history, he is less likely to experience a great many interruptions in his work role. To determine the extent to which this suspicion holds empirically, we correlated the age of the primary wage-earner with his reported work interruptions. Rather surprisingly, this correlation was almost non-existent ($r = .02$); the correlation between age and the criterion variable was .15.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

For similar reasons we also computed a percentage of unemployment as of total working life. It was related with the age of the worker but this too did not show any strong correlation ($r = .07$).

A fairly reasonable "pragmatic validity" of the variable of work career and its negligible relationship with the age of the wage-earner clearly suggest that this is a valid measure of the characteristic we want to study (e.g. the *orderliness* of career). We may therefore treat it as an independent variable in its own right.

[14] These interpretations do not concern us here; they are suggested to help make the point in regard to the relative independence of work variables.

[15] Under each question a table was provided where the respondents could list the *names*—more than five or as many as they could think of—the *relationship*, the frequency of *contact*, and the *place* where the initial acquaintance originated.

Strictly speaking, these questions measure the degree of *overlap* between the social networks of family members rather than the "connectedness" of their networks. This is because we do not have direct data on the interaction among the persons who were named by family members in their respective networks. Partly in recognition of this problem, we asked several questions to the respondents regarding their networks which furnished us with a great deal of relevant information. These questions were the following:

i) Write the name of the *one* person you feel the closest to?

ii) Who outside your family knows the most about you?

iii) How many of your friends are friends of the whole family?

iv) What one friend or relative outside your immediate family would you say each member of your family feels the closest to? (Indicate relationship)

Family Member	Name of Closest Friend or Relative
Husband	
Wife	
Oldest child	
Second oldest child	
Third oldest child	
Fourth oldest child	
Fifth oldest child	

A question on the *sex* of the network members was also included in the questionnaire.

Reading these questions in conjunction with those listed in the text, it was possible to determine, at least approximately, the interconnections amongst persons mentioned in the networks from the frequently occurring names in the individual networks. This enabled us to develop a measure comparable to those of Bott's.

Finally, it may be stressed that our measure of social networks is relatively stronger than many previous studies for the following

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

two reasons: First, it makes use of *children's network data* along with their parents' data which renders it a more genuine measure of the "total networks" of research families. Second, unlike many other studies, it is based on a *combined* score of *felt closeness* or network commitment—a subjective component—and the frequency of *actual contacts* —an objective component of network involvements (see the review of literature on "Social Networks" in chapter two).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER FIVE

WORK AND FAMILY MODES OF ADAPTATION: TESTING RESEARCH HYPOTHESES WITH EAST YORK DATA

In the preceding two chapters (three and four) we described the sources of data and the operational definitions of concepts involved in the hypotheses stated in chapters one and two. The data consisted of a sub-sample of single earner families which was drawn from a larger sample of East York families. All the concepts in the theoretical model, as measured with these data, meet the requirements of an interval level of measurement.

The present chapter attempts an empirical test of research hypotheses with the East York data on single-earner families. The chapter is divided into three parts. Using a set of closely related statistical techniques, the first two parts constitute several empirical tests of the main hypotheses. The last part provides an overview of the findings. A brief introduction to methods is given below.

In part one, the findings regarding the 12 major hypotheses of the study will be presented. *The Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient* (Pearson's r) would be used to test the hypothesized relationship between a given pair of work and family variables. This preliminary examination will help decide whether or not to accept the hypotheses which we derived from a theoretical exposition of the effects of work on family life.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In part two, our purpose would be to specify research hypotheses. There we will introduce socio-economic status and social networks as "test factors" to determine the extent to which they change the original relationship between work and family variables. In this part, we will also test the general hypothesis regarding the relative independence of work variables vis-à-vis each other. This will be accomplished by using a statistical method known as *Multiple Classification Analysis* (MCA). After this, we will present a *Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis* to assess the relative contribution of all five variables to the amount of variance "explained" in each dimension of family activities.

Finally, in part three, we will discuss the patterns of first-order relationships between the work and family variables. Following this, we will take a look at the impact of test factors on the originally observed relationships. The interaction between work variables and between work *and* test variables and its effects on the first-order correlations would also be discussed in some detail.

An Empirical Test of Research Hypotheses

The Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) is the method which we shall use to constitute a simple or first-order test of the 12 research hypotheses. The correlations, symbolized by r, are presented in Table 5.1. Next appears a t value of each r which is followed by its level of significance. In order to make a decision as to the acceptance (or rejection) of a given hypothesis, an explanatory note on these statistical quantities seems appropriate here.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Pearson's r is a symmetrical measure of association between two interval variables. It indicates the extant to which variation in one variable is related to variation in another, and as such, measures the *degree of strength* and the *nature of relationship* between a given pair of variables.

More specifically, being a measure of the goodness of fit for the least-squares straight line in a bivariate regression analysis, Pearson's r is a measure of *linear* relationship. When there is a perfect fit between two variables, r takes on the value of +1.0 or -1.0, indicating respectively a perfect positive and a perfect inverse relationship. When the linear regression line shows a very poor fit to the data, r will be close to zero; a value of zero denotes the absence of a linear relationship. Within these theoretical limits, the strength of the observed correlations may be determined by comparing their *relative sizes* with each other.[1]

One other most important and common use of r is in terms of the amount of *variance explained* in one variable by another. If we square the Pearsonian r we obtain a quantity called r^2. When expressed in percentage terms, r^2 indicates the amount of variance which a linear fit of two variables is likely to "explain". This interpretation—also referred to as "proportion reduction in error" or "PRE" (Costner, 1965)—would concern us in the course of multiple regression analysis; in this section we will interpret r as a measure of the *strength* and *nature* of relationship between work and family variables.

The extent to which the results obtained from the correlation coefficients can be generalized beyond the sample of the study may be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.1

Summary of Findings on Major Research Hypotheses (Pearson's r)

	Intra-Family Interaction		Extra-Family Social Activity	
	Jointness of Family Tasks	Jointness of Family Decisions	Jointness of Primary-level Activity	Jointness of Organization-focussed Activity
BUREAUCRATIZATION				
r	-.23	-.19	-.34	-.30
t*	2.40	1.87	3.56	3.16
Significance of t	.01	.05	.001	.001
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY				
r	.42	.38	.17	.22
t	4.69	3.98	1.70	2.26
Significance of t	.001	.001	.05	.01
WORK CAREER				
r	.20	.22	.23	.28
t	2.01	2.10	2.24	2.84
Significance of t	.05	.01	.01	.01

* The following formula was used to compute the t statistics:

$$t = r\sqrt{\frac{N-2}{1-r^2}}$$

(Due to missing values the N varied from 89 to 105.)

determined by *student's t statistics*. The usual procedure is to compare the observed t values with the critical values of a t table with N-2 degrees of freedom. If an observed value fails to bound the statistically significant critical region then the alternative hypothesis may be rejected.[2]

Following this, in the present analysis the correlation between a given pair of work and family variables which generates a t value *less than* 1.645—or a value not significant at the .05 level with a sample of 120—will be taken to reject the research hypothesis: $H_i: r > 0$ in the universe. If the t value is greater than 1.645 we will reject the null hypothesis of the following form: $H_o: r = 0$. In the event we reject the null hypothesis in favor of the research hypothesis we shall conclude that it is possible to predict the patterns of family life of a wage-earner from a knowledge of his work experience.

With this introduction to the meanings of statistics shown in Table 5.1, we may now summarize the empirical evidence on the research hypotheses as follows.

Bureaucratization

As may be seen from the correlation coefficients, the bureaucratization shows a moderately strong inverse relationship with family tasks and a relatively low association with family decisions. The correlations between bureaucratization and primary-level activity ($r = -.34$) and organization-focussed activity ($r = -.30$) are substantially strong.[3] All these correlations produce statistically significant t values.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Translating these correlations in a straightforward language, it may be stated that the bureaucratic families are likely to make an adaptation to a differentiated pattern of family behavior. In such families, the members are apt to show a segregated participation in the areas of family tasks, decisions as well as primary and organization-focussed activity.

Social Complexity

The variable social complexity which also related with all four aspects of family behavior in the predicted direction, presents a sharp contrast with the variable of bureaucratization. It correlated fairly strongly with family tasks ($r = .42$) and decisions ($r = .38$) but revealed a low to moderate relationship with primary-level activity ($r = .17$) and organization-focussed activity ($r = .22$).

These correlations may be interpreted to mean that the families where the wage-earners hold socially complex jobs tend to adapt to a joint pattern of participation in internal activities relating to family tasks and decisions, and external activities consisting of primary and organization-focussed activities.

Work Career

The relationship between work career and the sub-dimensions of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity is more consistent and uniform. Except for a relatively lower association with family tasks ($r = .20$) its correlation with other aspects of family life

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are moderately strong. The t values generated by these correlations are significant.

From these correlations, it may be concluded that the families of orderly career wage-earners are likely to practice a joint pattern of participation in all four sub-types of family activities, e.g. family tasks, decisions, primary-level, and organization-focussed activities.

Conclusion

Recapitulating these findings, it is clear that all twelve hypotheses derive a consistent support, ranging from low to fairly strong, from the empirical data on East York families. It is, therefore, legitimate to retain the research hypotheses and to reject the null hypotheses. Pending a discussion of the *nature* or *patterns* of observed correlations for a while, here we will undertake the task of specifying these hypotheses.

SPECIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

The Relative Independence of Work Variables

The primary aim of this section is to specify the hypotheses which we put to an empirical verification in the foregoing. This would be achieved by introducing various "control variables" into the original relationship between a given pair of work and family variables. Technically, the procedure is known as "the process of elaboration" (Rosenberg,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1968). Its objective is clarification of a zero-order association between two variables; the introduction of the third variable into the analysis specifies the *conditions* under which the relationship would be strong or weak.

In the following we will be concerned with two types of control variables: the work variables and the "test factors", e.g., socio-economic status and social networks. Holding work variables constant on each other would test the general hypothesis regarding their *relative independence*; this method would also throw some light on the *relative effect* of each work variable vis-à-vis the other. By controlling the test factors, the hypothesis which we wish to test may be stated as follows: that the extent to which families adapt to a differentiated or joint mode of participation in internal and external activities varies with a variation in the work experience of their wage-earners irrespective of a family's socio-economic status and network involvements.

The Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) will be used to test these hypotheses. It is preferred over the conventional subclassification analysis (i.e. cross-tabulation) because it constitutes a more rigorous statistical test. Second, unlike cross-tabulation, even in a small sample, it can control several "test variables" at a time. The mechanism by which MCA defines and processes variables may be briefly explained here.

The MCA simultaneously treats each independent variable as a *metric* variable and as a *dummy* variable; the number of categories of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dummy variable depends upon the number of coded values of the independent variable. Corresponding to these two types of variables, e.g. the metric variable and its non-metrical categories or "dummy variables", it provides two types of descriptive statistics.

Using additive multiple least-squares regression, first it adjusts the mean of the dependent variables for each dummy variable by the amount of deviation from the total sample or grand mean that is due to intercorrelations with other independent variables in the model. Second, treating each independent variable as a metric variable (by combining dummy variables into one), the MCA correlates it with the dependent (criterion) variables and then controls all other independent variables (factors) and test variables (covariates) on the original relationship separately and simultaneously (see Andrews et al., 1967).

The statistics relevant to these latter correlations are simple correlation ratio (eta) and standardized partial betas—which are generally similar to a stepwise multiple regression analysis where the entry of independent variables into the equation is *predetermined*. Basically then, the MCA may be considered equivalent to an *analysis of covariance* where the means of treatment groups (which in this research are bureaucratization, social complexity and work career) are adjusted for intercorrelations with covariates or test factors—which in our case include socio-economic status and social networks (cf. Winer, 1971; Kerlinger and Pedhazer, 1973).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Before we present data, it must be made clear that the dummy variables or categories of independent variables in the present analysis should not be viewed as *mutually exclusive like nominal variables* as is usually done in analysis of variance and covariance. In the MCA tables we have used the *same categories* of three independent variables which we suggested in chapter four where these variables were operationally defined.[5]

Intra-Family Interaction

i) *Family Tasks*

The statistics relating to family tasks, as summarized in Table 5.2a, permits various tests of hypotheses stated in the outset of this section. The zero-order correlation (eta) between family task index and work variables may be examined by looking at the table in a vertical way. And the pattern of change in this original relationship with an introduction of factors and covariates as controls can be assessed by looking at the adjusted means and partial beta values across the table in a horizontal way. The class or unadjusted mean and adjusted mean scores represent deviations from the grand mean of family task index which is 1.39 for the entire sample of 82 families.[6]

An unadjusted mean of .23 for the category of wage-earners whose jobs attain a high level of social compexity may be interpreted to mean that this aspect of the variable is highly likely to facilitate an adaptation to a joint mode of participation in family tasks. An

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.2a

Modes of Adaptation to Family Tasks by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates

Grand Mean of Family Task Index = 1.34 Standard Deviation = .49		Class Mean and Eta		Control Variables†					
				(Factors) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, and Work Career		(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks		(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks	
Independent Variables and their Categories	Number of Families	Unadjusted Mean	Eta	Adjusted Mean	Beta	Adjusted Mean	Beta	Adjusted Mean	Beta
BUREAUCRATIZATION									
Low	44	.09	.20	.09	.20	.11	.23	.10	.23
High	38	-.10		-.10		-.12		-.12	
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY									
Low	41	-.22	.45	-.22	.44	-.19	.41	-.20	.40
High	41	.23		.22		.21		.20	
ORDERLINESS OF CAREER									
Low	36	-.08	.17	-.04	.08	-.07	.16	-.03	.07
High	46	.09		.04		.08		.04	
MULTIPLE R			—		.491		—		.537
R^2			—		.241		—		.288

† When the independent variable is bureaucratization, the control variables to be considered as factors are social complexity and orderliness of work career; when the social complexity is treated as independent variable, the factors controlled are bureaucratization and work career; and, when work career is independent variable the other two work variables are controlled as factors. This same procedure is used in the next three MCA tables, viz. Tables 5.2b, 5.3a and 5.3b.

eta correlation[7] of .45 (which is equivalent to a *simple beta* from the bivariate linear regression of family tasks on social complexity) likewise, indicates that it is this variable which more strongly correlates with family tasks as compared to bureaucratization (eta = .20) and work career (eta = .17).

As we introduce factors and covariates, the association of family tasks with bureaucratization and social complexity of work do not reveal any remarkable change. Nevertheless, it is important to note some of the more visible alterations. For instance, an introduction of covariates brings opposite effects for the variables of bureaucratization and social complexity. As can be seen from Table 5.2a, both SES and networks operate to increase the partial beta for bureaucratization (.23) but reduce it for the social complexity (.41). A rather substantial change in the original relationship between work career and family tasks occurs when the other two factors are held constant (beta = .08). It is obvious that the covariates do not account for this change since the partial beta value of .16 remains very close to an original eta of .17.

In conclusion, then, the variables of social complexity and bureaucratization may be considered independent predictors while obviously the effects of orderliness of work career are curtailed by the factors. Second, both work setting and social complexity in their individual effects on family tasks are not contaminated by either covariates or the *joint* interaction of covariates and factors (see last

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

column in Table 5.2a). Of approximately 29% variance explained by all five variables, 24% is accounted for by work variables, which can be taken to indicate their theoretical importance vis-à-vis the test factors in the model.

ii) *Family Decisions*

The findings presented in Table 5.2b are generally consistent with Table 5.2a. Here too, the variable of social complexity strongly correlates with family decision index (eta = .42); both work setting and work career show a moderate relationship. The effects of social complexity and bureaucratization on the original relationship between work career and family decisions can be seen from the partial beta (.13) which is considerably reduced from an eta ratio of .19. In the case of work setting, the control of covariates indicates some improvement in the original relationship (beta = .26). On the other hand, both a separate and simultaneous control on factors and covariates brings a reduction of similar magnitude in the effects of work complexity on family decisions. Obviously, these variables relate to family decisions through different theoretical processes as described in chapter two.

An examination of means adjusted for factors and covariates, as may be expected, leads to similar conclusions. The more socially complex job category shows a class mean of .21 which deviates in the positive direction from the grand mean of 1.55; class means for other independent variables are relatively smaller which give them considerably smaller group or category means. The pattern of change reflected by adjusted means is consistent with partial betas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.2b

Modes of Adaptation to Family Decisions by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates

Grand Mean of Family Decision Index = 1.55 Standard Deviation = .50 Independent Variables and their Categories	Number of Families	Class Mean and Eta: Unadjusted Mean	Class Mean and Eta: Eta	Control Variables: (Factors) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, and Work Career: Adjusted Mean	(Factors) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, and Work Career: Beta	(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks: Adjusted Mean	(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks: Beta	(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks: Adjusted Mean	(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks: Beta
BUREAUCRATIZATION									
Low	44	.10	.20	.10	.20	.13	.26	.11	.24
High	38	-.11		-.10		-.14		-.13	
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY									
Low	41	-.21	.42	-.19	.40	-.17	.37	-.17	.35
High	41	.21		.20		.19		.17	
ORDERLINESS OF CAREER									
Low	36	-.10	.19	-.08	.13	-.07	.18	-.08	.14
High	46	.08		.06		.09		.06	
MULTIPLE R			—		.476		—		.537
R^2			—		.227		—		.288

These data make it plain that with respect to *individual* effects all work variables relate to family decisions in the predicted direction. In terms of *relative* effects, the variable social complexity seems the strongest among the other work variables. Finally, as in the case of family tasks, the effects of work career are suppressed by work complexity and bureaucratization, which together, seem to undermine its position as an independent predictor of family decisions.

Extra-Family Social Activity

i) *Primary-level Activity*

With respect to primary activity, an examination of eta correlation ratios in Table 5.3a reveals some closeness in the individual effects of bureaucratization (eta = .28) and orderliness of work career (eta = .24) while here the variable of social complexity has relatively smaller effects (eta = .20). The unadjusted class means, likewise, indicate that highly bureaucratic work settings are more likely to deviate from the grand mean (1.46) in the negative direction (-.15), e.g. towards greater differentiation of primary activity. Similarly, the families with wage-earners having a low orderliness in career show a negative deviation (-.13) which may be interpreted to mean that such families have a greater probability of adapting to a segregated mode of participation in the primary-level social activities.

Adjusting the class means and eta ratios for factors does not change the original relationship between work setting and primary activity, but a small change occurs in the effects of social complexity as the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.3a

Modes of Adaptation to Primary-level Activity by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates

Grand Mean of Primary Activity Index = 1.46 Standard Deviation = .50 Independent Variables and their Categories	Number of Families	Class Mean and Eta: Unadjusted Mean	Class Mean and Eta: Eta	Control Variables: (Factors) Bureaucratization Social Complexity, and Work Career: Adjusted Mean	(Factors) Bureaucratization Social Complexity, and Work Career: Beta	(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks: Adjusted Mean	(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks: Beta	(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks: Adjusted Mean	(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks: Beta
BUREAUCRATIZATION									
Low	44	.13	.28	.13	.28	.15	.32	.15	.31
High	38	-.15		-.15		-.16		-.17	
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY									
Low	41	-.10	.20	-.08	.16	-.09	.19	-.07	.14
High	41	.10		.08		.10		.07	
ORDERLINESS OF CAREER									
Low	36	-.13	.24	-.12	.22	-.13	.23	-.12	.22
High	46	.10		.10		.10		.10	
MULTIPLE R			—		.400		—		.417
R^2			—		.160		—		.174

standardized partial beta value is reduced to .16. On the other hand, a control on covariates brings some increment to the effects of work setting (beta = .32) while social complexity and work career remain unaffected. A simultaneous control of factors and covariates reveals that the variable of social complexity is more vulnerable to their joint effects, especially the effects of work setting and work career.

Summarizing the observations made from statistics reported in Table 5.3a, it may be concluded that each work variable correlates with primary activity consistent with our expectations. The variable of social complexity not only shows a relatively moderate association but is also subject to the joint influence of factors. The strong association shown by work setting and career is largely independent of the impact of other variables. About 16% variance is explained by three work variables; an addition of socio-economic status and family networks makes only a smaller contribution, e.g. 2%—since the five variables together account for 18% variance.

ii) *Organization-focussed Activity*

As in the case of primary activity, the bureaucratization strongly correlates with organization-focussed activity (eta = .29); the variables of work career (eta = .25) and social complexity (eta = .14) respectively appear second and third in terms of their strength of association (Table 5.3b). This is also evident from the unadjusted mean in that the more bureaucratic work setting obtains a high negative mean deviation (-.15) which when subtracted from the grand mean of 1.33, lowers it appreciably. The positive mean deviation for each "dummy variable" shows a great deal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.3b

Modes of Adaptation to Organization-focussed Activity by Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, and Orderliness of Work Career Before and After Adjusting for Factors and Covariates

Grand Mean of Organization-focussed Activity Index = 1.33 Standard Deviation = .47		Class Mean and Eta		Control Variables					
				(Factors) Bureaucratization Social Complexity, and Work Career		(Covariates) Socio-economic Status and Social Networks		(Factors & Covariates) Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks	
Independent Variables and their Categories	Number of Families	Unadjusted Mean	Eta	Adjusted Mean	Beta	Adjusted Mean	Beta	Adjusted Mean	Beta
BUREAUCRATIZATION									
Low	44	.13	.29	.13	.30	.14	.32	.15	.33
High	38	-.15		-.15		-.15		-.17	
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY									
Low	41	-.06	.14	-.04	.10	-.06	.12	-.02	.06
High	41	.07		.05		.07		.03	
ORDERLINESS OF CAREER									
Low	36	-.13	.25	-.13	.25	-.13	.25	-.13	.25
High	46	.11		.10		.10		.10	
MULTIPLE R			—		.353		—		.404
R^2			—		.124		—		.164

of correspondence with the eta ratios for work variables measured on the metric level.

After adjusting for the class means and eta correlations for factors, the original association of work setting and organization-focussed activity maintains (partial beta = .30), as does the association of work career (beta = .25). The variable social complexity seems to be influenced by work setting and work career as a control on them reduces its already low correlation (eta = .14) to a partial beta of .10. The simultaneous control of factors and covariates reduces it further to .06.

Once again, we observe a negligible effect of covariates—socio-economic status and social networks—on the original association of work variables with organization-focussed activity. The overall contribution of work variables can be seen from the fact that they account for 12% explained variance from a total of 16% variance attributable to the joint additive effects of five variables.

The Relative Importance of the Predictors of Modes of Adaptation

In the following section the relative contribution of each independent and test variables to the amount of variance explained in the criterion variable would be determined. *Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis* is the method to be employed for this purpose. The method generates a series of "beta coefficients" which indicate the relative predictive power of each independent variable. In addition, this method enables the assessment of variance explained by each predictor in the criterion variable.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Basically, the method is similar to path analysis. Nevertheless, the following two differences may be noted: it (especially stepwise multiple regression analysis) ignores the temporal order of predictors and second, it does not show their indirect effects, e.g. the process by which they link to the criterion variable. To take care of these limitations, we also did a regression analysis with a *predetermined order of variables*; the results are reported in Appendix D. Greater reliance, however, would be made on the stepwise multiple regression analysis, since as a "quantitative criterion" for assessing the independent effects of individual variables, the method is very strong and efficient. Its ability to show the *relative contribution* of predictors at each step as the additional variables enter into regression equation lends it superiority over several other statistical techniques.[8]

The findings produced by regression analysis may overlap a bit with those of MCA. But as it would be clear from our discussion, we will interpret these findings a) to show the relative importance of the predictors of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity patterns, and, b) to locate the intervening links between these predictors.[9]

Before reporting regression analysis, in Table 5.4 we present zero-order correlation coefficients for the entire set of variables in the model. As can be seen from the correlation matrix, of independent and test variables, only social complexity of work shows statistically significant correlations with high orderliness of work career ($r = .20$) and with high socio-economic status ($r = .31$). These correlations suggest that the wage-earners who hold more socially complex jobs are likely to have greater orderliness in their work careers, and they are more likely to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.4

Zero-Order Correlation Matrix

	Family Task Index	Family Decision Index	Primary Activity Index	Organization-focussed Activity Index	Bureaucratization of Work Setting	Social Complexity of Work	Orderliness of Work Career	Socio-economic Status	Social Networks
Family Task Index		.29	.33	.42	-.23	.42	.20	.19	-.16
Family Decision Index			.30	.27	-.19	.38	.22	.23	-.13*
Primary Activity Index				.46	-.34	.17	.23	.09*	.02*
Organization-focussed Activity Index					-.30	.22	.28	.23	.004*
Bureaucratization of Work Setting						.03*	.01*	.14*	-.08*
Social Complexity of Work							.20	.31	-.04*
Orderliness of Work Career								-.10*	.03*
Socio-economic Status									.001*

* Correlations not significant at .05 level of significance. All other correlations in the matrix are significant at .05 or a higher level of significance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

have high socio-economic status. The correlations of SES with work career ($r = .10$) and bureaucratization ($r = .14$) are insignificant, but they do point out that having greater orderliness of work career and working in more bureaucratic organizations is typical of wage-earners with high socio-economic status.

A complete lack of empirical correlation between (high) SES and (loose knit) network involvement, in view of a moderately strong theoretical association (Blum, 1965; Rainwater and Handel, 1965) is rather surprising. The negligible empirical association of family networks with each dimension of work system is understandable since the literature which we reviewed did not suggest any direct effects of network ties on the work sphere of life. Theoretically, however, one may speculate that network involvements mediate the effects of socio-economic status on other variables.

A knowledge of these intercorrelations is important for understanding the behavior of independent and test variables in the regression analysis.[10]

Table 5.5a presents a summary statistics for the regression of family task index on the independent variables and test factors. These variables are listed in a descending order according to the amount of variance explained by each in the task index. First column in the table shows zero-order R, which is a "simple beta" from a bivariate regression analysis; after this appears the standardized regression coefficients (Beta). The next three columns contain Multiple R, which indicates the "goodness of fit" of the linear regression model; R^2 stands for the amount of variance explained by the additive effects of variables as they

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.5a

Regression of Family Task Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors

Order of Independent Variables and Test Factors in the Regression Equation	(Statistics based on Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis) Simple R	Beta	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	B	Standard Error B	F Ratios	Significance of F Ratios
Social Complexity	.42	.36	.42	.17	.17	.34	.092	14.44	.001
Bureaucratization	-.23	-.27	.48	.23	.06	-.26	.086	8.95	.01
Social Networks	-.16	-.17	.51	.26	.03	-.16	.085	3.50	N.S.
Work Career	.20	.12	.52	.27	.01	.11	.087	1.67	N.S.
Socio-economic Status	.19	.10	.53	.28	.01	.09	.091	1.21	N.S.

DF

Regression = 5
Residual(N) = 91
F = 7.16
P < .001

progressively enter into the equation; and R^2 change shows the amount of variance accounted for by each individual variable with others held constant.

The quantity B refers to the regression coefficients computed from unstandardized values of each variable. Standard errors of the unstandardized regression coefficients, which indicate their stability, are listed in the next column. The F ratios appearing after this provide a test of the statistical significance of individual B's. In the form of null hypotheses, the F values test whether the predictors are equal to zero in the population. The last column in the table presents the level of significance for F ratios; it is determined by comparing the observed values with critical F tables with 1 and N-K-1 degrees of freedom (cf. Hays, 1973).

The F ratio listed under the table constitutes an *overall* test for the goodness of fit of the regression model. It indicates whether the sample of observations under investigation has been drawn from a population in which the multiple correlation is equal to zero (i.e. $H_o : R = 0$). If the overall F score is statistically significant we shall reject the null hypotheses and conclude that the observed multiple R cannot be attributed to measurement errors or sampling fluctuations.

As indicated by Table 5.5a, the social complexity of work is the strongest predictor of modes of participation in family tasks (beta = .36); bureaucratization occurs as a second important predictor (beta = .27). The same is revealed by another important quantity in the table, namely, the R squared (R^2); as can be seen these two variables account for 23% of the variance from a total of 28%. Only 5% variance is explained by the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

remaining three variables. The insignificant F scores of these latter variables indicate their poor contribution to the prediction,[11] as does the quantity labelled R^2 change.

It may be noted that a bivariate regression analysis revealed statistically significant F scores for the variables of work career ($F = 4.14$; $P < .05$) and socio-economic status ($F = 3.92$; $P < .05$). It is the intercorrelation between social complexity, SES and work career which, in the stepwise multiple regression, makes their F scores insignificant since the variable of social complexity enters first in the equation. In a predetermined mode of regression analysis (see Appendix D) when we control social complexity on SES and work career, the effects of these latter variables are reduced to .11 and .07 respectively. But a separate control on work career and SES accounts for a minor decrease in the original correlation of social complexity (the partial betas are .39 and .40). In this instance, the variable social complexity seems to operate as an "intervening variable" which mediates the effects of orderliness of work career and also of social status.

Controlling for socio-economic status tends to increase work setting's effect on family tasks; this is evident from its partial beta of -.26 which is slightly larger than the simple beta (-.23). The test factor social networks does not show any impact on this as well as other work variables. However, despite its low zero-order correlation with family tasks, it explains about 3% variance. This seems primarily due to its negligible association with other independent variables. But unlike Bott (1971), in this research, it is the close knit aspect of network connectedness which relates to a joint mode of participation in family tasks.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Looking at Table 5.5b, once again, the social complexity and bureaucratization emerge as the best predictors of family decision aspect of intra-family interaction. This time, the variable of work career comes up third in importance, while the SES remains the last variable to enter into the regression equation. The additive effects of all five predictors account for 24% variance in the criterion variable of family decisions; slightly more than half (14%) of [redacted] is accounted for by the social complexity of work alone.

From a bivariate regression analysis (Appendix D) we observe the significant F ratios for the variables of work complexity, work career, and SES, while the bureaucratization falls short of a significant F at a very small margin. The statistically significant F ratio of bureaucratization ($F = 5.57$; $P < .05$), as shown in the table, seems to result from a control on the effects of SES.[12] For instance, when we remove its influence from the original association of work setting and family decisions ($r = -.19$), the individual effect of work setting shows a moderate improvement (partial beta $= -.22$). Interestingly, controlling work setting on SES introduces an exact amount of change in the effects of SES which raises simple beta of .23 to a standardized beta of .26.

One reason for this may be sought from the negative association between high socio-economic status and less bureaucratic work setting ($r = -.14$), while both positively relate to a joint mode of intra-family interaction (and extra-family social activity). Thus, when we control them on each other to remove their mutually suppressing effects, their individual effects on the criterion variables are likely to emerge.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.5b

Regression of Family Decision Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors

Order of Independent Variables and Test Factors in the Regression Equation	(Statistics based on Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis)								
	Simple R	Beta	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	B	Standard Error B	F Ratios	Significance of F Ratios
Social Complexity	.38	.31	.38	.14	.14	.30	.102	8.55	.01
Bureaucratization	-.19	-.23	.43	.18	.04	-.22	.096	5.57	.05
Work Career	.22	.15	.45	.20	.02	.15	.097	2.46	N.S.
Social Networks	-.13	-.14	.47	.22	.02	-.14	.095	2.23	N.S.
Socio-economic Status	.23	.15	.49	.24	.02	.15	.100	2.22	N.S.

	DF
Regression	= 5
Residual (N)	= 83
F	= 5.35
P	< .001

As in the case of family tasks, here too, the variable of work complexity tends to reduce the correlation of SES (beta = .12) and work career (beta = .15) with family decisions. But on the other hand, the effects of SES and career on social complexity are relatively weak and less visible. The variable social network has no significant role to play in the regression equation; the stability of its individual impact on family decisions may be attributed to its lack of correlation with the other four predictors.

Table 5.6a presents relevant statistics from the regression of primary-level social activity on work variables and test factors. The variable bureaucratization occurs as the single most important predictor of adaptation to this dimension of external family activities (beta = -.35). The second best predictor is the variable of work career (beta = .20) and, social complexity occupies a poor third position (beta = .10). Over half the variance is explained by the bureaucratization alone (11%)—by removing the effects of the remaining four variables—which gives it an F score significant at the .001 level.

Unlike their small contribution to the variation in sub-types of intra-family interaction, both SES and network fail to explain the patterns of adaptation to primary-level activity. This is indicated by zero values of R^2. It is perhaps not surprising then to note that when we hold their individual or combined effects constant on the work variables, the original relationships of these latter variables do not show any substantial degree of change (Appendix D).

Compared with family tasks and decisions, the intercorrelation between social complexity and work career seems to operate in opposite

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.6a

Regression of Primary-level Activity Index on Independent Variables and Test Factors

Order of Independent Variables and Test Factors in the Regression Equation	(Statistics based on Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis) Simple R	Beta	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	B	Standard Error B	F Ratios	Significance of F Ratios
Bureaucratization	-.34	-.35	.34	.11	.11	-.34	.097	13.05	.001
Work Career	.23	.20	.41	.17	.06	.20	.099	3.97	.05
Social Complexity	.17	.10	.43	.19	.02	.10	.103	1.01	N.S.
Socio-economic Status	.09	.09	.44	.19	.00	.09	.102	0.77	N.S.
Social Networks	.02	-.01	.44	.19	.00	-.01	.096	0.02	N.S.

	DF
Regression	= 5
Residual (N)	= 86
F	= 4.04
P	< .01

directions with career having a slightly stronger influence. As, for instance, a singular control on social complexity decreases the effects of work career to a beta of .20 from a simple r = .23. On the other hand, controlling for work career reduces the original correlation of .17 between social complexity and primary activity to a partial beta of .12. However, both of them, when separately and jointly controlled, brought no alteration in the zero-order association of bureaucratization with the criterion variable.

With respect to organization-focussed activity (Table 5.6b), the bureaucratization again turns out to be the first best predictor (beta = -.33) and work career the second best (beta = .24). While family network remains insignificant, the socio-economic status emerges as a third strong predictor (beta = .21) and pushes social complexity to a fourth place. Both work setting and career respectively account for 9% and 8% variance from the total variance of 24% explained by the additive effects of four variables.

The variables of social complexity which generated statistically significant F scores (Appendix D) in a bivariate regression analysis ($F = 5.27$; $P < .05$) seems to have partly curtailed its impact on organization-focussed activity because of its strong correlation with social status (r = .31). For instance, when we hold SES constant, the effects of social complexity drop to a beta of .17 from its zero-order correlation of .22. This interpretation obviously assumes the causal priority of SES although the effect of social complexity on the relationship between SES and primary activity is sharper. As shown by the statistics presented in Table 4 of Appendix D, when we control work complexity, the simple r

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.6b

Regression of Organization-focussed Activity Index
on Independent Variables and Test Factors

Order of Independent Variables and Test Factors in the Regression Equation	(Statistics based on Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis) Simple R	Beta	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	B	Standard Error B	F Ratios	Significance of F Ratios
Bureaucratization	-.30	-.33	.30	.09	.09	-.31	.085	13.14	.001
Work Career	.28	.24	.41	.17	.08	.22	.086	6.60	.05
Socio-economic Status	.23	.21	.48	.23	.05	.20	.089	4.86	.05
Social Complexity	.22	.13	.49	.24	.02	.10	.090	1.36	N.S.
Social Networks	.01	-.02	.49	.24	.00	-.01	.084	0.08	N.S.

	DF
Regression	5
Residual(N) =	91
F =	5.81
P <	.001

of SES (.23) diminishes to a partial beta value of .17. Its overall better position in the stepwise regression analysis may be attributed to an elimination of the supressing effects of bureaucratization. In this context, it may be pointed out that a control over SES consistently tends to improve the relationship between the work setting and organization-focussed activity (beta = -.34).

As may be seen from Appendix D, the social network variable does not bring any alteration in the original correlations of work dimensions. Likewise, a simultaneous control over four variables shows no change in its correlation with organization-focussed activity. This leaves no basis for any suspicion that the social network's *own* effects are concealed or suppressed by other variables in the model.

A separate control on social complexity and work career reduces their individual effects in the same manner that we noted in the case of primary-level activity. Controlling for work career brings the original correlation of social complexity down to .17 beta weight, and the social complexity decreases the effect of work career to .25 from an original r value of .28. But both work career and social complexity reveal no effect on the relationship between bureaucratization and organization-focussed activity (r = -.30) and neither does bureaucratization influence their individual correlations.

Summary of Findings

One larger conclusion that follows from this analysis indicates the goodness of fit of our conceptual model. This is more clearly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

evidenced by the summary F ratios—as shown under each of the regression tables—which resulted from a simultaneous inclusion of five variables in the stepwise multiple regression analysis. The statistically significant values of the F's make it abundantly clear that our sample of observation was not drawn from a population with multiple $R = 0$.[13] More simply put, it may be concluded that the work and test variables which we selected for analysis are fairly relevant to forming an explanation of the modes of family behavior. This gives us some degree of confidence in the plausibility of the proposed research design and the theoretical orientation in which it is embedded.

This overall appropriateness of the model notwithstanding, it must be remembered that these five variables, in all their combinations, leave about 75% variance unexplained. Obviously, these variables do not exhaust the number of possible predictors of family behavior. Hence, in order to account for a maximum amount of variance, further exploration of relevant variables must be forthcoming.

These are the most *general conclusions* which we may draw from a general look at the MCA and the multiple regression analysis. The more *specific conclusions* may be stated as follows.

Intra-Family Interaction

1) The *social complexity* is the strongest predictor of the modes of adaptation with each sub-type of intra-family interaction, and its predictive power is not influenced by other work variables or the test factors. In other words, the families having wage-earners with more socially complex jobs tend to participate jointly in activities relating

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to tasks and decisions regardless of the work setting, career experience, SES, and the nature of their network connectedness.

2) The *bureaucratization* is the second best predictor of family decisions and tasks. This relationship is only moderately affected by SES but none of the two work variables, i.e. social complexity and career, and the test factor of social networks, alter it. Therefore, it may be concluded that the bureaucratic families tend to adapt to differentiated patterns of family tasks and decisions irrespective of the nature of work career and the types of jobs held by wage-earners or the social networks they belong to. But if the bureaucratic families are also of low SES, they are likely to show a rather more sharply segregated pattern of task-performance and decision-makings.

3) The variable *work career* occupies a moderate third position as a predictor of family decisions and fourth as a predictor of family tasks. This moderate link between work career and patterns of interaction maintains independently of the effects of bureaucratization, SES, and networks but weakens with the effects of social complexity removed. This means that the extent to which families of orderly career workers adapt to joint patterns of tasks and decisions is largely contingent upon their holding more socially complex jobs. Whether or not they work in bureaucratic organizations and belong to high or low SES, and to close or loose knit networks is not very important in explaining the patterns of their family interaction.

4) There is some indication to conclude that the *high SES* families are likely to adapt to joint modes of family tasks and decisions. But this is largely true if these wage-earners also work in more socially

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

complex jobs. The probability of jointness increases further, albeit slightly, if high SES workers perform their jobs in less bureaucratic organizations, and if their career patterns have been orderly. In this regard, the nature of their network ties is of little significance.

5) The families who belong to *close knit networks* show a small tendency towards adapting to joint patterns of family tasks and decisions but this tendency is weak. Also, the combination of network ties with high SES does not add to the effects of networks. It seems that when the work conditions conducive to jointness are present, network involvements become irrelevant to a greater extent.

Extra-Family Social Activity

1) The families of *bureaucratic* wage-earners are more likely to adapt to a highly differentiated pattern of primary and organization-focussed activity irrespective of the social complexity of jobs they work in, the career they experience, and the social networks they maintain ties with. But if such families belong to low SES, a more visible degree of segregation tends to characterize their extra-family social activity.

2) The variable of *work career* is the second most strong predictor of extra-family social activity patterns. This leads to the conclusion that the workers whose career has been orderly are highly likely to show joint patterns of participation in primary and organization-focussed activities. Whether these wage-earners work in bureaucracies or hold less socially complex jobs is not of great consideration. Nor do their network involvements and socio-economic background affect the strength of their joint social ties.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

3) The *social complexity* of work appears to be a moderate predictor of the modes of participation in social activities since in large measure its correlation is due to an orderly career of these wage-earners. In other words, this indicates that the wage-earners with socially complex jobs are more likely to adapt to joint patterns when they also have experienced an orderly career in their working life. Furthermore, if these wage-earners come from high SES families the level of their joint participation in organization-focussed activity increases rather considerably.

4) The families who belong to *high SES* are more likely to show greater jointness in terms of their involvement in organization-focussed activity but not so certainly in the areas of primary-level activity. In addition, if the wage-earners from these families work in less bureaucratic settings and hold socially complex jobs, they become more apt to adapt to a joint pattern of organization-focussed activity. This holds true irrespective of the connectedness of their networks.

5) The *social network* ties do not aid in explaining the patterns of extra-family social activity.

Research Findings in Review: Discussion and Explanations

The following section reviews these conclusions in order to suggest their tentative explanations. In large part, these explanations would base on the rationale that we specified in chapter two where we developed research hypotheses. Particularly, we will be concerned with explaining those patterns of relationships which stand out rather

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prominently in the above listed conclusions. These include: a) the

prominently in the above listed conclusions. These include: a) theables, and b) the differential role of test factors and work variables in the original association shown by work dimensions with internal and external family activities.

The Work Variables

An obvious reason for the uneven relationships between work and family dimensions is more or less of a "technical nature" which seems to reside in our use of *differential* intervening theoretical processes to link a given set of work and family variables. In other words, considering work dimensions as "global" variables, we emphasized different *component variables* in our attempt to connect them with the patterns of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity. It is the qualitatively different nature of these component variables which in turn varied as to their precipitating effects and thus causing a variation in the theoretically postulated relationships (cf. Rosenberg, 1968). However, this does not mean that our choice of component variables has been in error; instead, it identifies their crucial points of impact or transactions as well as their relative predictive power.

In light of this, the strong association of *bureaucratization* with primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity would seem consistent with a widely held belief that bureaucracies tend to produce the type of work personalities which are extremely isolating in the social areas of leisure life (Merton, 1968). This may be partly attributed to their stringent demands which keep wage-earners so involved in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

workplace as to inevitably make them absent from the family group's social life. Thus, Whyte (1957:3) who did a thorough study of one special group of wage-earners working for highly bureaucratic organizations aptly concludes that most of them "have left home spiritually as well as physically, to take the vows of organizational life."

There may be a small number of bureaucrats who are able to attain a reasonable synchrony between their organizational exigencies and extra-family social activity. As Katz and Danet (1973:11) note: "A . . . . major problem which confronts the society in which bureaucratic organization predominates is that of maintaining a balance between the kind of person who fits into organizational life—but who also fits 'out' of it . . . . If organizations 'require' the kind of personality that analysis of the bureaucratic role implies, one wonders how desirable this same personality is as a citizen or a friend or a father."

That a bureaucratic wage-earner is more likely to develop a personality in harmony with his work environment is indicated by several authors (e.g. Merton, 1968; Mills, 1972; Mannheim, 1940). Drawing upon Mannheim's work, Bensman and Rosenberg (1960:184) re-emphasize this point as follows: "Officials strive to develop those aspects of their personality which fit the bureaucratic milieu. This makes it difficult for them to develop aspects that are 'out-of-place'." This state may lead to severe conflicts in interpersonal relations in the social areas of life. Consequently, such wage-earners may resort to somewhat compartmentalized social relations, where differentiation in each aspect of extra-family social activity is likely to emerge.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Even those workers who have a great quest for identification with friends and family members sometimes fail to develop a genuine degree of warmth and emotional involvement to achieve a companionable pattern of leisure life. The norm of impersonality, which teaches them to avoid personalized social relations at the work place and outside it, tends to foster a compulsive habit of "controlled warmth" and "syntehtic emotion" in their personalities. This prevents them from committing themselves "beyond the point of involvement formally demanded of them" (Ibid:185). It is obvious that a wage-earner subject to these structural constraints of a bureaucratic setting is more likely to adapt to an extremely differentiated pattern of primary-level activity and organization-focussed activity.

In linking the variable *social complexity of work* to intra-family interaction, we emphasized the following component variables: the cooperative spirit, negotiating and concilating orientations and an ability to communicate etc. It was argued that these conditions of jointness are relatively more available to the families where the wage-earners hold jobs that provide greater opportunities for social interaction. The strong correlation between joint patterns of family tasks and decisions and having a wage-earner who holds a socially complex job shows that this is generally true.

Conversely, it follows that these traits which facilitate jointness do not fully develop in the families of wage-earners working in less socially complex jobs. This is obviously due to the nature of the job which is so closely related to machines that a large part of energy tends to deplete in "starting, stopping, controlling and adjusting the progress

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of machines" and "performing arithmetic operations" on data (*Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations*, 1971: 1170). This seems to leave the worker with little time for developing a relational orientation relevant to a joint mode of participation in family tasks and family decisions.

An alternative explanation follows from the observation that a joint mode of participation in intra-family interaction, i.e. tasks and decisions, requires more intensive social involvement and mutual bonding than a joint pattern of adaptation to extra-family social activity (cf. Turner, 1970; Rogers, 1973). Therefore, the real effect of relational orientation permitted by socially complex jobs seems more relevant to developing jointness in intra-family interaction. The effect of more socially complex jobs is also visible on the extra-family social activities but its impact is relatively low due to the less demanding efforts involved in a joint mode of these activities. On the other hand, the effects of bureaucratization are greater on extra-family social activity because the compartmentalization characteristics of bureaucratic orientation is relatively easier to achieve in this aspect than in the sub-types of intra-family interaction.

As compared with bureaucratization and social complexity, the variable of *work career* shows a moderate but consistent association with intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity. However, this moderate association should not be interpreted to undermine the importance of work career in the life of workers and their families. In part, this may be attributed to our measure of orderliness in work career which is not based on longitudinal data on career patterns. A more important

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reason may be sought in the behavior of all three work variables, e.g. their *mutual interaction* and the consequences it generates for the personality of the wage-earners.

The results from stepwise multiple regression analysis show that the effects of work career tend to reduce on intra-family interaction but emerge with regard to extra-family social activity. The variable that operates to cause this fluctuation is social complexity of work (see Appendix D) which shows an overriding impact on family tasks and decisions. Since more socially complex jobs provide conditions that lead to a flexible communication and empathy, they are apt to create a situation of mutual understanding between the wage-earner and other members. The resulting sympathetic attitude may offer a temporal relief from the deleterious effects of a disorderly career, or at least, lessen the feeling of anxiety which otherwise may result in a progressive estrangement of family members.

But when it comes to participation in the larger community *outside* the family, the loss of self esteem, fear of social comparisons, and social devaluation seem to be felt more seriously which increases the likelihood of a differentiated pattern of extra-family social activity even if such workers may happen to hold socially complex jobs. In other words, the social disengagement resulting from less orderly career tends to reduce the level of confidence and affiliative motive, which otherwise account for a joint social activity for the families where the wage-earners work in socially complex jobs. This seems to throw some additional light on the lower association between holding a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

socially complex job and adapting to a joint mode of extra-family social activity.

A fairly strong association between a segregated pattern of primary-level activity and a disorderly career may be attributed to the *informal* nature of these activities where a negative appraisal of career is more likely to be taken as a sharp blow to one's sense of pride (cf. Wadal, 1973). Perhaps this and the resulting fear of anticipated disapproval operate in a cumulative fashion. This may be seen from the observation that in such families the amount of segregation tends to increase considerably in the domain of organization-focussed activity which is rather of a more diffused nature.

Finally, it may be noted that in this interaction of work career with social complexity, the variable bureaucratization does not play any crucial role. Obviously, this is mainly due to a lack of correlation between the work setting and social complexity and between work setting and career. This same fact also accounts for a more consistent association of work setting with each dimension of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity.

The Test Variables

Socio-economic Status

Overall the work variables predict patterns of adaptation to intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity independently of a family's socio-economic status. However, the differential interaction of SES is noteworthy: with regard to bureaucratization, a control

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on SES tends to increase the original relationship between work setting and family variables, while it decreases in varying degrees the impact of work career and social complexity of work.

In the case of work career, one implication is that the effect of less orderly career becomes more severe when the family has a low SES or conversely, a high SES may provide some protection against the temporal disorders in work career. This may be due to the economic strength of high status families which can save the family from receding into a situation of constant nagging and psychological distress.

With respect to the variable of social complexity, a high SES seems to foster conditions where social skills and positive attitude towards interpersonal relations are likely to develop rather easily. Especially, a higher level of education among high SES families enables them to develop somewhat more sophisticated verbal skills as well as to learn certain procedures and means, which in turn, increase their knowledge of "latent" social structures (see Foskett, 1955; Komarovsky, 1967; Kohn, 1969). A high socio-economic status in the community may, therefore, provide an easy access to families where these attributes, relevant to jointness in family activities, might already exist to some degree. The socially complex jobs would then seem to facilitate an exposure to these elements which characterize high SES families.

The nature of intercorrelation between SES, bureaucratization, and modes of adaptation to family life, creates a somewhat problematic situation for suggesting an interpretation of the findings. Since high SES positively relates to bureaucratization and jointness, logically, one may expect a positive correlation between greater bureaucratization

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and joint patterns of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity. But this is not the case. Nor did our theoretical formulations suggest a positive association. This obviously shows the prevasiveness of highly bureaucratic settings, which regardless of SES, continue to produce a differentiated pattern of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity.

However, since a control of SES enhances a tendency towards *greater* differentiation, it is clear that high social status does protect the workers from bureaucratic stresses or from a complete submersion in the bureaucracy. The ability of high status workers to manipulate the internal structure of bureaucracies to bring it closer to their "non-bureaucratic moods" enables them to reduce their identification with the work setting (see Sjoberg et al., 1973; Clement, 1975). In other words, their prestige and status in the society may afford them some attitudinal and behavioral flexibility at the workplace. This is why, when we hold constant the operation of these external forces, the bureaucratization accelerates segregation in each facet of the wage-earner's family life.

It may be noted that having a high status in the society does not mean holding a prestigeous position in the hierarchy structure of bureaucracy—which may be true to some extent. In the context of this research, such a correlation simply indicates a possibility of working *in* a more bureaucratic organization. It is in this sense that we consider a high social status as providing some sort of cushion which protects from the consequences of working in more bureaucratic settings which largely account for differentiated patterns of intra-family interaction and extra-family social life.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Looking at the independent contribution of socio-economic status vis-à-vis work variables, it is abundantly clear from regression analysis that except for organization-focussed activity, it does not occur as an important predictor. Since a joint pattern of this aspect of social life is more likely to develop in families who do not face financial problems (Rubin, 1976), we may accept that component of high social status which has to do with the availability of economic resources. The implications of this explanation would appear to underscore the emphasis put on certain psychological differences, e.g. differential values, orientations and personality formation in the culture of lower socio-economic families (Centers, 1961; Lewis, 1968; Rainwater et al., 1959).

Finally, we may also consider the effects of work dimensions on the correlations between SES and family activities. Except for a control on the bureaucratization, which augments the effects of SES, the other two work variables consistently diminish the impact of SES on each aspect of family life. For instance, when we control social complexity, the correlation of SES with family tasks, decisions, and primary activity drops to one-half and more, and with organization-focussed activity, this reduction is about one-third of the original correlation. Controlling for the effects of work career also contribute to a low and moderate decrease in the effects of SES. In certain instances, the effects of social complexity and career are stronger than the SES when the latter was controlled on these work variables. Such an interrelationship may be interpreted to mean that the SES affects family life largely when the wage-earners hold socially complex jobs, and to some extent, when they also experience an orderly work career. This is consistent with our

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

alternative explanation which gives prominance to the effects of work on the personality of workers—their attitudes and behavior patterns.

High socio-economic status does, however, have initial impact on the formation of personality in the family (Bronfenbrenner, 1958). But once the worker enters the world of work, it is the nature of the work setting, content of work and career patterns which seem to become his main concerns and consequently, to assume a profound significance in his life.

Social Networks

The findings of this study cast a serious doubt on the Bott hypothesis that suggests a positive association between loose knit network involvement and joint modes of adaptation to intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity. The type of network involvement not only fails to alter the original relationship between work and family variables, it brings results, especially relating to family tasks and decisions, which stand in contrast to Bott's prediction. That is, it is the close knit involvement which shows a moderate tendency towards jointness in intra-family interaction rather than the loose knit. These findings offer an opportunity to suggest an alternative explanation.

It is clear from Bott's (1971) study that like us, she views family as a system which engages in an ongoing transaction with other social systems, work, community and kin. Whereas we seek an explanation of variation in family behavior from the work world, she derives it from a less specific social category referred to as social networks—which mediate between work and family systems. In addition to this difference in the sources of segregated or joint patterns, one major difference lies in the type of assumptions regarding the composition of networks or of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

occupational system. We focus on the most immediate effects of objective occupational conditions on family life regardless of the sex of the wage-earner. Bott seems to assume the presence of sex segregation in networks—close knit networks being more sex-specific. This not only enables these networks to socialize males and females to their culturally prescribed roles but to put normative controls on their family behavior to the extent where they must foster segregation in the family to fullfil expectations of network friends.

This view gives the impression that sex-segregation within the family is a reflection of sex-segregation outside the family, and that network connectedness simply supports its continuity or accentuates its effects. That this is a poor explanation which renders network of any intrinsic theoretical value has also been noted by Fallding (1971), and Rosser and Harris (1965). Fallding (p. 236) states his position as follows: "It seems that what she is really demonstrating is the existence in certain cases of sex in-groups. These reinforce male and female in a distinctive conception of themselves and their roles, whether they are at home or away from it. *The role-segregation of the sexes within the family goes with sexual segregation outside it . . .* one wonders whether *general* network connectedness has much to do with the case."[14]

Since an agreed upon norm of sex-segregation is more likely to emerge from greater homogeneity of close knit networks, it implies that if the close knit networks were *not same-sex*, this norm is less likely to develop. And consequently, the family may adapt to a joint pattern of family interaction and social activity.

In the modern mobile society, sex-specific networks seem less

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

likely. Alan Booth (1972), for instance, reports a tendency in males to formulate networks of a mixed type. In the case of this study, we found almost an equal number of cross-sex friends named by husbands, wives and children.[15] Then the critical element is not the composition of network, but the extent of common or separate ties. This view would consider close knit network involvement more conducive to joint conjugal roles. The very closeness of family network is likely to expose members to somewhat consistent expectation of their common network friends. Second, external closeness of family members is likely to induce emotional closeness in the family, which may eventually lead to a joint pattern of intra-family interaction and extra-family social activity.

This holds true with respect to intra-family interaction in the research reported here. As can be seen from regression analysis, the loose knit network involvement occurs as a third predictor of segregated patterns of family tasks and as fourth predictor of family decisions. This shows how external separation of family members due to their involvement in loosely knit networks tends to produce a similar pattern of participation in intra-family interaction.[16]

Given the obvious closeness between social networks and extra-family social activity, a lack of correlation between them can be interpreted to stress further the weakness of network involvement as an explanatory variable. These findings provide no substantial basis to share Bott's contention that marriage tends to be superimposed on prior close knit networks where husband-wife's separate ties to sources of social activity flourish and perpetuate the pattern after marriage. At best, the network involvement may be considered a facilitating factor

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which may reinforce work socialization and validate the wage-earner's work personality in the family.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Especially when the interest is to describe several correlations within the *same* sample, it is legitimate to compare the relative sizes of correlations generated by variables which belong in a given set (see Blalock Jr., 1972:405). The most widely used method, however, is to square the simple r, and interpret the resulting r^2 in terms of the percent variance explained (see Regression Analysis in the text). These percentages then may be compared with each other to determine which variable accounts for a large amount of variance. It is also possible to make use of F statistics to test the null hypothesis: $r^2 = 0$ by the formula given below:

$$F_{1,N-2} = \frac{r^2(N-2)}{1-r^2}$$

A detailed and fairly systematic description and interpretation of r and r^2 can be found in the following sources: *Handbook of Political Science Methods* by Garson (1971); *Understanding Data* by Erickson and Nosanchuk (1977); *Descriptive and Inferential Statistics* by Loether and McTavish (1976); and *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research* by Kerlinger and Pedhazer (1973).

[2] It may be remembered that a statistically significant correlation does not in itself imply that it is *substantially* significant. Therefore, if the relationship between two variables is theoretically important, the alternative hypothesis may be retained despite its failure to achieve statistical significance.

These two types of significance—statistical and theoretical—have been the subject of a much heated debate in the early 1970s. See for instance, Morrison and Henkel's *The Significance Test Controversy* (1970). Fortunately, this debate is now disappearing.

[3] The expressions low, moderate, and strong etc. correspond to the following sizes of correlations: *Low* = .15 to .20; *Moderate* = .21 to .29; *Substantially* or *Very Strong* = .30 and above.

We may point out here that the *size* of the sample is an important consideration in setting up the arbitrary limits of the strength of correlations. The limits that we have suggested may seem acceptable in a sample size of 100, which approximately is the sample of the present study. In a larger sample, a correlation smaller than .15 may turn out to be fairly strong, while in a sample of 40 or 50 a correlation of .30 may be a mere artifact of measurement errors. See any one of the books listed in note 1 above.

[4] In the MCA tables, the variables of socio-economic status and networks are *simultaneously* controlled. The same procedure is adopted to control work variables. This is done to simplify our interpretation of the findings, which would have become very confusing with individual controls

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on these variables for such controls would have produced a large battery of statistics.

However, the results from multiple regression analysis with a *predetermined order* of variables where all variables are controlled in various combinations—individually and jointly—can be consulted from Appendix D, to see the changes brought by any one variable in the original relationship of a given pair.

[5] Since levels of measurement form a *cumulative scale*, a concept measured at interval level also qualifies for the statistical operations which are generally meant for a concept measured at a lower level, i.e. ordinal level (see Loether and McTavish, 1976:13-31). It is these characteristics of our work (and other) variables that allow us to dichotomize them for multiple classification analysis.

[6] This reduction in the sample is caused by MCA, which requires a *single N* of cases for the calculation of relevant statistics. To obtain this N, the computer program for MCA deletes missing cases in a *listwise manner*, e.g., "omitting a case from the calculation of *all* coefficients specified in a single list if a case contains a missing value for *any variable entered* into that list" (see *SPSS* by Nie, et al., 1975). This means a great loss of data if the missing observations are randomly distributed in the sample. The reduction in the size of our sample is considerable but since the cases are randomly dropped from calculations, we feel it does not bias our findings.

It may also be noted that any discrepancy between the findings generated by MCA and Multiple Regression Analysis may be attributed to this difference in samples because regression analysis is based on uneven N's resulting from a *pairwise deletion* of cases—"omitting a case from the computation of a given coefficient if the value of *either of the two variables* being considered is missing."

[7] The eta measure of association is the square root of the ratio of the "between groups" sum of squares to the total sum of squares, as calculated in an analysis of variance. When one deals with the linear component of the independent variables (i.e., when we combine the dummy categories of work variables to make them metric variables), eta is identical to the product-moment correlation coefficient, except that its *sign is always positive*; this is so because eta is an *asymmetric* measure. The direction of relationship between an independent and dependent variable can be determined only by looking at the sign of means generated by MCA.

[8] Blalock Jr. (1972b:148-157) and Duncan (1971) also recommend the use of "causal criterion" in conjunction with "quantitative criterion" to assess the relative importance of predictors. Since "causal criterion" forces one to make certain assumptions regarding the temporal order of independent variables, as is done in path analysis, we decided to determine the relative importance of predictors using "quantitative criterion". For this purpose, the stepwise multiple regression analysis is the most appropriate method.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[9] Particularly, it is the regression analysis with a *predetermined order* which would help discover the intervening variables. Neither the stepwise regression analysis nor the MCA in the form *we* reported in the text uncover the interconnections between the predictors. In this sense, the regression tables presented in Appendix D are very important.

[10] In describing these zero-order correlations, no attempt is made to suggest a causal ordering of independent and test variables (see note 8 above).

[11] As may be seen from the computational formula of F ratio given in note 1, it has a very close association with r or r^2. Due to this, the F ratios, presented in the text, will be interpreted to show the intercorrelations between different variables and the manner by which they increase or decrease r^2. This means that F as a test of the significance of B is not of main concern to us. However, the level of significance of B's may be seen from Appendix D where their F ratios are obtained from a bivariate regression analysis.

[12] The effects of SES on bureaucratization are important. But it may also be noticed that this F ratio (and the one for the correlation of social complexity with primary activity as shown in Appendix D) must have been significant since each variable produced statistically significant t values (see Table 5.1 in this chapter). This expectation is based on the logic of their computational formulas; according to this logic $F = t^2$. (See the formula for t under Table 5.1, and for F, in note 1 above.) It is perhaps due to certain differences in the processing of raw data by *SPSS* system file that this discrepancy has occurred.

[13] This, however, does not mean that all the variables in the regression model have B's greater than zero. In fact, the model may achieve an overall statistical significance even if only one variable generates a $B_i \neq 0$. To see which specific B_i values are non-zero the statistics reported in Appendix D may be consulted.

[14] Harris (1969:174-75), taking a clue from Fallding's (1971) criticism on Bott, makes the following comments: "Where such groups or sets of relationships are mono-sex, their members are likely also to share norms of marital role segregation which derive both from the fit of ideas and from the conditions under which marital roles are performed. . . . Hence we should expect to find an irregular relationship between network inter-connectedness and role segregation, but a strong relationship between membership of mono-sex networks and marital role segregation."

[15] In *The Family Dynamics Study*, the respondents were asked to provide information about the *number* of *male* and *female* friends who they feel close to and with whom they have frequent contacts (see our measure of *social networks* in chapter four). The observation regarding the sex-composition of networks was made during the course of coding these data supplied by each family member in the self-administered questionnaires.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[16] The findings of previous research, carried out by Harrell-Bond (1969) in England and by Wimberley (1973) in Japan, showing an association between role segregation and loosely connected networks, are consistent with our results. Two other studies which discovered a fairly strong connection between jointness and *overlapping networks* provide a more direct support to the findings generated by our data: Hannan and Katsiaouni (1977) in a study of Irish farm families found a positive association between a joint participation in household roles and sharing of network members in common. Similarly, Gordon and Downing (1978:589) conclude from their investigation of the Cork City families of the Irish Republic that "as the number of shared network members rises so does the marital integration score."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER SIX

WORK AND FAMILY IN CONTEMPORARY INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH

This study has attempted an examination of the nature of articulation between work and family systems in a sample of urban families who lived in a highly industrialized city of Canada. Empirically, it investigated *one* aspect from several theoretically possible inter-system linkages, namely, the manner by which family adapts to the world of work.

The present chapter summarizes the conceptual framework and major conclusions of the study. In addition, it seeks implications of these conclusions for the conventional explanations of family differentiation and then, for the images of work-family linkages. This same section also critically evaluates the alternative hypotheses which certain descriptions of the work dimensions under analysis seem to suggest. Finally, the chapter indicates new directions in which the future research may proceed.

SUMMARY

Conceptual Model

The main thrust of the study was to investigate how the family adapts to the work experience of its wage-earners. This partly aided us in locating the relevant variables in work and family systems as well as in suggesting an empirical problem for analysis. With respect to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

latter, we set ourselves the task of analyzing the extent of *differentiation* and *jointness* in family activities.

We identified four subtypes of family activities: two of these, *family tasks* and *decisions* relate to internal activities of the family, and the other two, *primary-level activity* and *organization-focussed activity*, to its domain of external social activities.

In regard to the work system, we concentrated on the following three important structural components: work setting, content of work and work career. Operational definitions of these components were based on their theoretically relevant elements. Accordingly, we defined work setting as to its level of *bureaucratization*, work content in terms of its *social complexity*, and career as to the degree of *orderliness*.

We argued that these components of the work system tend to influence the social experience of the wage-earner in such a way as to develop a *work personality* in consonant with their specific characteristics. In our theoretical model, we introduced this concept as a structural link, which stands between the components of work and family systems. This methodological stance enabled us to form theoretical relationships between work and family dimensions. Our reasoning led us to suggest that it is through his work personality that a wage-earner comes to reflect his coping styles and orientations learned at work into the family. And in its adaptive response, the family models its internal and external activities into a differentiated or joint pattern.

This suggested that the actual occurrence of a given mode should vary with differences in the work experience of wage-earners. Following this general proposition, the aforementioned three components of work were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

linked with four aspects of family activities. This generated 12 theoretical hypotheses which we tested against empirical evidence presented in chapter five.

Sample and Data

The data utilized for this purpose consisted of a sub-sample of 105 single-earner families where either husband or wife worked as a *primary wage-earner*. The sub-sample was derived from a larger sample of 211 East York families who participated in *The Family Dynamics Study*. Two-fold criteria were employed to draw the sub-sample that the families must have a *single-full-time* worker and that such a worker must represent an *intact* family. Except for the sex of the wage-earner, size of the total family household, and distribution of families in different life-cycle categories, the sub-sample was found comparable on a set of socio-demographic characteristics to the larger sample.

Conclusions

A detailed list of findings may be found in chapter five. There we have discussed the interaction between work and background variables of *SES* and *social networks*—which were introduced as test factors in the original model as outlined above—and the process by which this interaction affects the nature of work-family articulation. In order to place the implications of this study in a proper perspective, in the following we will very briefly recapitulate some of the major conclusions:

1. The families in which the wage-earners work for *bureaucratic*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

organizations tend to adapt to a differentiated pattern of internal and external activities. The probability of this pattern is not significantly altered by socio-economic status and network connectedness of these families.

2. The families where the wage-earners hold *socially complex jobs* are likely to participate jointly in each subtype of their internal and external activities. Their network ties do not change this pattern but their socio-economic background seems to enhance jointness in their organization-focussed activities.

3. The families of *orderly career* workers tend to adapt to a joint pattern of internal interaction and external social activities. Neither SES nor do network involvements of these families affect this mode to any remarkable degree.

4. The *high SES* families are likely to show jointness in both internal and external activities. But largely this relationship seems to be contingent upon the extent to which wage-earners from such families work in socially complex jobs.

5. The families who belong to *close knit social networks* show a small tendency towards jointness in each aspect of internal activities but not in the areas covered by external activities.

IMPLICATIONS

Work Experience and Family Life

This research was undertaken to achieve several objectives. One important objective was to increase our understanding of how work and family systems interact with each other and how the members adapt to these

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

systems. Another objective was to know the extent to which work-family articulation is influenced by certain background characteristics of the family, i.e. its SES and network connectedness—which, at least analytically, seem to be one-step removed from the exigencies of the work world.

As may be seen, the findings of this study indicate the existence of strong links between work and family life. These links remain largely invariant among families having different levels of involvements in social networks, and are only moderately affected by their socio-economic standing. This makes the need for shifting conventional focus from SES and networks to an analysis of the effects of work experience on family very clear and urgent.

These findings also make it plain that the explanation of changes in family activities offered here is much more plausible and stronger than those suggested by SES and network studies. By implication, this seems to lend some support to the argument that posits a discontinuity of early socialization as the individual passes through different stages of adolescence and adulthood (cf. Parsons, 1942; Coleman, 1961). Or put in a more direct way, as the proposed explanation goes, it is the occupational socialization which tends to shape the orientation of workers, and in this way, affects their patterns of participation in family activities.

Further data (especially longitudinal) are needed to determine more definitively which aspect of socialization makes greater contribution to induce differentiation in family activities. From the cross-cultural data analyzed by Aronoff and Crano (1975), it seems that initial training accounts for only a marginal amount of family differentiation. The findings of our research, by showing the importance of work-family interplay in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

explaining differentiation, add a new dimension to this continuous interest in the analysis of differentiation in male-female activities.

We may now go beyond these immediately apparent implications of the study and place it in the context of contemporary industrial world. In doing so, we would specifically see what these findings imply for the study of work and family systems in modern urban-industrial societies of which Canadian society is an instance.

The Nature of Work-Family Linkages

In this thesis, we have tried to show a rather acute shortage of theoretical and empirical research that addresses to the articulation of experience of people in *both* their work and family social contexts. This seems to have resulted in a situation where sociologists, as much as the lay public, often find it difficult to form a clear conception of the nature of work-family linkages. This may be seen from the existence of several contrasting positions on the manner by which work and family systems are assumed to articulate with each other.

One position views work and family as two separate and largely non-overlapping worlds. When stretched a bit further, this position sees a great deal of *segregation* between the behavior patterns and rules of conduct which characterize life in these two regions. The second position considers work and family spheres as performing *compensatory* services. Accordingly, it argues that the deprivations or pressures of one sphere may be compensated for satisfactions and comforts of the other. By contrast, the third position suggests a *generalizing* link between work and family systems. Drawing upon a carry-over tendency in human behavior, it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

holds that values and orientations learned at one situation (i.e. work) tend to spill over to other related contexts (i.e. family) and in this way, become consistent and congruent with each other.

The present study, though not particularly designed to verify these broad positions, offers some insight into the process by which work and family interact with each other. Also since this study identifies more precise points of intersection between these two systems, it is possible to develop a more clear picture of work-family linkages.

As may be seen, the findings of this study argue for a generalizing model[1] and suggest a strong likelihood of the carry-over of coping mechanisms which the wage-earners learn to deal with the realities of their work world to their family life. Our observations pertaining to a strong association between a differentiated pattern of family life and job conditions that allow or stress greater specialization and precision in orientation, support this conclusion. Nowhere in these data did we find a reverse relationship in support of the contention that feelings away from the world of work represent compensation from the job.

However, it seems appropriate to interpret these findings to suggest a modification in the compensatory position rather than announcing its rejection. The fact that wage-earners do bring strains, pressures and rewards of work to family life in a generalizing manner, it may be said that family is not a sanctuary where one finds gratification of his external problems and difficulties. Under these circumstances, the efforts made by family to change its activities in such a way as to make them consistent with the work personality of its wage-earners, and to minimize the probability of conflict, may be considered a compensation to the wage-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

earner. Stated otherwise, this means that, in modern competitively-oriented industrial societies, family compensates the wage-earner and helps him stay effectively on the job largely by adapting to a more congenial life-style (see Caplow, 1954; Seeley et al., 1956).

The findings generated by our analysis are also significant in their implications for the position that proposes a segregation of work and family worlds. By revealing intimate connections between work and family, these findings stand to argue that this position has been rather exaggerated. This calls for a critical appraisal of several reasons—historical, ideological, and theoretical—that not only have led to a perpetuation of this "myth of separate worlds" but also have deterred careful analyses of the *degree* of segregation between work and family life.[2]

The evidence presented in this thesis is solid enough to question this myth both on theoretical and empirical grounds. As we begin to look at the process of articulation in the framework of a more dynamic perspective we immediately come to realize the presence of strong interlocks and subtle behavioral exchanges between work and family systems. Perhaps it is equally important to recognize that in these interchanges, the values and norms of one context do not necessarily interfere with the appropriate levels of performance in another context.

After indicating the weakness of the assumptions on which the segregation thesis is based, we are now in a position to re-examine its implications for the conceptions of work and family in the contemporary systems of stratification. Two themes may be separated for comment. The first considers work and family as alternative spheres of involvement where greater involvement in one is either less likely to affect the level of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

involvement in the other (Cuber and Harroff, 1970; Pahl and Pahl, 1971) or it tends to result in a reduced participation (Edgell, 1970; Oeser and Hammond, 1954). This implies that work and family tend to split into largely different and at times competing concerns as "central life interests". The second theme suggests that since a great majority of workers view work as an extrinsic or utilitarian activity, an instrumental attachment to work, which may be otherwise dehumanizing and gripping, can allow a richer involvement in domestic and community activities (Dubin, 1956). Some evidence has been collected by Goldthorpe et al. (1968) to show that this pattern characterizes the family life of a large number of British workers.

In spite of certain minor differences these views are rooted in a theory which posits that the social experience of industrial workers is inevitably segmental, with each "segment lived out more or less independently of the rest."[3] An implication is that the interaction between work and family is not so close as to lead to a restructuring of roles of the participants of these systems.

The findings from this study and those of Rubin's (1976) and Komarovsky's (1967) do not substantiate these themes for these findings imply that an instrumental attachment to work with alienating conditions tends to accompany a tenuous involvement in the family. Other data collected by Willmott (1971) and Clark et al. (1978) show that a conception of work and family as two alternative and competing concerns is largely at odds with social reality. The present study goes a step further in questioning these conceptions since it specifies some ways by which wage-earners remodel their family life in terms of their work behavior.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Obviously, this seems to come about from their tendency to see work and family as two facets of their life of central concerns.

It seems that the studies proposing a split between work and family life view work as an *individual* activity. This is particularly true of a large body of research and theorizing in the area of social stratification.[4] One implication of this literature is that it is the job occupant alone who is responsible for his choice of job, work organization, and the type of career which he experiences. Implicitly, it is suggested further that it is the wage-earner not the family unit who plays some role in the system of stratification.

Contrary to this view, our study reveals a considerable degree of overlap between work and family life spheres. The manner by which family changes its activities to adapt to the world of work clearly indicates the responsiveness of all family members. This fact calls our attention to view *work as a family property*. In the single-earner families it is the vicarious participation of non-working members which seems to make work a family-level concern.[5] For without their participation it is rather difficult to conceive of any changes in family activities supportive of wage-earners.

Considering work as a family property, the findings of this study allow us to draw implications for the flow of workers in the labor market. Perhaps a more differentiated family life may tend to be encouraged to fill in less socially complex jobs and to supply human raw material to bureaucratic machinery. On the other hand, this type of family may pose a dilemma by producing wage-earners with unstable work careers.

In suggesting this implication we, like Goode (1970) and others

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(e.g. McLaughlin, 1973; Kanter, 1977a), consider the likelihood of family having independent effects on the work system.[6] However, since the limitations imposed by the objectives of current analysis did not permit us to develop this argument, further research is needed to know the extent to which family type—differentiated or joint—may control the supply and quality of labor by manouvering its modes of adaptation. In order to form a more clear conception of the linkages between family and the system of stratification such research efforts are likely to prove extremely valuable undertakings.

An Evaluation of Alternative Hypotheses

As it was indicated in chapter two, our theoretical model and the manner by which we derived hypotheses rested almost entirely on the predominant pictures of bureaucracy, social complexity, and work career. But as we go through the literature, we note certain competing descriptions of these work dimensions. After having before us the findings generated by our model, it is now important to examine these alternative descriptions; such an examination is felt necessary since these views seem to imply hypotheses which present a sharp contrast with the ones which we have suggested.

Bureaucratization

Of late some sociologists have begun to speak of "bureaucratic flexibility". Harry Cohen (1971), for example, using data from Peter Blau's *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy* (1956) and from his own study, *The Demonics of Bureaucracy* (1965) has stressed structural flexibility as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

against Merton's (and also Weber's) conception of bureaucracy as an administrative apparatus of largely a rigid and inflexible nature. He cites several instances to show how bureaucracies tend to adjust, amplify, and re-define rules and regulations in response to their operating needs. Cohen also feels that it is not uncommon for the bureaucrats to make a liberal use of discretion, informal manipulation of rules, and modification of procedures when they deal with specific cases.

Melvin Kohn's analysis seems more sympathetic to bureaucracy. In a series of publications he has not only advocated the flexibility of bureaucratic personality but has predicted a sound "psychological functioning" for bureaucrats as compared to non-bureaucrats. He concludes one of his papers as follows:

> Men who work in bureaucratic firms or organizations tend to value, not conformity, but self-direction. They are more open-minded, have more personally responsible standards of morality, and are more receptive to change than are men who work in non-bureaucratic organizations. They show greater flexibility in dealing both with perceptual and with ideational problems. They spend their leisure time in more intellectually demanding activities. In short, the findings belie critics' assertions. (1971: 465)

Both of these interpretations seem to suggest contrasting implications for the family life of wage-earners who work for highly bureaucratic organizations. For instance, their further exposition would suggest that these are the bureaucratic families who are likely to adapt to a joint pattern of family activities rather than the non-bureaucrats. But the findings of this study (see especially the MCA tables where the variable of bureaucratization was *dichotomized*) clearly do not support Kohn's portrait of his "bureaucratic man". As we expected from an extension of Merton and Weber's formulations of bureaucracy, the bureaucratic families manifested a clearly differentiated pattern of family life. In large part,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this pattern seems a reflection of the rigidity and overconformity that characterize bureaucratic personality.

We may, therefore, conclude with Bensman and Rosenberg (1960: 181), who in a restatement of Weber's position, describe the meanings of working in bureaucracy in the following way: "To the official himself, the bureaucracy is a whole way of life, no less exacting than other ways of life. It makes sharp demands, it imposes rigid codes and stringent standards, and it places a special kind of stress upon him as a *total* individual."

Social Complexity

A few statements can be found in the literature that seem to render the variable of social complexity to a somewhat ambiguous status. Despite a commonly held belief that the coming of technology and automation has tended to reduce the social content of the job, the effects of this phenomenon are seen almost inconsequential for family life. An implication is that neither social complexity nor lack of it would affect the structure of relationships in the family to any significant degree. Young and Willmott (1973) view the increasing use of technology as a mixed blessing. They do recognize its constraining effects but nevertheless assume that eventually technology would tend to synchronize with the family life. This is largely because the family will change, rather inevitably, by its own dynamics which will get impetus from the modern economy of abundance.

The roots of this argument lie in what has become known as the *embourgeoisement thesis*. One aspect of this thesis lays a great deal of stress on the societal affluence and certain general changes occurring in the family. The material and symbolic value of these changes is seen

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sufficient enough to compensate for the work whose content is socially empty. An influential statement that represents this position has been made by Goldthorpe et al. (1968). They declare:

> We would not give the same weight as these writers (Blauner and others) to the effects of *technology* in determining attitudes to work and the structure of work relationships. As a factor of great potential importance, we would again refer to ongoing changes in working-class life outside work, and most notably in this respect to changes within the family. In consequence of the conjugal family assuming a more 'companionate' or partnership-like form, relations both between husband and wife and between parents and children would seem likely to become closer and more inherently rewarding. . . ." (1968: 175)

The data presented in chapter five show that this family companionship is not randomly distributed in the population nor can it be attributed to certain internal dynamics of the family itself. Instead, it varies directly with the social complexity of the job; this may be seen from a high level of segregation manifested by wage-earners who hold less socially complex jobs. And according to our conceptualization, the nature of technology employed to carry out work functions is an important determinant of the degree of social complexity of the job.

This leads us to stress again that it is the job itself which orients, and to a large extent, controls the behavior of the wage-earner. By the same token it seems to regulate his activity in the family and society, and ultimately, tends to shape his modes of social participation. Therefore, it would appear that the level of technology, which sets limits to the complexity of the job, is still a crucial factor in predicting the family patterns of workers in this affluent society. This interpretation lends support to Blauner's (1973) position, according to which one significant impact of technology must be seen in its alienating effects that not only restrict human growth and freedom but segregate the worker

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from his own self and the family. Thus, C. Wright Mills (1967) was probably correct in calling work as the mainspring of life, which, depending upon its content, may enlarge or diminish the wage-earner.

Work Career

In their essay, "The Anomie of Affluence: A Post-Mertionian Conception", Simon and Gagnon (1976) set forth certain bold ideas which seem to imply an alternative explanation of the effects of work career. Part of their formulation is a caution against the negative consequences of a too orderly and too predictable career. They recast this conception of career in the structure of advanced industrial societies, and argue that an anomy of affluence—that may result from an orderly work life—can be as dangerous and frustrating in its personal consequences as the anomy of scarcity, which is often attributed to work disruptions.

Simon and Gagnon feel that a too orderly sequence of careers may produce a type of social order which seems to ease rather rapidly the achievement of much valued goals of life. This ease and certainty in attaining the goals may trivialize them to the point "where achievement no longer affords what has been called 'consumatory gratification'." This may, likewise, fail to accrue "constraining gratification" that "ties the individual to the prevailing social order" (p. 361). It is in this sense that the effects of orderliness seem highly likely to loosen social and personal ties. As a result, the individual may fail to connect his life plans and their meanings with the "collective meanings" of the family group. It is also possible that a too orderly career may weaken commitment to family as it does to easily accessible success goals. This may foster a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"cooler attitude" towards an experience of achievement and a corresponding spirit of detachment from an active family life. The social bonds may loosen their hold further if a too orderly career leads to an abrupt mobility of the wage-earner. All these consequences seem to portend a segregated domestic and communal life.

Contrary to Simon and Gagnon (1976), we attributed some of these consequences to a disorderly career while an orderly career was seen as a source of self-esteem and a better self-image, which entail the effects of increasing congruency in orientation and togetherness in marital relations. As may be seen from the MCA, our conceptualization stands the test of empirical evidence. However, further research is required to examine the views expressed by Simon and Gagnon. It is important that such research must obtain data from "the higher economic and educational strata" to whom they particularly addressed in this paper.

For the present, we may conclude from the findings of this study that the stabilizing and ego-enhancing effects of an orderly career do not necessarily lead to a sense of detachment or a lack of passion and enthusiasm. Indeed the realities of the capitalist economic system are such that for a large majority of people a disorderly career is a source of personal anomy and frustrations with serious implications for family life (cf. Wadel, 1973; Giddens, 1973).

The Quality of Work and the Quality of Family Life

This evaluation of alternative viewpoints makes it clear that as yet no substantial change in the structure and organization of work has occurred. In their present form, the bureaucracies, mechanically-paced

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

jobs and career interuptions produce severe tensions and rigid orientations that eventually lead to a differentiated family life. It is also plain from the findings of this study that people tend to perceive *both* work and family as central life concerns and that the linkages between these regions take place in a generalizing manner.

On the other hand, as may be observed from the previous research, it has become very common to think of marital togetherness as a major factor that promotes greater cohesion and unity in the nuclear family (see Scanzoni, 1970; Edgell, 1970). Some sociologists refer to companionship as the primary goal of modern marriages (e.g. Burgess et al., 1971; Blood and Wolfe, 1963). In one study, Komarovsky (1967: 337) views companionship as "an important *raison d'etere* of marriage". Bell and Vogel (1968: 23) feel that "performing tasks together may strengthen family solidarity and reinforce family values". Gordon and Downing (1978) define marital integration in terms of the degree to which couples share decision-makings, household tasks, and leisure activities. Lack of sharing or segregation in these areas is seen as an indication of a low level of marital integration. Yet there is other evidence that suggests a link between episodes of conflict and family segregation (see Turner, 1970; Glasser and Glasser, 1970; Fallding, 1971).

The question as to which pattern is more cohesive needs to be explored further in the future research since it was not in the aims of this study. For the present purpose, these findings from earlier studies may be considered suggestive of the nature of atmosphere in segregated families. This renews our criticism on the bureaucratization, mechanization of work and career disruptions for they all contribute to a segregated,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and by implication, a less integrated family life. An extension of this criticism would call for certain fundamental alterations in the organization of work in the contemporary societies moving towards greater industrialization.

Clearly bureaucracies are not mere devices for producing goods and services. They employ subtle psychological pressures that invoke consistent patterns of action and, eventually discipline the behavior of their participants. More important is the fact that their influence spills over beyond the economic boundaries into intellectual and ideational sectors of a wage-earner's personality and ultimately permeate his family life. If the purpose is to attain a joint and well integrated family, a restructuring of bureaucracy in a manner that allows greater flexibility, personal freedom and autonomy and spontaneity seems mandatory. Likewise the work itself may be redesigned in directions that offer maximum opportunities for individual growth and self-realization, and for developing social skills and satisfying relationships. This may involve devising ways that would halt an ever increasing fragmentation and dehumanization of work or ways that would amplify its social content. Similarly action needs to be taken to ensure greater continuity in work career. This is essential not only to increase economic security of the worker but to enhance his self-esteem and give him a stable sense of identification with the world of work. All these accompaniments of an orderly career are likely to lend a stability to work and family roles of the wage-earners.

These suggestions for introducing changes in conventional patterns of organizing work may not be taken as an indication of our preference for a utopian system.[7] In fact, these suggestions are translated from the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

implications of this study that stem from a *social criticism* cast in a democratic-humanistic thinking which we have tried to build in our model. In simple words, such suggestions imply that the modern developments of industrialism must be subordinated to sociopolitical policies sensitive to the existence of dual linkages between work and family worlds. The outcome of these changes may be evaluated in terms of the satisfaction which accrue from a meaningful life at work and away from the work place, in the family.

Finally, it may be stressed that unless we keep the notion of affluence separate from a careful analysis of the pressures and constraints of the job world, the question raised here cannot be fully appreciated. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to make the effects of affluence an empirical question in itself and to see which section of the population and with what work experience has been influenced by it.[8]

Future Research

This thesis has presented a model which illustrates the process by which work and family affect each other. In its present form the model may be viewed as tentative at best. A major task before the future research is to elaborate it theoretically and provide it a more rigorous empirical grounding. This may be accomplished by a) replicating the model as sketched here and with an introduction of new variables, and b) making it more dynamic or interactional. Some suggestions are made in the following pages.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Elaborating the Model

The model offered here has tried to uncover certain important points of intersection between work experience—as it is shaped by *bureaucratization, social complexity,* and *work career*—and family activities. The process by which the transference of work experience from occupational world to family group may occur was indicated by introducing the concept of *work personality* in the model as an intervening variable. Unlike other work and family variables, the available data did not allow a quantification of this variable. Future research, especially interested in replications of this study, would be well-advised to pay some attention to a precise measurement of work personality concept.

The first step in this direction may be taken by constructing scales of work personality or by devising other methods to index the patterns by which wage-earners accommodate to their work situations. The fact that work personality varies with a variation in job conditions, a scale as comprehensive as Adorno's "authoritarian personality" may be needed to cover a reasonably wide range of occupations, their characteristics and constraints. Obviously, such an undertaking would involve a careful scrutiny of several relevant work variables.

This means that a challenging task lies before the future research. Its completion seems important for many reasons. First, once a scale has been developed, it would be possible to study work personality as an independent variable in its own right. Second, it would be relatively easier to know the degree and nature of transmission of work-effects *within* the family. Third, such a scale would permit a more precise determination of the impact of SES, networks and work variables on the personality;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this may provide a fairly accurate and direct test of the relative strength of different explanations of family behavior.

In addition to the concept of work personality, further development and elaboration of the model must begin with an introduction of new variables. These variables may be chosen from previous research that has looked at the impact of work on family life from several different angles.[9] Some of the important work variables may be listed here; it shall be the job of future studies to identify the *theoretical process* by which these variables may articulate with different aspects of family life.

Kohn's (1969) research has convinced him of the significance of *closeness of supervision, the complexity of organization of work, the substance of work,* and *the degree of self-reliance required in work* as important determinants of parental values of self-direction and conformity in child socialization. Linkages between these dimensions of work and patterns of intra-family social activity may be explored.[10]

Work autonomy and *alienation* are other extremely valuable variables that merit attention. In one study, McKinley (1964) has linked autonomy with socialization techniques. It was found that fathers who enjoyed greater autonomy at work tended to show less hostility and defensiveness in their families and toward their children in the process of socialization. An extrapolation of this variable leads one to speculate greater jointness for the families of such wage-earners. Since lack of autonomy is often seen in terms of the existence of alienation (cf: Blauner, 1973), a segregated pattern may characterize the family life of workers subject to alienating conditions. Further research may be undertaken to develop this link as well as to test it with empirical data.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kanter (1977a) from a thorough review of literature on work and family, has identified five aspects of work structure and organization that deserve further exploration. These are: a) *the degree of occupational absorption,* b) *the amount of time demanded by occupations and the timing of occupational events,* c) *the provision of material and symbolic rewards,* d) *occupational and organizational culture,* and e) *emotional aspects of one's structural location at work.* The latter two aspects find some discussion in our theoretical formulations but need to be given more attention in future. Research addressing the effects of *relative absorption of an occupation*—"the extent to which it draws in [the wage-earner] and demands performance from other family members"—on family life would seem a more intriguing undertaking.[11] In particular, this would indicate what types of occupations tend to co-opt the family along with its wage-earners. There is a considerable amount of research on how the big organizations succeed in securing the loyalty of non-working members but little is known about the role of *specific* occupations.

In an earlier paper, Holland (1959) has offered a classification of some occupations according to their "demand" characteristics. He arrived at the following four types which, for him, make up an "occupational environment": *persuasive* (includes business executives, salesmen, etc.), *motoric* (dentists, truck drivers), *supportive* (social workers, school teachers), and *conforming* (clerks, accountants). In a latter study, Steinmetz (1974) related these types with different degrees of punishment in child socialization, and like Kohn (1969), found them better predictors than the SES. Parents in persuasive and motoric types of jobs were found to have significantly higher physical punishment scores than those in supportive and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conforming occupations. She feels that these differences stem from differential occupational values and from a use of different skills (verbal and physical) and problem-solving approaches. This classification of occupation seems valuable and may be linked with patterns of participation in family activities. From the results of our study, it would appear that the wage-earners in supportive categories are more likely to show greater jointness than the other three categories.

Job situations may also be looked at in terms of their constraints and pressures. In this regard, the effects of *work fatigue, monotony, repetitiveness, shift-work* and *job-related travel* on family life may be investigated. Preliminary analysis of how shift-work interferes with marital relations, leisure life and socialization of children has been reported by Young and Willmott (1973).

Future research may also examine the nature of interaction between family and certain social psychological work variables, e.g. *achievement orientation, commitment to work organization,* and *perceived levels of cohesion with co-workers at the work place.* The manner by which the wage-earners view the *structure of opportunities* within the work setting and its effects on family life is another area which is relatively less explored. The research carried out by Scanzoni (1970), Edgell (1970) and Kanter (1977a) is important in that it indicates the relevance of these variables. However, it is essential to ask substantive theoretical questions with broader implications. For instance, it seems interesting to know what type of family life—joint or differentiated—aids in achieving the "success goals" which are so consistently stressed by the modern work ethic.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, the search for new work variables must be balanced by simultaneously locating new variables in family for analysis. Future research efforts may be directed to an investigation of family cohesion, integration and stability. Marital satisfaction and adjustment are other areas which deserve further study. In a time when a great many critics are calling our attention to an increasing dissatisfaction of workers, it seems important to undertake analysis of how job-related dissatisfactions affect marital satisfaction.[12]

For instance, Rinehart (1975) in his book, *The Tyranny of Work*, has shown a high level of dissatisfaction and alienation among blue and white collar Canadian workers as against the rosy picture painted in its "work ethic survey" by Information Canada (1975). Sheppard and Harrick (1972), in an aptly titled book, *Where Have All the Robots Gone?* have challenged the official myth of happy American workers. They describe the magnitude of dissatisfaction and part of its reasons as follows:

> In today's highly regimented, increasingly automated, and deeply impersonal industrial society, the human being who has found fulfilling work is indeed among the blessed. . . . But more and more workers—and every day this is more apparent—are becoming disenchanted with the boring, repetitive tasks set by a merciless line or by bureaucracy. They feel they have been herded into economic and social cul-de-sacs. (p. xi)

In accord with the *generalizing model*, these studies seek consequences of job-discontents for political and economic systems with a somewhat lesser emphasis on other aspects of a wage-earner's life. It would be worthwhile to extend their analyses to family life and to see how family adapts to dissatisfying work situations. An investigation in this direction is also needed to specify the conditions under which an inverse correlation between SES and marital satisfaction—as shown by a large

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

number of studies[13]—may hold.

Finally, it may be stressed that future research, directed to a specification of the linkages between variables suggested here, must recognize the need for more refined concepts. Both theoretical and operational definition of the concepts used must reflect the complex realities of work and family life in a precise and accurate way.

Developing Interactional Models

The analysis presented here may be considered a limited attempt in narrowing the research gap between work and family worlds as areas of empirical investigation. In making this attempt, we were led to emphasize how work experience affects family life more than the reverse situation, i.e. how family influences work life.

There are sufficient theoretical reasons to argue that family is not just acted upon by the work world; instead, it exercises a strong independent influence on the structure of work, its organization, and the industrial order as a whole. The examples of Russia, China, and Israel, where official attempts to synchronize family systems with ambitions of modernization and a rapid industrialization have been far less successful suggest the independent impact of family variables on economic and social developments. The manner by which family exerts its influence may take different forms. Since family is a primary agency of socialization, by influencing career plans and skill structure, it may control the quality of needed labor as well as its supply and distribution. The family may affect member's decision to work for a given company or firm, and in this way, may enter into bargaining for the amount and nature of rewards in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

exchange of an appropriate delivery of services. Similarly, the level and type of family-support to its wage-earners may influence their commitment to jobs and work organizations. The existence of family-owned business, especially in the form of big corporations or farming lands, represents another way in which the family may influence economic decision-makings at the national or international level.

These are some of the several instances of the role of family in affecting the shape of an economy.[14] They clearly suggest that family patterns be investigated as independent variables. However, it may be pointed out that an exclusive concern with this mode of analysis is likely to render it as much partial as a one-directional emphasis on the influence of work on family life. This illustrates the need for more dynamic or interactional models which would allow to study simultaneously how work and family affect each other.

By way of introducing the concept of work personality in the model of this study, we have indicated a direction in which the future research may proceed. Theoretically, we have tried to develop an argument that views personality as an outcome of the *joint* effects of work and family. Empirically, however, it was not possible to investigate the *process* by which the elementary family may have affected the formation of work personality. Neither was it possible to determine the extent of family's influence on the decision of wage-earners to work for certain types of jobs and organizations. Further research may look into these issues rather than studying exclusively the unidirectional effects of one system on the other.

Obviously, this mode of theorizing and empirical analysis would

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

require *longitudinal studies*. The data collected by such studies would certainly provide a deeper understanding of the interaction between work and family and their *reciprocal* effects on each other. In particular, these studies would seem important in uncovering certain subtle processes involved in the mutual adaptation of work and family when either the wage-earners change their occupations due to familial and social structural pressures or when family passes through certain developmental events.

For instance, there is a strong theoretical and empirically-documented tradition which suggests that occupational mobility tends to produce certain conditions—i.e. separation from the kinfolk and the resulting psychological dependency—that contribute to enhance jointness in family life.[15] But the question as to how family connections and obligations may resist the decision to move is not given the attention it deserves. Likewise, the extent to which mobile families may modify or maintain their patterns of activities at the place of destination is not examined in any detail. This may be attributed to a lack of longitudinal data and to a reluctance in applying the dynamic system models.

Thus, it may be stressed that a proper study of changes in work career, jobs and organizational settings and their relationship with changes in family lifestyles must be based on longitudinal data.

The importance of longitudinal studies may also be seen in terms of answering certain other questions which are of considerable relevance to the present study. These include the *relative influence of occupational and family socialization* and the *transmission of work-effects* in the family. An answer to the first question would show the extent to which people select certain jobs that reflect pre-existing attitudes and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

orientations. Although the available evidence indicates the important role of occupational socialization in shaping people's conceptions and values, further research, which may deal with this question in conjunction with the empirical problem explored here, is needed. The latter question, i.e. regarding the transmission of work experience, is of particular importance in studies of single-earner families. In view of the absence of any concrete evidence, one may speculate, as we did, that this transmission may occur due to several characteristics of work and family systems. Some of the more important are the following: a) the structural closeness of family members, b) the existence of certain communicational links within the family and between different families and their work friends, and c) the exacting nature of occupational realities that inevitably spill over in the family through work personality.[16] In order for a precise identification of the process further studies must be conducted. These studies may obtain data on non-working members' attitudes, feelings and the extent of their knowledge about wage-earners' jobs and organizational pressures.

The longitudinal research designs, which are easier to cast in interactional perspectives, may be directed to investigations of dual-career families. Some notable attempts in this direction are already being made by the Rapoports (1971) and Holmstrom (1972) in their detailed studies of a small number of families. Since these studies addressed to different and somewhat broader research problems, it is hard to compare their findings with the results obtained by our study to know the differences or similarities. The present study, however, compared single-earner families with *only one* person working with a small group who had a part-timer but did not observe any differences in their family patterns.[17] Apparently,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this strengthens the model outlined here which did not suggest that an additional worker in the family would make any difference. But this may not be construed as an unequivocal conclusion. A continuous exploration into the behavior of families with different number of wage-earners may suggest certain new directions for theoretical formulations.

In concluding this dissertation, we may point out that a decade has lapsed in the collection of East York data and the analysis presented here. Our decision to make use of these data was influenced by various considerations; two of them may be mentioned. First, the original study, of which this study is a part, was very well-designed, and was able to collect a strong and fairly large set of data. This convinced us of the suitability of these data to the research problem investigated in this thesis. The second consideration was partly based on our assumption that led us to view these data as a reasonably good reflection of contemporary Canada for no great alterations have taken place in its family and economic systems during the last decade.

This justification notwithstanding, if the theoretical issues addressed in the thesis are significant—as we feel they are—then hopefully its objectives are being achieved even if it used a ten-year-old data set.

Further research may be undertaken to collect fresh data and on a *large* number of families. The ideas explored in this thesis and its cast of social criticism may be re-examined in light of these new data.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

[1] There is a large number of other studies which lends a fairly more consistent and strong support to the generalizing model than the compensatory model (see Wilensky, 1961, 1964; Hagedorn and Labovitz, 1968; Meissner, 1971; Form, 1973). But unlike our study, which makes *the family as a unit of analysis*, these earlier studies generally focussed on the *individual wage-earners* and how their job characteristics affect their levels of social participation.

[2] A few efforts in this direction made by Caplow (1954), the Rapoports (1965), and Kanter (1977a) are welcome. They note, historically the charge made of the family as a particularistic unit which breeds nepotism has resulted in denials of seeing close links between work and family life. Moreover, since due to this charge, family ties are often viewed as antithetical to the growth of a rational economic system, there has flourished an ideology that sees operational advantages in keeping official business separate from the household. Partly these conceptions have contributed to the development of a grand social theory which has set up an analytical tradition of viewing the social fabric of complex societies as composed of relatively distinct and specialized social systems. This, in turn, has resulted in a continuous use of "closed" system models in the micro analyses of work-family inter-relationships. In particular, these models have tended to see an intense interchange of values and normative standards between work and family as a threat to their stability. All these factors seem to have played a prominant role in the persistence of this myth.

[3] Apparently it was under the influence of earlier studies of the effects of urbanism (e.g., Wirth, 1938) that Dubin (1956) was prompted to derive his hypothesis from an uncritical acceptance of an axiom that the social experience of urban-industrial man is "divided into discrete parts". As the most recent research on urban life has questioned this basic premise so has the research on industrial worker's behavior cast serious doubt on Dubin's hypothesis—that for a large majority of workers (90% in his study) work and workplace are not central life interests, and that these workers involve themselves in activities that occur away from the work world.

Several writers have noted certain formidable difficulties with Dubin's conceptualization and the evidence he presents to substantiate it. Arthur Kornhauser (1965: 328) states: "In our opinion, the methods and data of that research do not all justify the conclusion that work is not of central significance for workers. What the results indicate is that workers find their *pleasures* and *intimate personal relationships* more in non-work situations than at work. A clear distinction must be made between the subjective *importance* of work and the *satisfactions* it provides. Dubin defines 'central life interest' to refer to '*expressed preferences*' for work relationships. Our own results, on the other hand, indicate how large the job looms in the worker's life, including its negative implications as well as the positive, and including feelings about the job's importance as a source of economic gratifications, its contribution to a sense of personal worth and its implications regarding

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the worker's place in the community". Kornhauser further observes that "job and its direct economic consequences are very much in the forefront of working people's thinking, at least on a par with family interests and decidedly more prominent than other segments of their lives" (p. 9).

Unlike Dubin, Kornhauser concludes: "In general . . . feelings toward different sectors of life tend to be in agreement; the tendency is not, as often alleged, for individuals dissatisfied with their jobs to find extra compensatory enjoyment in their leisure, nor for these least contented away from the job to be especially satisfied at work" (p. 266).

Bertil Gardell (1976: 894) has also criticized Dubin on conceptual grounds. He feels Dubin's hypothesis "rests on a confusion of *work* as a central value in Western societies with the reaction to *jobs* which are not psychologically rewarding. The playing down of work as a central life interest by industrial workers should be understood as a defense mechanism making it possible to tolerate the powerlessness and meaninglessness of the job itself as well as the low status it carries. It is still very important to most people to work, to be employed. . . . Thus, in contrast to Dubin, I would argue that it is the conflict of *work* being so important for ego in the western culture and *jobs* being so psychologically nonrewarding which is the core of the problem for those employed in monotonous industrial tasks".

This clarification implies that if the quality of job situation is conducive to self-esteem, workers are more likely to view their jobs in a positive manner. Perhaps this is the message conveyed by Orzack's (1959) study of professional nurses in which she replicated Dubin's "Central Life Interest" questionnaire. In contrast to Dubin's study, four out of five nurses in Orzack's sample saw their work and workplace as central life interests.

The conclusion of another study on the meaning of work carried out by Morse and Weiss (1955) are contrary to those of Dubin's. They found 80% of workers in their national sample would keep working "even if they had enough money to support themselves". This they interpret to show "that working is more than means to an end for the vast majority of employed men" (p. 191). This interpretation was also corroborated by the views expressed by their respondents; according to them, working gives a purpose to life, a sense of accomplishment, and provides an outlet for social activity and self-expression.

This rather lengthy summary of findings and alternative view is presented to make two interrelated points. First, we wish to raise doubts regarding Dubin's hypothesis and the implication it contains for work-family linkages. For its uncritical acceptance means an acceptance of the present work conditions as they are and of the *status quo*. An improved or enriched leisure cannot be seen as an alternative to a meaningful work as Dubin would have us believe. Obviously, these are the work conditions that need to be changed to improve the quality of leisure life. The second point we intend to make is to call for a recognition of the spillover effects from the world of work to other facets of life. Failure to see this aspect of work-family linkages may result in a rationalization of the contemporary developments in the work situations and the resulting strains in the family life of industrial workers (for an elaboration of these points see text).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[4] Perhaps it is important to note that some of the feminists have criticized stratification theory primarily because of its tendency to define class or status of *the family* in terms of the *husband's occupation* (see Acker, 1973; Haug, 1973).

[5] It is the "vicarious participation" which seems to produce what Papanek (1973) has so aptly called "*two-person single career*" families. (In describing this pattern, Papanek specifically referred to families where the husbands worked and the wives played the role of a vicarious participant in their husbands' careers.)

[6] The nature of family's independent effects on the economy will be elaborated in a bit more detailed manner towards the end of this chapter where we make suggestions for developing dynamic system models.

[7] Other critics of these developments in the contemporary industrial societies seem to take similar positions (see Presthus, 1962; Blauner, 1973; Wadel, 1973; Rinehart, 1975).

Two reviews of literature on work, family, and social participation also share the views which we have expressed here. Gardell (1976: 885) from a review of studies carried out in the U.S.A., Canada and his own research on Swedish industrial workers, concluded: "Traditional ways of organizing work in industrialized societies are in conflict with basic human needs related to creativity, influence, and growth. This conflict seems to affect adversely not only work satisfaction and job and labor-market behaviour, but also participation in and rewards from non-work activities such as participation in organized cultural, political, and educational activities". In order to be able to resolve this conflict he makes suggestions for several broader changes ranging from changes in production techniques and job design to making the work more humane and democratic. He maintains that these changes "must coincide with a trend toward shorter and more flexible working hours, and a more flexible relation between work family-leisure activities considering different needs in different stages in life" (p. 901).

The second critical review of literature is presented by Kanter (1977a). Although Kanter confined her analysis to studies primarily conducted in the United States, her conclusions and suggestions with respect to implementing changes in the structure and organization of work are essentially similar to those of Gardell.

[8] Certainly, the families which we have investigated in this thesis did not reveal any visible impact of affluence. Rubin (1976) who observed family life of American workers, subjected to alienating and dehumanizing job-conditions, also concludes that "the affluent and happy worker of whom we have heard so much in recent decades seems not to exist" (p. 204). The findings of our study and those of Rubin's research seem to belie both the liberal and conservative theories that have often denied the existence of poor working conditions by way of spreading the notion of modern affluence.

[9] A brief review of this research is presented in chapter two.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[10] The variable "substance of work" is similar to the variable *social complexity of work* which we investigated in this study. But unlike Kohn, our research problem led us to combine "data" and "things" categories of the variable—while he treated them separately.

[11] Parker (1967: 49) has suggested a conceptual scheme that may be used (with some caution) to differentiate between occupations as to their level of absorptiveness. He distinguishes three patterns of relationship between work and family; that where family is an *extension* of work, that where it is neutral and has *minimum contact*, and that where it is *opposed* or forms a "competitive" relationship with the work.

[12] Research reported in non-family context has consistently shown that work dissatisfactions tend to result in personal dissatisfaction and poor mental health (Kornhauser, 1965). But relatively few studies are available that seek to link work dissatisfaction with levels of marital dissatisfaction. Though the general pattern indicated by these studies is that of positive correlation between work and marital satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) some studies found a rather weak correlation (e.g., Williamson, 1952; Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1964). Further research is needed to arrive at a definitive conclusion in this area.

[13] Some of the studies showing this inverse correlation may be found in a review paper, "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of Research in the Sixties" by Hicks and Platt (1970: 553-575).

[14] For a detailed analysis of the independent effects of family on industrialization see Goode's *World Revolution and Family Patterns* (1970), Shorter's *The Making of the Modern Family* (1975), Geiger's *The Family in Soviet Russia* (1968), and Bell and Vogel's *A Modern Introduction to the Family* (1968). Habakkuk (1955; also reprinted in Bell and Vogel, 1968), in his study of economic change in nineteenth-century Europe, presents a strong case for the independent influence of family. Using historical data, he has attempted to show how different aspects of family structure, especially the rules of inheritance, affect the supply of labor and mobility, and eventually, the process of capital formation and economic development.

[15] There is a fairly large number of studies that have tested this type of hypothesis. For a critical review of these studies see Bert Adams' *Kinship in an Urban Setting* (1968) and John Edward's *The Family & Change* (1969).

[16] Kohn (1969: 151) faced with a somewhat similar situation was led to make the following speculations: "It may be that men's occupational conditions affect their own values and that men influence their wives; it may be that men communicate something of their occupational experiences to their wives and that this knowledge affects the wives' value-choices; or it may be any of several other possibilities".

[17] There were only 29 families in which either the wives or the school-age children worked on a part-time basis (see note 6 to chapter three).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberle, David F. and Kaspar D. Naegele, "Middle-Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes Toward Children", in Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), *A Modern Introduction to the Family*, New York: The Free Press, 1968: 188-97.

Acker, Joan, "Women and Social Stratification: A Case of Intellectual Sexism", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78 (January, 1973): 936-45.

Adams, Bert N. and James E. Butler, "Occupational Status and Husband-Wife Social Participation", *Social Forces*, vol. 46, no. 4 (June, 1967): 501-507.

Adams, Bert N., *Kinship in an Urban Setting*, Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1968.

Aldous, Joan and Murray A. Straus, "Social Networks and Conjugal Roles: A Test of the Bott Hypothesis", *Social Forces*, vol. 44 (June, 1966): 576-80.

Aldous, Joan, "Wives' Employment Status and Lower-Class Men as Husband-Fathers: Support for the Moynihan Thesis", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 31, No. 3 (August, 1969a): 469-76.

Aldous, Joan, "Occupational Characteristics and Males' Role Performance in the Family", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 31 (November, 1969b): 707-12.

Anderson, Charles H., *The Political Economy of Social Class*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Andrews, Frank et al., *Multiple Classification Analysis: A Report on a Computer Program for Multiple Regression Using Categorical Predictors*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1967.

Angell, R. C., *The Family Encounters the Depression*, New York: Scribner, 1966.

Argyris, Chris, *Personality and Organization*, New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Aronoff, Joel and W. D. Crano, "A Re-examination of the Cross-Cultural Principles of Task Segregation and Sex Role Differentiation in the Family", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 40 (February, 1975): 12-20.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bakke, E. Wight, *The Unemployed Man: A Social Study*, London: Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1933.

Bakke, E. Wight, *Citizens Without Work*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Barnes, J. A., "Graph Theory and Social Network: A Technical Comment on Connectedness and Connectivity", *Sociology*, vol. 3 (May, 1969): 215-32.

Becker, Howard S. and Anselm L. Strauss, "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization", *American Journal of Sociology*, LXII (November, 1956): 253-63.

Bell, Norman W. and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), *A Modern Introduction to the Family*, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Bensman, Joseph and Bernard Rosenberg, "The Meaning of Work in Bureaucracy," in Maurice R. Stein, et al. (eds.), *Identity and Anxiety*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960: 181-97.

Berger, Bennett M. "Adolescence and Beyond", *Social Problems*, vol. 10 (1963): 394-408.

Berger, Peter and Hansfried Kellner, "Marriage and the Construction of Reality," in Drietzel Porter (ed.), *Recent Sociology*, vol. 2, Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1970: 50-72.

Berger, Peter et al., *The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness*, New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Blalock, Hubert M. Jr., *Social Statistics*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972(a).

Blalock, Hubert M. Jr., "Evaluating the Relative Importance of Variables", in Paul Lazarsfeld et al. (eds.), *Continuities in the Language of Social Research*, New York: The Free Press, 1972(b): 148-57.

Bland, Richard, "Measuring 'Social Class'", *Sociology*, vol. 13, No. 2 (May, 1979): 283-91.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis D. Duncan, *The American Occupational Structure*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Blau, Peter M. and Richard A. Schoenherr, *The Structure of Organizations*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Blauner, Robert, *Alienation and Freedom*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Blishen, Bernard R. and H. A. McRoberts, "A Revised Socioeconomic Index for Occupations in Canada", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 13 (February, 1976), 21-29.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Blood, Robert O. and D. M. Wolfe, *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*, New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Blood, Robert O., *The Family*, New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Blum, Alan F., "Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships", in A. B. Shostak and W. Gomberg (eds.), *Blue-Collar World*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965: 195-207.

Boissevain, J. and J. C. Mitchell (eds.), *Network Analysis: Studies in Human Interaction*, The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Booth, Alan, "Sex and Social Participation", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 37 (April, 1972): 183-93.

Bott, Elizabeth, *Family and Social Network*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1971.

Bradburn, N. M. and David Caplovitz, *Reports on Happiness*, Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Breer, Paul E. and Edwin A. Locke, *Task Experience as a Source of Attitudes*, Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1965.

Brim, Jr., Orville G., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle", in Orville G. Brim Jr. and Stanton Wheeler (eds.), *Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays*, New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie, "Socialization and Social Class through Time and Space", in Eleanore E. Maccoby et al. (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958: 400-425.

Buckley, Walter F., *Sociology and Modern Systems Theory*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Burgess, Earnest W. et al., *The Family: From Traditional to Companionship*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1971.

Butler, Peter M., *Involvement in Work and Family Worlds: A Study of Work-Family Linkages in Single-Earner and Dual-Earner Families*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974.

Caplow, Theodore, *The Sociology of Work*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Cavan, Ruth Shonle and K. H. Ranck, *The Family and the Depression*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Centers, Richard, *The Psychology of Social Classes*, New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapin, F. Stuart, "The Growth of Bureaucracy: An Hypothesis", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 16 (December, 1951): 835-36.

Chinoy, Ely, *Automobile Workers and the American Dream*, New York: Random House, 1955.

Clark, Robert A. et al., "Husbands' Work Involvement and Marital Role Performance", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 40, No. 1 (February, 1978): 9-21.

Clement, Wallace, *The Canadian Corporate Elite*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart (The Carleton Library), 1975.

Cohen, Harry, "Bureaucratic Flexibility: Some Comments on Robert Merton's 'Bureaucratic Structure and Personality'", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21 (1971): 390-99.

Coleman, James S., *The Adolescent Society*, New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Costner, Herbert L., "Criteria for Measures of Association", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 30 (June, 1965): 341-53.

Crozier, Michel, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Crysdale, Stewart, "Family and Kinship in Riverdale", in S. P. Wakil (ed.), *Marriage, Family and Society: Canadian Perspectives*, Toronto: Butterworth & Co. (Canada) Limited, 1975: 275-86.

Cuber, John F. and Peggy B. Harroff, *Sex and the Significant Americans*, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970.

Davis, James A., *Elementary Survey Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Dennis, Norman, Fernando Henriques and Clifford Slaughter, *Coal is Our Life*, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1956.

Deutsch, Karl W., *The Nerves of Government*, London: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Canada*, Ottawa, 1961.

Dubin, Robert, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers", *Social Problems*, vol. [redacted] No. 3 (January, 1956): 131-42.

Duncan, O. D., "Path Analysis: Sociological Examples", in H. M. Blalock, Jr. (ed.), *Causal Models in the Social Sciences*, Chicago: Aldine, Atherton, 1971.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Durkheim, Emile, *Suicide* (trans. by J. A. Spaulding and George Simpson), New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Durkheim, Emile, *The Division of Labour in Society* (trans. by George Simpson), New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Dyer, William G., "The Interlocking of Work and Family Social Systems Among Lower Occupational Families", *Social Forces*, vol. XXXIV, No. 3 (March, 1956): 230-33.

Dyer, William G., "Family Reactions to the Father's Job", in Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg (eds.), *Blue-Collar World*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965: 86-91.

Eckstein, Harry, *Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Edgell, Stephen, "Spiralists: Their Careers and Family Lives", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21 (September, 1970): 314-23.

Edgell, Stephen, "Marriage and the Concept Companionship", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 23 (1972): 452-61.

Edwards, John N., "Familial Behavior as Social Exchange", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 31 (August, 1969a): 518-26.

Edwards, John N., *The Family & Change*, New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1969b.

Elkin, Frederick and William A. Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 20 (1955): 680-84.

Ericksen, Julia A. et al., "The Division of Family Roles", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 41, No. 2 (May, 1979): 301-13.

Erickson, B. H. and T. A. Nosanchuk, *Understanding Data*, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1977.

Erikson, Erik H., *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, New York: Norton, 1968.

Falding, Harold, "The Family and the Idea of a Cardinal Role", in Gerald Handel (ed.), *The Psychosocial Interior of the Family*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1971: 220-46.

Form, William H., "The Internal Stratification of the Working Class: System Involvements of Auto Workers in Four Countries", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 38 (December, 1973): 697-711.

Foskett, John M., "Social Structure and Social Participation", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 20 (1955): 431-38.

Fox, Alan, *A Sociology of Work in Industry*, London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1971.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fraser, Ronald (ed.), *Work: Twenty Personal Accounts*, vol. 2, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1969.

Fromm, Erich, *The Sane Society*, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1955.

Furstenberg, Jr., Frank F., "The Transmission of Mobility Orientation in the Family", *Social Forces*, vol. 49 (1971): 595-603.

Gans, Herbert J., *The Urban Villagers*, New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Gardell, Bertil, "Reactions at Work and Their Influence on Nonwork Activities: An Analysis of a Sociopolitical Problem in Affluent Societies", *Human Relations*, vol. 29, No. 9 (1976): 885-904.

Garson, G. David, *Handbook of Political Science Methods*, Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1971.

Geiger, H. Kent, *The Family in Soviet Russia*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Gerstl, Joel E., "Leisure, Taste and Occupational Milieu", in Erwin O. Smigel, *Work and Leisure*, New Haven, College and University Press, 1963: 146-67.

Giddens, Anthony, *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*, London: Hutchinson University Library, 1973.

Gilbert, Sid and Hugh A. McRoberts, "Differentiation and Stratification: The Issue of Inequality", in Dennis Forcese and Stephen Richer (eds.), *Issues in Canadian Society*, Scarborough, Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1975: 91-136.

Glasser, Paul H. and Lois N. Glasser (eds.), *Families in Crisis*, New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Gold, Martin and Carol Slater, "Office, Factory, Store and Family: A Study of Integration Setting", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 23 (February, 1958): 64-74.

Goldthorpe, John H. et al., *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1968.

Goldthorpe, John H., et al., *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1969.

Goode, William J., *World Revolution and Family Patterns*, New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Goode, William J., "Family Disorganization", in R. K. Merton and R. Nisbet (eds.), *Contemporary Social Problems*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971: 467-544.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Goodman, Leo A. and William H. Kruskal, "Measures of Association for Cross Classification III: Approximate Sampling Theory", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 58, No. 302 (June, 1963): 310-64.

Gordon, Michael and Helen Downing, "A Multivariate Test of the Bott Hypothesis in an Urban Irish Setting", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 40, No. 3 (August, 1978): 585-93.

Grathoff, Richard H., *The Structure of Social Inconsistencies*, The Hague: Martinus Nighoff, 1970.

Greenfield, Sidney M., *English Rustics in Black Skin*, New Haven: College and University Press, 1966.

Grusky, Oscar, "Corporate Size, Bureaucratization and Managerial Succession", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 67 (November, 1961): 261-69.

Guilford, J. P., *Psychometric Methods*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Habakkuk, H. J., "Family Structure and Economic Change in Nineteenth-Century Europe", *The Journal of Economic History*, vol. XV, No. 1 (1955): 1-12.

Hagedorn, Robert and Sanford Labovitz, "Participation in Community Associations by Occupations: A Test of Three Theories", *American Sociological Review*, vol. xxxiii (April, 1968): 272-83.

Hall, A. D. and R. E. Fagen, "Definitions of Systems", *General Systems*, vol. 1 (1956): 18-28.

Hall, Richard H., *Organizations: Structures and Processes*; Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Handel, Gerald (ed.), *The Psychosocial Interior of the Family*, Aldine, Chicago, 1971.

Hannan, Damian F. and Louise A. Katsiaouni, *Traditional Families? From Culturally Prescribed to Negotiated Roles in Farm Families*, Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute, 1977.

Hansen, Donald A. and Reubin Hill, "Families under Stres", in Harold T. Christensen (ed.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964: 782-819.

Harrell-Bond, Barbara E., "Conjugal Role Behavior", *Human Relations*, vol. 22, No. 1 (February, 1969): 77-91.

Harris, C. C., *The Family: An Introduction*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Harry, Joseph, "Family Localism and Social Participation", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 75, No. 5 (March, 1970): 821-27.

Haug, Marie R., "Social Class Measurement and Women's Occupational Roles", *Social Forces*, vol. 52 (1973): 86-98.

Hawthorn, Geoffrey and Michael Paddon, "Work, Family and Fertility", *Human Relations*, vol. 24, No. 6 (December, 1971), 611-28.

Hays, William L., *Statistics for the Social Sciences*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Heer, David M., "The Measurement and Bases of Family Power: An Overview", *Marriage and Family Living*, vol. 25 (May, 1963): 133-39.

Helfrich, Margaret L., *The Social Role of the Executive's Wife*, College of Administrative Science, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1965.

Herbest, P. G., "Task Differentiation of Husband and Wife in Family Activities", in Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), *A Modern Introduction to the Family*, New York: The Free Press, 1960: 339-346.

Herzberg, F., *Work and the Nature of Man*, London: Staples Press, 1968.

Heydebrand, Wolf V. (ed.), *Comparative Organizations: The Results of Empirical Research*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Hicks, Mary W. and Marilyn Platt, "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of Research in the Sixties", in C. B. Broderick (ed.), *A Decade of Family Research and Action 1960-1969*, National Council on Family Relations, 1971: 59-78.

Hill, Reuben, *Families Under Stress*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Holland, John L., "A Theory of Vocational Choice", *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 6, No. 1 (1959): 35-45.

Holmstrom, Lynda Lytle, *The Two-Career Family*, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1972.

Hughes, Everett C., *Men and Their Work*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Humphreys, Alexander J., *New Dubliners: Urbanization and the Irish Family*, New York: Fordham University Press, 1966.

Information Canada, *Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations*, vol. 1, Ottawa, 1971.

Information Canada, *Canadian Work Values: Findings of a Work Ethic Survey and a Job Satisfaction Survey*, Ottawa, 1975.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Irving, Henry W., "Social Networks in the Modern City", *Social Forces*, vol. 55, No. 4 (June, 1977): 867-80.

Jahoda, Marie and Neil Warren, "The Myths of Youth", *Sociology of Education*, vol. 38 (Winter, 1965).

Kanter, Rosabeth M., *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy*, Social Science Frontiers Monograph Series, New York: Russell Sage, 1977a.

Kanter, Rosabeth M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books Inc., 1977b.

Kantor, David and William Lehr, *Inside the Family*, London: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Katz, Elihu and Brenda Danet (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Kemper, Theodore D. and Melvin L. Reichler, "Work Integration, Marital Satisfaction, and Conjugal Power", *Human Relations*, vol. 29, No. 10 (1976): 929-44.

Kerlinger, F. N. and E. Pedhazer, *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Kohn, Melvin L., *Social Class and Conformity*, Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1969.

Kohn, Melvin L., "Bureaucratic Man: A Portrait and An Interpretation", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36 (June, 1971): 461-74.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler, "Occupational Experience and Psychological Functioning: An Assessment of Reciprocal Effects", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 38 (February, 1973): 97-118.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler, "The Reciprocal Effects of the Substantive Complexity of Work and Intellectual Flexibility: A Longitudinal Assessment", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 84, No. 1 (1973): 24-52.

Komarovsky, Mira, *Blue-Collar Marriage*, New York: Random House, 1967.

Komarovsky, Mira, *The Unemployed Man and His Family*, New York: Octagon Books, 1971.

Koos, Earl L., *Families in Trouble*, New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.

Kornhauser, Arthur, *Mental Health of the Industrial Worker*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lasson, Kenneth, *The Workers: Portraits of Nine American Jobholders*, New York: Grossman Publishers, 1971.

Lennard, Henry and Arnold Bernstein, *Patterns of Human Interaction*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Lenski, Gerhard E., "Social Participation and Status Crystalization", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 21 (August, 1956): 458-64.

Levinger, George, "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage", *Sociometry*, vol. 27, No. 4 (December, 1964): 433-448.

Levinger, George, "Marital Cohesiveness and Dissolution: An Integrative Review", in Paul H. Glasser and Lois N. Glasser (eds.), *Families in Crisis*, New York: Harper and Row, 1970: 107-125.

Lewis, Oscar, "The Culture of Poverty", in D. P. Moynihan (ed.), *On Understanding Poverty*, New York: Basic Books, 1968: 187-200.

Litwak, E. and I. Szelenyi, "Primary Group Structures and their Functions: Kin, Neighbours and Friends", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 34 (August, 1969): 465-82.

Loether, Herman J. and Donald G. McTavish, *Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: An Introduction*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Loomis, Charles P., *Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change*, Toronto: Van Nostrand Co., 1960.

MacIver, R. M., *The Ramparts We Guard*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.

Maidman, Frank, *Family Openness and Patterns of Adolescent Social Engagement*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1971.

Mannheim, Karl, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1940.

Marx, Karl, *Capital*, vol. 1, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961.

Maslow, A. H., *Eupsychian Management*, Homewood, Illinois: Irwin and the Dorsey Press, 1965.

Massey, Garth, "Studying Social Class: The Case of EMBOURGEOISEMENT and the Culture of Poverty", *Social Problems*, vol. 22, No. 5 (June, 1975): 595-608.

McDonald, John C., *Automation and the Changing Family*, Social Planning Secretariat, Ottawa: Series No. 27 (year of publication not given).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

McKinley, Donald G., *Social Class and Family Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

McLaughlin, Virginia Yans, "Patterns of Work and Family Organization: Buffalo's Italians", in Michael Gordon (ed.), *The American Family in Social Historical Perspective*, New York: St. Martins Press, 1973: 136-51.

Meissner, Martin, "The Long Arm of the Job: Social Participation and the Constraints of Industrial Work", in W. E. Mann (ed.), *Canada: A Sociological Profile*, Toronto: Copp Clark, 1971: 362-77.

Merton, Robert K., *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Michels, Robert, *Political Parties*, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Miller, Daniel R. and Guy E. Swanson, *The Changing American Parent*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Mills, C. Wright, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Mills, C. Wright, *The Sociological Imagination*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Mitchell, J. Clyde (ed.), *Social Networks in Urban Situations*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.

Mizruchi, Ephraim H., *Success and Opportunity*, New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Moore, Wilbert E., "Occupational Socialization", in David A. Goslin (ed.), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969 (Chap. 21).

Morgan, Winona L., *The Family Meets the Depression*, Minneapolis: The University of Minhesota Press, 1939.

Morrison, Denton E. and Ramon E. Henkel (eds.), *The Significance Test Controversy: A Reader*, Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Morse, Nancy C. and R.S. Weiss, "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 20, No. 2 (April, 1955): 191-98.

Mortimer, Jeylan T., "Social Class, Work and the Family: Some Implications of the Fathers' Occupation for Familial Relationships and Sons' Career Decisions", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 38, No. 2 (May, 1976): 241-56.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mortimer, Jeylan T. and Jon Lorence, "Work Experience and Occupational Value Socialization: A Longitudinal Study", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 84, No. 6 (1979): 1361-85.

Mowrer, Ernest R., "The Differentiation of Husband and Wife Roles", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 31 (August, 1969): 534-40.

Moynihan, Daniel P., "Employment, Income and the Ordeal of the Negro Family", *Daedalus* (Fall, 1965): 745-70.

Mueller, John H. et al., *Statistical Reasoning in Sociology*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1977.

Neff, W. S., *Work and Human Behavior*, Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Nelson, Joel L., "Clique Contacts and Family Orientations", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 31 (October, 1966): 663-72.

Nie, Norman H. et al., *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nie, Norman H. and C. H. Hull, *SPSS Batch Release 7.0 Update Manual*, March, 1977.

Nisbet, Robert A., "The Decline and Fall of Social Classes", *The Pacific Sociological Review*, vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring, 1959): 11-17.

Nunnally, Jum C., *Psychometric Theory*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Nye, F. Ivan and Lois W. Hoffman (eds.), *The Employed Mother in America*, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Oeser, O. A. and S. B. Hammond, *Social Structure and Personality in a City*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.

Ogburn, William F., *Technology and the Changing Family*, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1955.

Ogburn, William F., *On Culture and Social Change* (selected papers edited by O. D. Duncan), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Orzack, Louis H., "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals", *Social Problems*, vol. 7, No. 2 (Fall, 1959): 125-132.

Osborn, Albert F. and Tony C. Morris, "The Rationale for a Composite Index of Social Class and Its Evaluation", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 30, No. 1 (March, 1979): 39-60.

Ostry, Sylvia, *Unemployment in Canada*, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, Canada, 1968.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Otto, Luther B., "Class and Status in Family Research", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 37, No. 2 (May, 1975): 315-32.

Pahl, R. E. and J. M. Pahl, *Managers and Their Wives*, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1971.

Papanek, Hanna, "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78, No. 4 (1973): 852-72.

Parker, S. R., "Industry and the Family", *The Sociology of Industry*, New York: Praeger, 1967.

Parkinson, C. Northcote, *Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957.

Parsons, Talcott, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 7, No. 5 (1942): 604-16.

Parsons, Talcott and R. F. Bales, *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Platt, Jennifer, "Some Problems in Measuring the Jointness of Conjugal Role-Relationships", *Sociology*, vol. 3 (1969): 287-97.

Pleck, Joseph H., "The Work-Family Role System", *Social Problems*, vol. 24, No. 4 (April, 19[illegible] 417-27.

Porter, John, *The Vertical Mosaic*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Presthus, Robert, *The Organizational Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Pugh, D. S. et al., "Dimensions of Organization Structure", *Administrative Science Quarterly* (June, 1968): 65-106.

Rainwater, Lee, Richard P. Coleman and Gerald Handel, *Workingman's Wife*, New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1959.

Rainwater, Lee, "Marital Sexuality in Four Cultures of Poverty", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 26 (November, 1964): 457-66.

Rainwater, Lee and Gerald Handel, "Changing Family Roles in the Working Class", in Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg (eds.), *Blue-Collar World*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965: 70-76.

Rainwater, Lee, *Family Design: Marital Sexuality, Family Planning and Family Limitation*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Rainwater, Lee, "Crucible of Identity: The Negro Lower-Class Family", in Gerald Handel (ed.), *The Psychosocial Interior of the Family*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1971: 362-97.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rapoport, Robert and Rhona Rapoport, "Work and Family in Contemporary Society", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 30 (June, 1965): 381-94.

Rapoport, Rhona and Robert N. Rapoport, *Dual-Career Families*, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971.

Reissman, Leonard, "Class, Leisure and Social Participation", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 19 (1954): 76-84.

Ridley, C. A., "Exploring the Impact of Work Satisfaction and Involvement on Marital Interaction when Both Partners are Employed", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 35 (May, 1973): 229-37.

Riesman, David et al., *The Lonely Crowd*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Rinehart, James W., "Affluence and the Embourgeoisement of the Working Class: A Critical Look", *Social Problems*, vol. 19 (Fall, 1971): 149-162.

Rinehart, James W., *The Tyranny of Work*, Don Mills: Longman Canada Limited, 1975.

Rodgers, Roy H., *Family Interaction and Transaction*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Roethlisberger, F. J. and W. J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J., *Training for Human Relations*, Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1954.

Rosenberg, Morris, *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rosenberg, Morris, *The Logic of Survey Analysis*, New York: Basic Books Inc., 1968.

Rosser, Colin and C. Harris, *The Family and Social Change*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Rubin, Lillian B., *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina, "The Study of Family Power Structure: A Review, 1960-1969", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 32 (November, 1970): 539-552.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina, "Dual Linkages between the Occupational and Family Systems: A Macrosociological Analysis", *Signs*, vol. 1, No. 3, Part 2 (Spring, 1976): 51-60.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Scanzoni, John H., *Opportunity and the Family*, New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Schneider, Eugene V., *Industrial Sociology*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Seeley, John R., Alexander Sim and Elizabeth W. Loosley, *Crestwood Heights*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956.

Seidenberg, Robert, *Corporate Wives—Corporate Casualties?*, New York: Doubleday, 1973.

Selltiz, Claire et al., *Research Methods in Social Relations*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Sheppard, Harold L. and Neal Herrick, *Where Have All the Robots Gone?* New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Shokeid, Moshe, "Social Networks and Innovation in the Division of Labour between Men and Women in the Family and in the Community: A Study of Moroccan Immigrants in Israel", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 8, No. 1 (February, 1971): 1-17.

Shorter, Edward, *The Making of the Modern Family*, New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Shulman, Norman, *Urban Social Networks*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Toronto: University of Toronto, 1972.

Siegel, Sidney, *Non Parametric Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Simmel, Georg, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (ed. and trans. by Kurt Wolff), New York: The Free Press, 1950.

Simon, William and John H. Gagnon, "The Anomie of Affluence: A Post-Mertonian Conception", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 82, No. 2 (September, 1976): 356-78.

Sjoberg, Gideon et al., "Bureaucracy and the Lower Class", in Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973: 61-72.

Slater, Elial and Moya Woodside, *Patterns of Marriage*, London: Cassell, 1951.

Smelser, Neil J., *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Smith, Raymond T., *The Negro Family in British Guiana*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Steiner, Jerome, "What Price Success?" *Harvard Business Review* (March-April, 1972): 69-74.

Steinmetz, Suzanne K., "Occupational Environment in Relation to Physical Punishment and Dogmatism", in S. K. Steinmetz and Murray A. Straus (eds.), *Violence in the Family*, New York: Harper and Row, 1974: 166-72.

Stouffer, Samuel A. and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, *Research Memorandum on the Family in the Depression*, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1972.

Terkel, Studs, *Working*, New York: Aron Books, 1975.

Thompson, James O., *Organizations in Action*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Thompson, Victor A., *Modern Organization*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Tiffany, Donald W. et al., *The Unemployed: A Social-Psychological Portrait*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970.

Toomey, D. M., "Conjugal Roles and Social Networks in an Urban Working Class Sample", *Human Relations*, vol. 24, No. 3 (October, 1971): 417-31.

Tsouderos, John E., "Organizational Change in Terms of a Series of Selected Variables", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 20 (April, 1955): 206-10.

Turk, James L., *The Measurement of Intra-Familial Power*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1970.

Turk, James L. and Norman W. Bell, "Measuring Power in Families", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 34 (May, 1972): 215-22.

Turner, Christopher, "Conjugal Roles and Social Networks", *Human Relations*, vol. 20, No. 2 (1967): 121-30.

Turner, Ralph H., *Family Interaction*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.

Udry, J. Richard and Mary Hall, "Marital Role Segregation and Social Networks in Middle-class Middle-aged Couples", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 27 (August, 1965): 392-95.

U.S. Department of Labor, *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Veroff, Joseph and Sheila Feld, *Marriage and Work in America*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Vogel, Ezra, *Japan's New Middle Class*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.

Wadel, Cato, *Now Whose Fault Is That?* Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies No. 11, University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Warner, W. Lloyd and James C. Abegglen, "Successful Wives of Successful Executives", *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 44 (March-April, 1956): 69-70.

Watzlawick, Paul et al., *Pragmatics of Human Communication*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc., 1967.

Weber, Max, *General Economic History* (trans. by Frank H. Knight), Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.

Weber, Max, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (trans. by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills), New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Whyte, Jr., William H., "The Wives of Management", *Fortune*, vol. 44 (October, 1951): 86-88; 204-205; 207-208; 210, 213.

Whyte, Jr., William H., *The Organization Man*, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957.

Wilensky, Harold, "Orderly Careers and Social Participation: The Impact of Work History on Social Integration in the Middle Mass", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 26, No. 4 (1961): 521-39.

Wilensky, Harold, "Work, Careers, and Social Integration", in S. N. Eisenstadt (ed.), *Comparative Social Problems*, New York: The Free Press, 1964: 306-19.

Williamson, Robert C., "Economic Factors in Marital Adjustment", *Marriage and Family Living*, vol. 14 (November, 1952): 298-301.

Willmott, Peter and Michael Young, *Family and Class in a London Suburb*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.

Willmott, Peter, "Family, Work and Leisure Conflicts among Male Employees: Some Preliminary Findings", *Human Relations*, vol. 24 (December, 1971): 575-84.

Wimberley, Howard, "Conjugal-Role Organization and Social Networks in Japan and England", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 35, No. 1 (February, 1973): 125-30.

Winer, B. J., *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Wirth, Louis, "Urbanism as a Way of Life", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. XLIV (July, 1938): 1-24.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Young, Michael and Peter Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

Young, Michael and Peter Willmott, *The Symmetrical Family*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1973.

Zimmerman, Carle C., *Family and Civilization*, New York: Harper and Row, 1947.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON SES HYPOTHESIS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON SES HYPOTHESIS*

Principal Investigator Source	Year of Publication	Research Sites	Size of Samples	General Description of Samples	Measures of Socio-Economic Status (SES)	Support for SES Hypothesis: Internal Family Activities†	Support for SES Hypothesis: External Family Activities†
Seeley, Sim, and Loosley	1956	"Crestwood Heights" Toronto, Can.	17,000 ††††	Upper, and upper-middle class Gentile and Jewish (about one-third) families	Presumably the measure of SES was based on a combination of husbands' occupation, income, education and the overall social standing of "Crestwood Heights" in Toronto.	"mixed" (some evidence for a curvilinear pattern††)	"mixed"
Young and Willmott	1957	"Bethnal Green", East London, England	45 "the marriage sample"	Working-class and predominantly Gentile families	Using Registrar-General's *Classification of Occupations* (1950) husbands' occupations were classified as follows: higher professional; lower professional; clerical; skilled manual; semi-skilled manual; and unskilled manual.	moderate	X†††
Rainwater, Coleman, and Handel	1959	Chicago, Louisville, Tacoma, and Trenton, USA	420 working-class and 120 middle class wives	Working-class city families	Coleman Index of Urban Status (It is a modified and expanded form of the "Warner I.S.C.").	moderate	moderate
Willmott and Young	1960	Woodford, England	44 "the marriage sample"	Middle-class suburban families	A two-fold division of classes (manual and non-manual, or 'working' and 'middle') was developed by classifying occupations according to a modified version of the procedures used in the *British Census* (1951).	low	low
Blood and Wolfe	1963	Detroit, Michigan, USA	731	616 white and 115 black families of working and middle-class background	The measure was a composite index of scores assigned to occupation, education, and income, plus the prestige-ranking of the husbands' nationality or ethnic origin.	low (inconsistent pattern)	moderate
McKinley	1964	Boston Area, USA	260	Intact, Caucasian, urban and sub-urban families	Following Hollingshead's index of social status, three levels of SES—upper, middle, and lower—were distinguished.	low	X
Rainwater	1964	England, USA, Puerto Rico, and Mexico	—	Lower class families living in a "common culture of poverty"	(This is a review paper. Measures of SES can not be precisely determined from the material presented in the paper.)	strong	X
Rainwater	1965	Chicago, Cincinnati, and Oklahoma City, USA	257	Urban white and black (63) families, largely representing Protestant and Catholic religions	Occupation was the primary measure of SES. Income, education, and reputation of the residential area were also used for class designation. The four levels of class used in the analysis include: upper-middle, lower-middle; upper-lower, lower-lower.	strong	moderate
Rainwater and Handel	1965	Chicago and 5 other U.S. cities	—	Upper working-class families	(This paper is a résumé of findings generated by three of their several other studies. In all these studies, occupation has been an important consideration in the measurement of SES.)	low	X
Gans	1965	"The West End" Boston, USA	7,000††††	First and second generation Italian Americans of low SES	Class designation was based on income, occupation, and education of the husbands.	strong	strong
Rosser and Harris	1965	Swansea, South Wales	1,962	Urban Welsh families; about half of them (51%) were Anglican	Measure of SES consisted of scores assigned to respondent's own and his father's occupation as well as his self-appraisal of his social standing.	low	X

... continued

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix A (continued)

Principal Investigator Source	Year of Publication	Research Sites	Size of Samples	General Description of Samples	Measures of Socio-Economic Status (SES)	Support for SES Hypothesis: Internal Family Activities	Support for SES Hypothesis: External Family Activities
Humphreys	1966	Dublin, Ireland	29	First generation urban Catholic families	Class placement of families rested primarily on husband's occupation with some consideration of income, education, place of residence, and the life style of the family.	low (a somewhat curvilinear pattern)	X
Komarovsky	1967	"Glenton", USA	58	Stable blue-collar, white, protestant families	Level of education was the main criterion by which different SES groups (e.g. high school graduates and those who did not complete high school) were distinguished. (Some importance is also given to income and the nature of the job.)	strong	strong
Adams and Butler	1967	Greensborough, North Carolina, USA	768	White urban males and females representing a variety of occupations	Using occupational portion of Hollingshead's Index, the following seven occupational categories were identified: top professionals and managers; upper middles, middles; clerical-technical; skilled; semiskilled; unskilled.	X	moderate (a curvilinear pattern)
Mowrer	1969	North-northwest, Chicago, USA	1,180	Suburban families from lower-middle and middle classes	Occupations of husbands were classified into several groups following U.S. Census.	largely opposite results (also indicate a curvilinear pattern)	X
Young and Willmott	1973	London, metropolitan region, England	585	Urban families of lower-middle, middle and managerial class background	As in the case of their earlier studies, here too Young and Willmott adopted occupation as the main standard of class placement. Using Registrar-General's scheme, they divided their sample into four types: professional and managerial; clerical; skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled.	low	low (a somewhat curvilinear pattern)
Crysdale	1975	"Riverdale", Toronto, Can.	239 "blue collar" and 58 "white collar" workers	A predominantly working-class community living in the downtown area of Toronto	On the basis of occupation, a twofold class distinction, e.g. blue-collar and white-collar was developed.	low	low
Rubin	1976	San Francisco Bay, USA	50	White, intact, working-class families	A combination of income level and the quality of job was the primary consideration in determining the social status of families.	moderate	moderate

* In the case of studies which do not apply quantitative statistical techniques or where the findings are not clearly illustrated, some degree of judgement was used in determining the strength and nature of the relationship.

† The areas discussed under "internal" and "external" activities reveal a great deal of variation in this literature. Often the choice has been either arbitrary or guided by the "availability of data".

†† These studies which seem to provide some evidence for a curvilinear pattern indicate that although upper-class families are more joint than the working or lower classes, they do not achieve the pattern of togetherness that characterize middle class families.

††† The X indicates that the study under review does not offer relevant data.

†††† These figures refer to the total population of the area. No specific samples were used in these studies. Most of the information was obtained through participation-observation methods and the informants from the communities investigated.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON BOTT'S NETWORK HYPOTHESIS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix B

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON BOTT'S NETWORK-HYPOTHESIS*

Principal Investigator Source	Year of Publication	Research Sites	Size of Samples	General Description of Samples	Measures of Network Connectedness	Support for Bott Hypothesis: Internal Family Activities†	Support for Bott Hypothesis: External Family Activities†
Udry and Hall	1965	California, USA	43 (students)	Middle-class middle aged couples	Network connectedness was determined by asking each of the 4 persons—named by respondent's parents separately—whether he/she knew the other three, and how well.	none	X††
Nelson	1966	New Haven, USA	125	Working-class Caucasian (90%) and black (10%) families	The measure based on the frequency by which women saw at least 2 persons of the same *five* out of the 4 people they visited most often.	strong	X
Aldous and Straus	1966	Minnesota, USA	391	Farm and urban (blue and white collar) families	The respondent was asked to name 8 women she most often visited socially and how many of them knew each other.	none	X
Turner	1967	"Leadgill", England	115	Rural families of farm background	"Positive affectional ties" and "regularity of interaction" between the focal individual and his/her network members provided the main criteria by which different levels of connectedness were distinguished. Individual networks were aggregated to determine inter-household connections.	moderate	X
Harrell Bondttt	1969	A new housing estate in Oxford, England	about 85	Predominantly Irish immigrant families	Geographic mobility (migration to Oxford) served as a proxy measure of (loose-knit) network involvements."	opposite results	opposite results
Shokeidttt	1971	Romema, Israel	about 38	Immigrant Jewish farm families	Migration from Asran, Morocco to Israel was used as a proxy measure of change in networks from close-knit to loose-knit.	none§	low§
Toomey	1971	Medway Towns, England	206 wives and 180 husbands	White, intact families of manual workers	The respondent was asked to name 3 or 4 people he/she most often spent time with and how many of them knew each other. "Each spouse having a network of contacts in which 75% or more of the contacts were reported as knowing each other well was classified as having a 'closely knit' network."	none	X
Wimberley	1973	Kanazawa, Japan	40	Middle-class merchants (20) and salary-men (20) families	The measure was developed by looking at the frequency of social contacts between *friends* of the family being investigated.	opposite results	X
Hannan and Katsiaouni	1977	Irish Republic	408	Irish farm families	Index of network connectedness was based on the ratio of actual to potential ties among both the wives' and the husbands' closest confidants.	opposite results	X
Gordon and Downing	1978	Cork City, Irish Republic	686	Irish, intact, lower-middle and middle-class urban families	The number of persons or couples which knew each other from a list of 6 provided by wife for herself and for her husband.	none (largely opposite results)	X
Ericksen, Yancey, and Ericksenttt	1979	Philadelphia, USA	1,212	Urban, white (91%) and black (9%) families with median income over $13,000	The measure was derived from the physical proximity between the respondent and at least two of his/her three specified relatives, e.g. "the sibling to whom the respondent felt closest".	opposite results	X

* In the case of studies which do not apply quantitative statistical techniques or where the findings are not clearly illustrated, some degree of judgement was used in determining the strength and nature of the relationship.

† Bott calls internal activities "conjugal role-relationship" and includes in it decision-making, house work, looking after children, and financial management. The external activities cover recreation, contacts with relatives, friends, neighbours, and somewhat formal social ties, e.g. contacts with children's schools, church, political parties, trade unions, professional organizations, clubs and voluntary associations (1971:232-236). The studies summarized in this table present a wide variation in their selection of empirical areas for investigation. (Unlike many others, Nelson's (1966) index of "family orientations"—companionate vs. traditional—consists of attitudinal data.)

†† The X indicates that the study under review does not contain relevant information on patterns of participation in external activities of the family. There are few studies which included "leisure life" aspect in their analyses but tended to combine it with internal family activities to construct an index of "conjugal roles" (e.g., Turner, Wimberley, Gordon and Downing). This makes it rather difficult to determine the relationship between network and this specific dimension.

Bott herself did not offer any systematic account of participation in external family activities. At times, she could not keep separate her "network data" from the information she gathered on family ties with informal groups and voluntary associations, etc. However, she points out that generally the couples with joint leisure pursuits were those who shared their "conjugal roles".

††† These studies do not provide a direct test of Bott's hypothesis. They are included here for a) they formulate research problems in Bott's convention, and b) interpret findings as having a bearing upon her hypothesis.

§ For both aspects of activities the pattern seems to be a mixed one.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX C

COPY OF THE REFERENCE LETTER

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
53 SPADINA AVENUE
TORONTO M5S 1A1

University of Toronto

Dear

Several years ago, my colleagues and I conducted a large scale study of family life in Toronto. We were interested in the normal family and how it functioned. Our research was funded by the Vanier Institute of the Family, the Canada Council, and the Clarke Institute Research Fund.

Now, one of my Ph.D. students, C. M. Siddique, is continuing our work by looking at the relation between the family and the work world. Specifically, he is interested in how different types of jobs and work careers affect family life.

From our earlier study, he has all the information to complete his work except for one item—the size of the business or corporation in which the head of the family worked.

One of our respondents worked for you, and we would appreciate knowing the approximate number of full and part-time employees working in an average week in 1969—the year of our original study.

I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your reply.

If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them. We would also be pleased to send you a copy of the results of the study when it is completed.

Sincerely,

James L. Turk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Professor J. L. Turk,
Department of Sociology,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Professor Turk:

On an average week in 1969, our organization had approximately _____ full and part-time employees. (Please count all employees working for your organization regardless of location.)

I (would, would not) like a copy of the research findings.

Yours truly,

_____

Address to which the
findings should be sent:

_____

_____

_____

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX D

TABLES FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 1

Regression of Family Task Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables

Independent and Test Variables	Zero-order Correlations†† Simple Beta	R^2	B	F Ratios	Significance of F	Control Variables† Bureaucratization	Social Complexity	Work Career	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, & Work Career	Socio-economic Status	Social Networks	Socio-economic Status and Social Networks	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks
	(Standardized Regression Coefficients, i.e., partial Betas)												
BUREAUCRATIZATION	-.23	.05	-.22	5.78	.05	—	-.24	-.23	-.24	-.26	-.24	-.28	-.27
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY	.42	.17	.40	21.81	.001	.42	—	.39	.40	.40	.41	.39	.36
WORK CAREER	.20	.04	.20	4.14	.05	.20	.11	—	.11	.18	.20	.18	.12
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	.19	.04	.18	3.92	.05	.23	.07	.17	.10	—	.19	—	.10
SOCIAL NETWORKS	-.16	.02	.15	2.55	N.S.	-.18	-.14	-.16	-.16	-.16	—	—	-.17

† When one of the 5 variables is treated as an independent variable, other variables are controlled on it individually and simultaneously. For instance, in the extreme right hand column of the table, four variables are controlled on each variable listed in the first column under "independent and test variables".

†† This statistic is obtained from a bivariate regression analysis. (These notes are also relevant to the other three tables presented on the pages that follow.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 2

Regression of Family Decision Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables

Independent and Test Variables	Zero-order Correlations: Simple Beta	R^2	B	F Ratios	Significance of F	Control Variables: Bureaucratization	Social Complexity	Work Career	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, & Work Career	Socio-economic Status	Social Networks	Socio-economic Status and Social Networks	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks
						(Standardized Regression Coefficients, i.e., partial Betas)							
BUREACRATIZATION	-.19	.03	-.18	3.40	N.S.	—	-.20	-.19	-.20	-.22	-.20	-.24	-.23
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY	.38	.14	.37	15.67	.001	.38	—	.35	.35	.34	.37	.33	.30
WORK CAREER	.22	.05	.22	4.60	.05	.22	.15	—	.15	.20	.23	.21	.15
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	.23	.05	.23	5.17	.05	.26	.12	.20	.15	—	.23	—	.15
SOCIAL NETWORKS	-.13	.02	-.13	1.64	N.S.	-.15	-.12	-.14	-.14	-.13	—	—	-.14

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3

Regression of Primary-level Activity Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables

Independent and Test Variables	Zero-order Correlations: Simple Beta	R^2	B	F Ratios	Significance of F	Control Variables: Bureaucratization	Social Complexity	Work Career	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, & Work Career	Socio-economic Status	Social Networks	Socio-economic Status and Social Networks	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks
						(Standardized Regression Coefficients, i.e., partial Betas)							
BUREAUCRATIZATION	-.34	.11	-.33	12.48	.001	—	-.34	-.33	-.34	-.36	-.34	-.36	-.35
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY	.17	.03	.16	2.70	N.S.	.17	—	.12	.13	.15	.17	.15	.10
WORK CAREER	.23	.05	.22	4.87	.05	.23	.20	—	.20	.22	.23	.22	.20
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	.09	.01	.09	0.85	N.S.	.14	.04	.07	.09	—	.09	—	.09
SOCIAL NETWORKS	.02	.00	.01	0.03	N.S.	-.01	.02	-.00	-.01	.02	—	—	-.01

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4

Regression of Organization-focussed Activity Index on Bureaucratization of Work Setting, Social Complexity of Work, Orderliness of Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks with a Predetermined Order of Control Variables

Independent and Test Variables	Zero-order Correlations: Simple Beta	R^2	B	F Ratios	Significance of F	Control Variables: Bureaucratization	Social Complexity	Work Career	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, & Work Career	Socio-economic Status	Social Networks	Socio-economic Status and Social Networks	Bureaucratization, Social Complexity, Work Career, Socio-economic Status, and Social Networks
						(Standardized Regression Coefficients, i.e., partial Betas)							
BUREAUCRATIZATION	-.30	.09	.27	9.88	.01	—	-.30	-.30	-.30	-.34	-.30	-.34	-.33
SOCIAL COMPLEXITY	.22	.05	.20	5.27	.05	.23	—	.17	.18	.17	.22	.17	.13
WORK CAREER	.28	.08	.26	8.26	.05	.28	.25	—	.25	.26	.28	.26	.24
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	.23	.05	.21	5.46	.05	.27	.17	.20	.21	—	.23	—	.21
SOCIAL NETWORKS	.01	.00	.00	0.00	N.S.	-.02	.01	-.01	-.02	.00	—	—	-.02

END

23080

FIN

ARC - 375

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.