

JOHN MOGEY

SOCIOLOGY OF MARRIAGE
AND FAMILY BEHAVIOR
1957-1968

A Trend Report and Bibliography

Prepared for the International Sociological Association
(Committee on Family Research)

under the auspices of the
International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation
with the support of the National Sciences Foundation

THE HAGUE · MOUTON · PARIS

Published with the financial support of Unesco

**First published in
CURRENT SOCIOLOGY
LA SOCIOLOGY CONTEMPORAINE
Volume XVII, N° 1-3, 1969**

Contents

Sociology of Marriage and Family Behavior 1957-1968

Part I. Preface and Acknowledgements	5
Part II. Getting the data	9
Part III. Analysing the annotations	15
Part IV. Trends in the sociology of the family	25
Part V. Regions and countries as contributors to trends	39
Part VI. Discussion	44
References	50

Sociologie du Mariage et du Comportement Familial 1957-1968 (Résumé)

53

Part I. Tendances de la sociologie de la famille considérée dans son ensemble	54
Part II. Tendances régionales de la recherche	55
Part III. Perspectives	56

Bibliography

Statement by the Editor of Current Sociology	58
Advertissement du Rédacteur en chef de la Sociologie Contemporaine	59
List of regions and total number of items for each region.	60

10	North America	62
20	Latin America	70
21	Middle America	72
22	Tropical South America	79
23	Brazil	83
24	Temperate South America	89
30	Asia	93
31	East Asia: Mainland Region	93
32	Japan	93
33	Other East Asia	141
34	Middle South Asia	156
35	South-East Asia	177
36	South-West Asia	192
37	U.S.S.R.	197
40	Africa	216
41	Western Africa	218
42	Eastern Africa	228
43	Middle Africa	231
44	Northern Africa	236
45	Southern Africa	239
50	Australia and New Zealand	240
60	Europe	249
61	Western Europe	249
62	Southern Europe	283
63	Eastern Europe	299
64	Northern Europe	321
	List of Descriptors	342
	Descriptor Index	345
	Abbreviations of Journal Titles	363

Sociology of Marriage and Family Behavior

1957-1968

by

JOHN MOGEY

PART I. PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the flood of reports and documents continues to rise the importance of keeping an inventory of publications in the sociology of the family becomes about equal to that of research itself. The first trend report on this topic in this journal, Vol. 7 (1), 1958, covered the period 1945-56 and included the entire world. Since that date important publications have made contributions to the task of keeping such an inventory of scholarly work: Christensen, 1964; Khatri, 1965; Aldous & Hill, 1967; Sussman, 1968; Heiskanen, 1969; Koenig, 1969; Spencer, 1967; and others listed in the bibliography now presented. Critical analyses for specific purposes are still essential if scholars immersed in one area in research are to be kept informed about developments in others and about new data.

The principal objective of the present trend report is to present a critical review of the world literature (excluding the U.S.A.) on the sociology of the family. In the course of searching for trends two innovative changes have, it is believed, been made: (1) the high degree of selection within the potential literature so that there is a concentration on sociological studies of the family; and (2) the use of computer techniques to add quantitative and objective dimensions to the critical evaluation of the material. The exclusion of the U.S.A. is made necessary by the volume of material published there in these years and by the time available for the preparation of this report. The present trend report, therefore, aims to satisfy two needs of scholars and researchers interested in the problems of the family; (1) it represents a continuation of the collective type of disciplinary introspection, or evaluation research, or perspective taking, or research about research

spoken of in the 1958 report; and (2) is serves to bring to the attention of sociologists, necessarily and closely involved with detailed studies of particular family variables, the variety of materials in other world areas that are available as intellectual aids to their own research. This second aim should serve to correct the description of sociological contributions to research on the family as a series of "isolated outposts" with no intellectual interconnections (Aldous, 1968).

Although this report is written by one person, it is a truly co-operative venture. No single individual however energetic and skillful could have compiled this bibliography and set of annotations. Even gaining a sufficient mastery of the multiplicity of languages to read these articles would be a lifetime task. This text is based on two parallel flows of data:

- 1) bibliographic items reported from 39 countries of the world;
- 2) annotations of those items believed to be most important contributions to family research in sociology.

The 1958 report was based on 908 items; this second report, twelve years later, includes a bibliography of 2,090 items, and excludes the U.S.A. Between 1957 and 1967, Moge found 8,000 relevant items on family research in the Inventory of Family Research maintained at the Family Study Center, University of Minnesota. He wrote about the trends in a 10% sample of this universe (Mogey, 1969). The increase in the number of items outside of the U.S.A. since 1957 reflects both an increase in output, and also an increase in cooperation between scholars and researchers in these fields of sociology. Even so, to claim that this bibliography covers all of the world, or all of the output, would be misleading. The coverage of India, Southeast Asia, parts of Africa and some countries of Europe is inadequate. Traditions of cooperative research spread slowly, insistence on deadlines seems to be taken in some traditions as evidence of mistrust, and many scholars struggling with survival problems have few opportunities or resources to participate in a volunteer project, and therefore little appreciation of the importance of deadlines. In essence, a combination of academic, political and personal difficulties prevented the arrival of documents from some areas. As an example, in Japan rioting students stopped the access of the Area Editor to his office, and so to our material, for over eight months, but fortunately they were released in time.

This work was initiated in the Committee on Family Research at the Sixth World Congress of the International Sociological Association at Evian, France, 1966. After a decision to proceed, I was appointed Editor-in-Chief. I have had boundless cooperation from the volunteer team of Area Editors. Their work has made this study possible. My warm acknow-

ledgement of their assistance over the past three years is too small a token of my appreciation for all their efforts, often completed under conditions of great difficulties. In paying this deserved tribute to the colleagues whose names follow, let me also make it clear that I carry full responsibility for the use made of the materials they provided.

Area Editors

Australia: Jean I. Martin, LaTrobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

Austria: Leopold Rosenmayr, Universitaet Wien, Dr. Karl Luegerring 1, 1010 Wien, Austria.

Belgium, Congo: Claire LePlae, Catholic University of Louvain, 2b rue E. Van Even, Louvain, Belgium.

Brazil: Regina Helena Tavares, Centro Latino-Americano de Pesquisas ciencias sociais, Rua D. Mariana 138, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Canada: Colette Carisse, Department of Sociology, University of Montreal, C.P. 6128, Montreal, P.Q., Canada.

China: Ai-Li Chin, M.I.T., Center for International Studies, E53-414, Cambridge, Mass.

Czechoslovakia: Ladislav Ruzicka, c/o S.N. Agarawala, Demography Training and Research Center, Govandi Station Road, Chembur, Bombay, India.

Denmark: Jan Nordhoek, Borgergade 28, 3 Copenhagen, Denmark.

East Africa: Raymond Apthorpe, Makerere University College, P.O.B. 3298, Kampala, Uganda, and Peter Marris, University College, Nairobi, Kenya.

Egypt: Laila Shukry El Hamansy, Social Research Center, The American University in Cairo, 113 Sharia Kasr, El Aini, Cairo, Egypt.

Finland: Elina Haavio-Mannila, University of Helsinki, Institute of Sociology, Hallituskatu 11-13, Helsinki 10, Finland.

France, North Africa: Andrée Michel and Feyrabend Lautman, Centre d'Études Sociologiques, 82, Rue Cardinet, Paris XVII, France.

Germany: Erwin K. Scheuch, Forschungsinstitut fuer Soziologie, University of Koln, 5 Koln-Sulz, Zulpicher Strasse 18, Germany.

Great Britain: Christopher Harris, University College, Swansea, Wales, U.K. and

Christopher Turner, University of East Anglia, Norwich, U.K.

Greece: Constantina Saflios-Rothschild and John Georgiopoulos, Merrill Palmer Institute, 71 East Ferry Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

- Holland, Afrikaans, S. Africa, Indonesia*: Gerrit Kooy and L. Th van Leeuwen, Department of Sociology, Heerenstraat 25, Wageningen, Netherlands.
- Hungary*: Elizabeth Kosa, Szociologiai Jutato Csoport, L. Uri Utca 49, Budapest, Hungary and Laszlo Cseh-Szombathy, 11., Keleti Karoly U. 5-7, Budapest, Hungary (Hungarian Central Statistical Office).
- India, Ceylon, Pakistan*: Dhierendra Narain, Department of Sociology, University of Bombay, Bombay 32, India and A. A. Khatri, B.M. Institute, Ashram Road, near Nehru Bridge, Ahmedabad 9, India.
- Iran*: Morteza Kotobi, 23, 25 rue Djamchid, Ave. Ferdowsi, Tehran, Iran.
- Italy*: Gian A. Gilli, Centro Ricerche Sociologiche, Olivetti, Ivrea, Italy.
- Japan*: Kiyomi Morioka, Tokyo Kyoiku University, Otsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
- Korea*: Man-Gap Lee, Seoul National University, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Seoul, Korea.
- Latin America*: Luis Linero-Otero, Mexican Institute of Social Studies, 40 Londres, Mexico City, Mexico.
- Malaysia*: Joseph B. Tamney, University of Singapore, Dept. of Sociology, Bukit Timah Road, Singapore 10.
- New Zealand*: Miriam Gilson, Department of Social Administration and Sociology, Victoria University of Wellington, P.O.B. 196, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Norway*: Erik Grønseth, Institute of Sociology, University of Oslo, Blindern, Box 1096, Oslo 3, Norway.
- Phillipines*: Shiro Saito and Diana Chang, University of Hawaii, University Library, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Poland*: Antonina Kłoskowska, Uniwersytecka 3, Lodz, Poland.
- Romania*: Octavian Berlogea, Institutel de Expertiza si Recuperare a Capacitatii de Munca, Romulus, 62- Bucuresti, Romania and David Stratman, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
- Spain and Portugal*: Salustiano del Campo, Instituto de la Opinion Publica, Paseo de la Castellana 40, Madrid, 1, Spain.
- Sweden*: Jan Trost, Department of Sociology, University of Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Taiwan*: Frank Wen Tsai, c/o Professor W. Eberhard, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, California 90720.
- Turkey*: Yildiz Tugrul, Sekizinci Cadde. No. 7-6, Bahcelievler, Ankara, Turkey.
- U.S.S.R.*: A. G. Kharchev and V. B. Golofast, Academy of Sciences, 4 Embankment Makarova, Leningrad V-164, U.S.S.R.

West Africa: A. K. Datta, Department of Sociology, University College, Cape Coast, Ghana.

Yugoslavia: Olivera Burič, Institute of Social Sciences, Beograd, Norodnog fronta br. 45, Potranski fah 927, B-58, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

Acknowledgment is made to the National Science Foundation for a grant, (GN575) that enabled me to spend the summer of 1968 working on the U.S.A. materials at the Family Study Center, University of Minnesota, and the fall semester of 1969 writing this report. This grant also provided funds for student assistance in translating, data analysis, and secretarial tasks. Miss Marguerita Smith worked as principal assistant, and had responsibility for the bibliography, while Miss Margaret MacAdam took charge of computer operations. I also wish to thank colleagues in the department of sociology and anthropology and the computer center of Boston University for help and encouragement. My fellow members of the Committee on Family Research, International Sociological Association, have given unstinting support at all times.

PART II. GETTING THE DATA

Volunteer area editors were asked to provide two types of information:

(a) a bibliography of all items published on the sociology of the family between January 1, 1957 and December 31, 1968 for their area of the world. This was construed to mean primarily items published in that area but, secondarily, also to include items about that area published elsewhere.

(b) annotations of the most important central research contributions to the sociology of the family taken from the bibliography.

Bibliography

To translate these goals into operational terms, the following rules were accepted by area editors:

Include:

- a. Empirical research findings, using clearly specified concepts
- b. Case studies of families that reach a definite set of conclusions
- c. Statistical descriptions using rates computed per thousand married women, per thousand married men, or some equally clearly defined family category
- d. Anthropological descriptions of family behavior, or family typologies

- e. Historical descriptions of families as types
- f. Contributions using explicit family variables either as consequences or as determinants of other variables such as income studies, consumer behavior, unemployment, migration, refugees, illegitimacy, juvenile delinquency, adoption, aging, socialization, and personality development
- g. Family budget studies where the family and not the budget is central
- h. Chapters or sections about the family in general monographs, review articles, or books. This will include data about families in community studies and other microsociological research.

Exclude:

- a. All contributions where individual variables (such as men, women, children) rather than family variables (such as marital, parental, kinship and sibling roles) are used. This deliberately excludes most of the literature of individual psychology and is selective about items from social psychology. Much of applied psychology, such as educational psychology, counseling psychology and psychoanalysis is thus excluded from the bibliography.
- b. Non-systematic works on marriage and the family directed towards the layman or the general public; persuasive articles; prescriptive articles; text books for schools and colleges; articles on morals in courtship, or marriage; advice-to-parent guides; most of the material in glossy mass-circulation magazines; and most essays in intellectual magazines intended for a general public. Legal and religious treatises on the family, since they are primarily normative and prescriptive, should also be excluded.

Aldous and Hill (1967) list 1,014 items in non-English languages between 1957 and 1964. *Sociological Abstracts* includes some 1,750 items under *Sociology of the Family* between 1957 and 1968; of this total 700 items approximately are about the family outside the U.S.A. (*Sociol. Abstracts*, 1952-). The present bibliography of 2,090 items is not directly comparable with these totals for it includes items about non-U.S. families written in English as well as items in languages other than English. This bibliography, as will become clear in the analysis, is more restrictive in its definition of the sociology of the family than either of these sources.

In summary, the second trend report defines "family sociology" as a contribution that relates to some aspects of family role behavior and uses sociology or social psychology as the source of concepts. The intent is not to duplicate exactly what was done in 1958, but to adapt the mode of analysis and presentation to the present level of sophistication in the research literature about the family.

From the standpoint of form, a contribution to the Bibliography and Trend Report may be:

1. Book.
2. Chapter or section in a book.
3. Review article in a journal.
4. Article in a journal.
5. Published report of an official government, or United Nations, or similar agency.
6. Published report of a voluntary association such as a church, welfare agency, or political party.
7. Dissertation, if copies are available in a library.
8. Textbooks or compendiums.
9. Final reports of research projects, if copies are available on request.

Given the specialized definition of the sociology of the family and the emphasis on research studies, the size of the present bibliography is one measure of the success of the collective enterprise. The bibliography includes items that have not entered into other compilations and that in the critical judgement of family scholars familiar with their local literature deserve to be known. The fact that some countries are not represented must again be mentioned but they can probably be covered in succeeding trend reports. The present bibliography is as complete and selective as is possible.

Annotations

The task of annotating research items proved more challenging than compiling the bibliography: Area Editors were asked to fill out a short summary of those items that made an important contribution to family sociology as we defined it above. These annotation sheets specified that, in addition to the bibliographic material, information be given on:

- a) problem of research,
- b) concepts used,
- c) research design,
- d) data collection,
- e) data analysis,
- f) findings.

Each of these headings was discussed during 1967 through correspondence and their meanings operationalized. In the second half of 1968, a code book giving much more specific detail was circularized. However, the idea of making a detailed inventory of the methodological aspects of the research that had gone into the production of a contribution was evidently unusual. Some area editors considered that a statement of the type of

contribution and a short version of the conclusions reached by the author was what was sought. In general, the annotations cover with care and accuracy, the concepts used by the author and give specific details about the findings or conclusions reached. In the tables that follow, the statistical material is based on the application of the code book to the written annotations provided by the area editors.

While a request for such detail was itself unusual and demanding, a trial run of the literature of family sociology published in the U.S.A. (Mogey, 1969) discovered that authors in U.S. journals did not generally report their procedures in sufficient detail to allow us to uncover either their specific methods of data collection or their specific techniques of data analysis.

One conclusion that emerged from that study is that in the reporting of substantive research results through journal articles, the assumption

TABLE I
Outline of major sections of trend report

Major Analytical Variable	Represented in the text by:
TIME	1 twelve year unit: 1957-1968 2 six year intervals: 1957-1962 1963-1968 4 three year intervals: 1957-1959 1960-1962 1963-1965 1966-1968 12 single years
GEOGRAPHY	39 countries, as given earlier 10 regions, shown in the List of World Regions in the Bibliography 1 world unit, excluding the U.S.A.
GROUPS OF VARIABLES	<i>Theoretical Approach :</i> 7 conceptual frameworks, see Table III. <i>Research Design :</i> use of existing data, field studies; community context. <i>Data Collection :</i> size of sample, use of random samples, type of family variable measured; level of measurement, nominal, ordinal, interval or cumulative scales; family role studied: spousal or parental, or sibling. <i>Data Analysis :</i> use of descriptive statistics, statistical tests used, verbal summaries, typologies, number of authors, one or more. Subject matter: List of Descriptors in Bibliography.

TABLE II
Output of family sociology

Year	U.S.A.	Canada	Latin America	Japan	U.S.S.R.	Asia	West. Europe	East. Europe	North. Europe	Australia New Zealand
1945-1947	244	—	—	1	—	—	44	—	11	—
1948-1950	291	—	—	8	—	—	114	—	8	—
1951-1953	360	—	—	35	—	7	150	—	29	—
1954-1956	509	—	—	19	—	13	203	—	27	—
1957-1959	1,070	3	15	28	13	10	33	19	27	12
1960-1962	2,745	3	15	30	21	36	35	50	30	13
1963-1965	2,730	22	29	35	35	93	48	57	37	19
1966-1967	1,010	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1966-1968	—	17	24	60	37	77	41	72	37	12

Sources: 1945-56: Hill, 1958.

1957-67: U.S.A., Moge, 1969; figures are estimates from a 10% sample.

1957-68: Regions, this report, annotations only included. Bibliography totals are much larger.

seems to be that coherent techniques for data collection and data manipulation are so well established that they need not be recorded. This assumption does not hold in the U.S.A. where a common language, and to some extent, common graduate school traditions, might be expected to promote a set of shared norms for family research. The recording in publications of research methods in other world areas is equally inadequate. To some extent, this gap in information may result from the policies of editors of journals.

Other reviews of the literature of family research in the U.S.A. have also

TABLE III
*Percentage distributions of family research studies
using different conceptual frameworks for world and for U.S.A.
by three year intervals and by one time period*

Conceptual Framework ³	Time Period ¹					
	1957-59	1960-62	1963-65	1965-68	1957-68	1957 ² -67
Anthropological	9	9	11	8	9	3
Sociological	29	23	31	32	30	13
Institutional	20	19	17	15	17	8
Psychological	13	11	13	16	13	38
Psychoanalytical	1	1	1	1	1	18
Ecological	16	19	16	17	16	9
Developmental	5	3	4	3	3	10
N	184	263	397	394	1.238	723

1. Figures are percentages of N: columns do not add exactly to 100% because items not coded for conceptual framework (10%) are omitted and percentages have been rounded.

2. Moge, 1969: 228. U.S.A. only.

3. Examples of key words used in classifying annotations by conceptual frameworks:

- a) *Anthropological*: consanguinal family; conjugal family; lineage; descent; residence; marriage as exogamy, levirate, polygamy; culture.
- b) *Sociological*: nuclear family; family of orientation; equilibrium; function; family position; family role; instrumental or expressive role differentiation.
- c) *Institutional*: legal rules for marriage or inheritance; divorce rules; marriage customs; family budget; historical changes.
- d) *Social Psychological*: socialization; love; hostility; self as I and me; symbolic environment; interpersonal relationship.
- e) *Psychoanalytical*: personality as id, ego or superego; unconscious; cathexism; latency; oral, anal, or genital stages; obsession.
- f) *Ecological*: immigration, assimilation; family fertility; demographic elements; statistical counts of married persons.
- g) *Developmental*: stages of family cycle; family tasks; role sequence; family career; unity of interacting personalities; semi-closed system.

Nye and Berardo, 1966.

pleaded for more attention to be paid to methodological issues, though the issue of omission of information on methods in favor of using journal space for other aspects of research has not been raised: Nye and Bayer, 1963; Klein & others, 1969, Ruand and others, 1969.

PART III. ANALYSING THE ANNOTATIONS

The annotations prepared by the area editors may be regarded as the reports of a 'panel of judges' on family sociology. As judges, they accepted a book of rules for what should be included. These rules were designed to exclude as much as possible of those writings about the family that are not based on serious research. As will be clear once the presentation of the data from the annotations begins, the rules allowed into this study a wide variety of research reports.

Each report was searched for information on specific variables that are indicators of the principal components of sociological research. These components and the variables that represent them in this report are:

1. Theoretical approach: seven conceptual frameworks as shown in Table III;
 2. Research design: use of existing data; use of new data; community context;
 3. Data collection: sample size; use of random samples; variables that measure structural elements of role interaction or systemic properties of the family as a whole; spouse role;
 4. Data analysis: ordinal level of measurement; use of verbal analysis; use of descriptive statistics; one author; single or multiple authorship;
 5. Subject matter: descriptor list given at the end of the bibliography.
- Some 218 separate variables were listed in the code book. Coders worked as a team, checking on each other, to ensure a high degree of reliability. For certain of the code book variables there were too few cases to be used in the analysis: for others coders reported that inferences had to be made frequently because the key word for the variable was not given in the annotation. The nineteen variables, given above, together with the descriptor list, are those that survived both this process of elimination through experience, and also survived the statistical analyses to be reported below. They are variables that measure frequencies in the annotations that show, on some test of significance, real differences in this set of reports about the output of family sociology.

With regard to the geographical context of family research, three alternatives have been used at various points in the analyses. First, since this

is the world, without the U.S.A., the set of reports has been treated as a single output. Second, the set is divided into reports from 39 different countries. Third, because some countries have only 5 or 6 annotations over this twelve year span, and because the continent of Africa produced many research reports that did not fit easily into any list of contemporary nation states, a grouping of countries into regions has been used.

Some comments on the geographical context of the data will follow after the third aspect of this trend analysis has been mentioned.

The third element in this trend analysis is time. Here, four alternatives exist and all have been used:

- 1) each year of the twelve between 1957 and 1968 can be treated as a unit;
- 2) years can be grouped into four sets of 3 year intervals: 1957-59; 1960-62; 1963-65; 1966-68;
- 3) two six year intervals are possible: 1957-62; 1963-68.
- 4) the whole twelve years can be considered as a single unit of time.

Diagrammatically, the scheme for reporting on trends in the sociology of the family is given in Table I.

This study represents a continuation of the first trend report on the sociology of marriage and family behavior (*Current Sociology* 7 (1), 1968). During the period 1957-1968, several other inventories of family research in the U.S.A. have appeared. So as the analyses of the present data proceeds, reference will be made to these other secondary sources.

Countries and regions of the world

The list of world regions was constructed heuristically so that adequate numbers of annotations were present in contiguous areas to provide a base for the descriptive analysis of changes over time. The ten regions follow the scheme used in the United Nations Demographic publications (United Nations, 1966). Each annotation was entered to the region to which it applied: thus a study, for example, published in Finland about families in Ovamboland would be entered under Africa (code: 43) and not under Northern Europe (Finland):

43 036 TUUPAINEN, Maija. *Marriage in a matrilineal African tribe*. University of Helsinki, Institute of Social Policy Studies, series B, No. 2, 1968, 230 p.

So, too, a study of Hindu families published in Japan is entered under India (code: 34):

34 161 NAKANE, Chie. "An analysis of Hindu families" (Japanese). *Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 43, 1967: 1-82.

Comparative studies as for example:

33 029 FREEDMAN, Ronald. "Norms for family size in underdeveloped areas", pages 215-230 in: NAM, B. (ed.), *Population and Society*, Boston, Mass., 1968.

is entered to Asia (code: 33), since the data mainly relate to Taiwan. It is a measure of the area specificity of family sociology that only one or two cases, certainly less than half of one per cent of all annotations, caused questions about the area to which they belonged. General reports about the family in Europe, or any other continental area, that use data to support their statements, have not yet begun to appear in any numbers in any geographical area.

Cross-cultural comparisons of two or more ethnic or tribal or national groups account for 0.5% of the output in 1957-62 and for 3.3% in 1963-68. This rise does not reach statistical significance, so it is not recognized in this report as a trend. Yet the potential is present, as the study of the U.S.A. data 1957-67 showed. As studies of the effects of urbanization and of changes in community structures and cultures are shown later to be increasing, so the attempts at comparative approaches to data collection should increase. For in the analysis of the relations between governmental or community changes and changes in family interaction, each national or community group is simply one case. Two areas, Canada and U.S.S.R. report 0 and 1 cross-cultural study in these years; 15 or 16 are reported for Japan, Asia, Africa, Southern and Eastern Europe and Northern Europe; almost 67% of these comparative studies were published between 1963 and 1968. Examples are recorded in the bibliography index under 106, Comparative Studies; one instance from the annotations is:

35 106 SMITH, Robert J.; RAMSEY, Charles E.; CASTILLO, Gelia. "Parental authority and job choice: sex differences in three cultures". *Amer. J. Sociol.* 69 (2), 1963: 143-149.

At this point, a list of the countries that contribute most annotations* to each of the ten regions makes clear some of the sources of variability in the more statistical sections that follow. Wherever region and country are the same, tables give adequate information.

CANADA:

French Canada, since much of the English literature is covered in Spencer, 1967.

SOUTH AMERICA:

Brazil: 39 annotations; 19 about fertility, birth control, abortion, adoption or similar topics; 8 about education or economic influences on family

* A small number of these annotations are not included in our *Bibliography*, for lack of adequate bibliographical data.

behavior; 10 are general institutional studies of social change and the family. Almost all, 41 out of 42, are by one author; one single author has three papers and three have two papers each, so that many scholars are involved.

Mexico: 20 annotations: 7 about family planning, fertility, abortion and similar topics; 7 about peasant or worker families. Almost all, 19 out of 20, by single authors; no case of more than one contribution by any author.

Colombia: 10 annotations: 8 on fertility, family planning or abortions; 3 on peasants, workers, etc. All by single authors; one author has 2 annotations.

Chile: 5 annotations, all on family fertility, or family planning.

Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela: 2 or 3 very descriptive papers from each country on family composition.

ASIA:

Japan: 155 annotations, adequately covered in tables.

U.S.S.R.: 106 annotations, adequately covered in tables.

Taiwan: 47 annotations: 20% of them by joint authors. All papers by joint authors include one American. Some 5 or 6 of the one author papers are by Americans. Two topics dominate the literature: (1) Ethnographic descriptions of traditional family types and of changes in them, as for instance papers about the adopted daughter, auspicious marriage, clan rules, property transfers; (2) sociological studies, primarily of fertility and family planning. This type could be extended to include some empirical research on child training, attitudes to marriage, male selection, and extended family patterns. Evidentially, at least two research traditions co-exist: an older one concerned with rules rather than behavior and working with historical or institutional records, and a more recent development of empirical field research about family behavior. The two influence each other for several of the more recent papers use concepts and data from both traditions.

Korea: 37 annotations: Similar evidence to that for Taiwan for interaction between institutional and empirical approaches exists. Three topics dominate the literature: (1) historical, descriptive, macroscopic studies that give way after 1962 to studies with similar methodology but with an emphasis on kinship and family patterns under conditions of social change; (2) after 1965 studies of fertility and birth control become important; (3) empirical studies relating first to occupational and economic change, and later, following the construction of a social class index, to

family behavior: comparative studies of Korean, Japanese and Chinese family undergoing social change follow. The output is unusual in that 3 authors write 20 out of 37 papers and often appear with others in the 7 papers with more than one author. In contrast, therefore, to Taiwan and to the Philippines, Korea is a region of scholarly isolation.

Phillipines: 85 annotations, 30% of which are signed by more than one author. This high proportion is a sign that visiting researchers in this country work with members of the local group of family sociologists. Another indication of group activity is a set of five annotations on aids to research. The most common contribution is a descriptive account of a tribal sub-group. Next come three topics of equal frequency: (1) transactions between families and economic factors; (2) internal family interaction, mainly child rearing; and (3) fertility and allied topics. Other topics include marriage patterns, mate selection and the impact of societal changes on the family.

Turkey: 6 annotations, four of them descriptions of special groups such as rural village, women or squatters and the other two about fertility.

Israel: 10 annotations. The Israel annotations do less than justice to the number of studies of the Israeli family. The 10 annotations range widely: they include several institutional descriptive studies about the shtetl family, religious rules for marriage and kinship; others that use empirical sociological methodology to explain such topics as the adjustment of immigrants, socialization of children, and fertility both in the kibbutzim and in Israel generally.

AFRICA:

The 109 annotations were gathered from several area editors: West Africa – 49; East Africa – 5; Middle Africa – 31; North Africa – 19; Africa – 5. Of these 109, 95 or 87% are signed by one name. Six authors have two titles and two have three titles each in the collection. The same author proportions hold whether the language of the original is English or French. Half deal broadly with the affects of social change on family housing, standards of living, or education of the children. The other half are descriptive institution studies of marriage, kinship, divorce, law, or property and usually about traditional tribal societies. Research reports dealing with empirical data about urbanization, youth, women, and intermarriage are particularly frequent in French-speaking Africa. Unfortunately, both Afrikaans-speaking South Africa and Egypt are represented by only one or two annotations.

WESTERN EUROPE:

Belgium: 65 annotations, three quarters by one author. The 25% by two or more authors is a high proportion, and since the same names appear on both single and joint author papers, indicates the presence of an active indigeneous center for family research. Five papers are by one author, three papers by another, while two authors have two papers apiece. The major topic is occupational influences on the family, especially studies of family budgets and of the effects of women working. Next in frequency comes fertility, followed closely by studies of social problems. A group of papers on aids to research confirms the presence of an active research group. Three recent papers on family policy indicate an emerging topic of concern.

France: 40 annotations, all but eight by single authors. One author has eighteen contributions. Four broad topics predominate, reflecting the interests of different research groups: (1) Education, especially very young children and mother-child relations; (2) the changing definition of the roles of women; (3) economic aspects of family life; and (4) marriage patterns. A minor theme, but important for the quality of the work, is the empirical historical investigation of family sociology from parish records. Three papers on research aids confirm the existence of an interest in sociological research about the family.

West Germany: 12 annotations, half of them signed by two or more authors. The topics range widely from macroscopic studies of urbanization, by way of an official statistical analysis to improve the performance record of the Ministry of the Family in the Bundesrepublik, to specialized applied tests for the effects of television on child rearing practices.

Netherlands: 37 annotations, on a wide variety of topics. Eight items are about the economic state of the family, but not as in other countries concerned much with the role of the working wife. Marriage and mate selection come next in frequency: then follow a few studies of religion, education and the family. Four or five studies on aids to research mark the existence of a group of family sociologists. Of these annotations, one third are by joint authors. No single author signs more than four of these contributions.

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE:

Region is primarily Eastern Europe, since Southern Europe has only annotations from Greece and Spain.

Greece: 34 annotations, with 7, or 20%, by two or more authors. Two authors contribute five papers each or about one third of the output.

The dominant theme is the effect of social change on the family. There are for this country six studies comparing some aspect of the Greek family with other countries of Europe, or with the U.S.A. Many reports are about village life rather than about the predominant urban family. Most papers are by visiting scholars.

Spain: 21 annotations by 12 different authors. They cover a range of topics, mostly using institutional concepts: an encouraging feature is the appearance of three articles summarizing for the benefit of Spanish speaking sociologists trends and methods used in family research in the U.S. and Great Britain.

Poland: 115 annotations, 105 signed by one author. Of these 105 papers or books 35 authors contribute one paper each; 7, four papers each; 15, two papers each; one author has 5 papers, and another has 7 papers. Poland evidently has a corps of active researchers in family sociology. The range of papers is wide. It includes a minority, 17, or 15%, of descriptive studies. The dominant topic is the influence of occupational or economic conditions on family life styles. Fertility studies are less common than studies of family disorganization which come to about 15% of the total. Noteable as an indicator of the existence of a viable group of family sociologists are 9 papers on research theory or methodology.

Hungary: 22 annotations, 18 signed by single authors. Three of these authors contribute half the output. Studies of fertility and birth control account for almost half of the papers. The majority of the remainder are empirical descriptions of family interactions for special groups in the population: these amount to 30% of the total. Only two broad historical or institutional items are included.

Czechoslovakia: 14 annotations, mostly careful empirical studies of the employment of married women and its effects on the socialization or education of children or on family interaction. A subsidiary group of papers deals with fertility, and family problems like abortion or marital counseling. Results from Czechoslovakia were affected by political disturbances.

NORTHERN EUROPE:

Great Britain: 65 annotations, 66% by single authors and 33% with the names of 2 or more authors. No author contributes more than 2 papers to the total. Two research summary articles are included, so here too, is a small group of family sociologists. The output differs from that of other regions in including 12 items, 18%, that are historical but also

empirical. Equal in frequency are studies of divorce, delinquency, old age, and other family problems. Smaller topics include kinship networks, work and the family, and family planning and fertility.

Sweden: 12 annotations, all by single authors. The predominant theme here is mate selection and the studies are very sensitive to theoretical and methodological requirements.

Norway: 30 annotations, eleven by the same author; only two of the thirty are by two or more authors. The principal topics are: (1) marriage patterns and mate selection; (2) socialization, particularly a group of 7 papers on father-absent sailor families; and (3) the changing roles of women, with the emphasis on housework, rather than on wage earning. Two or three papers on aids to research are present in the annotations. The pattern is very similar to that for France: two differences are the attention given to homemaking and the fact that the three historical papers use an institutional approach.

AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND:

Australia: 48 annotations, twelve of them empirical studies of the problems of new immigrant families, with a few parallel studies of mixed Australian-aboriginal families. The Australian family is written about mainly in terms of changing roles and functions. There are some fertility studies, 4 out of 48, and some studies of familydisorganization.

New Zealand: 9 annotations, five of them about the Maori family. The remainder cover social change and the New Zealand family, and studies of fertility.

Definitions of trends

Before launching into a discussion of trends, it will be well to take a look at two related topics: (1) What is a trend? and (2) the methods to be used to examine trends, once it is decided what they are.

All of the many uses of the word "trend" assume that something is changing from one period of time to another. All measurements of trends assume that variables are tracing out a path through time. Observations may depart from the trend line tracing the path because of errors due to sampling, or of errors made in coding, or for many other reasons. The trend line is, therefore, best regarded as an average, or mean, for a moving series of observations. As an average description of what has happened during a past period of time, it does not necessarily predict the future. The comparison of trend lines for separate variables assumes at the simplest level that they are products of some underlying system that generates these trends.

The objectives of the present trend analysis are modest. Sophisticated mathematical tools such as those used by economists in time series analysis would be inappropriate. The annotations are a rich source of data, but the methods used in their analysis must be respectful of their variety and quality. The acceptance of a set of rules by the area editors who prepared them would, if the rules were followed, increase the likelihood of discovering trend lines, or average frequencies of change in the use of specific variables that are similar to each other. Trend lines tracing from 1957 to 1968 paths that are similar in slope, or some other characteristic, would be evidence that the sociology of the family forms a system of scholarship with its own coherence and sense of intellectual identity. A description of changes in cell frequencies for particular types of study would lead to the assertion of the presence of trends where the variation in fact is due to sampling error: this would lead to the acceptance of trends where none in fact existed. The application of a set of mathematical equations not specifically developed for this sort of data could lead to the denial of the existence of trends where they did, in fact, exist. This report tries to avoid these two types of potential error by combining inspection of cell frequencies with some statistical tests that are applicable to simple frequency data.

The description of family sociology as a series of isolated outposts of data and generalizations (Aldous, 1968) arose, in part, through an attempt to include psychological as well as sociological research in the same analysis. This is a legitimate point of view if all of human behavior in the area of research, the family, is the central pivot of the scheme of classification. Such topics as personality, or child development, or aging, do proceed in separate intellectual worlds from those of family roles, or family disorganization, or stages of the family cycle. The greater the range of conceptual frame works included, the more the model of the research product as a series of isolated outposts is appropriate. By excluding studies that have psychological concepts as both independent and dependent variables, studies that are simply statistical compilations, and prescriptive studies whether legal, moral, or religious, if they have no empirical data, this trend report hopes to show that enough common ground exists in the sociology of the family to justify its classification as a system of research. One defense for the present focus is the absence of common theory, or even of conceptual frameworks, in research on the family. By concentrating on commonalities exclusively in the sociology of the family, we accept the fact that the realities of the world of research make it nonsense to look for systemic variables where none can exist. This is only to say that the construction of general

theories that could be applied to all aspects of the family is not a task that can be tackled by an inventory of existing trends in research.

In several countries anthropological, demographic, historical, institutional, psychological and sociological approaches are used both empirically and non-empirically in reporting research on the family. Consequently, a unidimensional system of scholarship can never be considered as a model of these data. The rules for exclusion and inclusion are still broad enough to allow a wide variety of research reports into the analysis.

Measurement of trends

To present trends, a variety of methods are used. The simplest way to demonstrate that change occurs is to show the cell frequencies, or percentages, for several time intervals. This form is used in Table II and elsewhere.

To discover how much the cell frequencies have to differ between one time interval and a later one for this difference to be other than might be expected by chance variations, a number of statistical measures were used: for cells that gave frequency counts on any one variable binomial probabilities were calculated; where appropriate, the chi-square test was used. The analysis of variance, giving F-ratios, was used to uncover statistically significant movements in the variables taken as whole over each single year from 1957 to 1968. Similar analyses of variance uncovered the countries and the regions that contributed significantly to the trends in the data as a whole. Finally, region by region changes in contributions over time were checked by the rank order correlation test: if on any variable, a region moved from, for example, being the most frequent to being the fourth most frequent contributor, this test for *rho* measured whether this change in relative rank order position could be due to chance variation, or not.

Table I gives an outline of the major sections of the report on trends in the sociology of the family that follows.

The first noteworthy trend is the overall increase in productivity. This is clearly shown in Table II, a composite table taken from several sources. Most regions that feature largely in the trend analysis have more than doubled the number of studies in 1968 and for most, this increase takes place after 1963. Western Europe, Northern Europe, Latin America, Africa and Australia-New Zealand do not share in this increase. These are sometimes regions where growth began in 1951 or 1953 instead of after 1963: the presence and encouragement of a band of sociologists interested in the family is a necessary prerequisite for these figures. The function of the Committee on Family Research of the I.S.A. in this process will be taken up in the conclusion.

The predominant type of contribution is the journal article: this accounted for 61% of the total in 1957-62 and for 57% between 1963 and 1968, a non-significant variation. Chapters about the family, 17% to 18%, are next in frequency: about 30% of all contributions take this form in Australia, South America, Japan and the U.S.S.R. Books about the family decline from 13% in 1957-62 to 10% in 1963-68. As was observed in the previous trend report, books are most important in the U.S.S.R., Southern, Eastern and Western Europe. During the period covered by this trend report no significant changes took place in the regional rank order by type of contribution.

In all regions and all countries, at all times, one single author is usually named as the contributor. The range is from 60% in Western Europe to 97% in Japan. For the U.S.A. 1957-67, the corresponding figures are 65% for one author and 14% for books. The only region where three or more authors often sign a single contribution is the U.S.S.R. where 5% of the output in every year 1957 to 1968 is so attributed. To correct any impression about the prevalence of collective research, however, the fact that 86% of contributions from the U.S.S.R. are by one person should be recorded.

For 248 publications, 35% of the total number of field studies, the interval between field work and publication can be estimated. There is a progressive decline in this interval from 7 years in 1957 to 3 years in 1967: the modal period seems to be 5 years. This period of gestation is longest in Latin America, followed by the U.S.S.R., Africa and Northern Europe. So it may be related partly to the longer time taken to prepare qualitative data such as ethnographic descriptions for final publication. No significant regional trends occur.

To conclude this first description of cell frequencies, it should be noted that the increasing numbers of contributions which appear after 1963 are not associated with much regional variation in publication habits.

PART IV. TRENDS IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE FAMILY

In this section we consider the data derived from the annotations as a single whole, without reference to region, or country. Tables IV-VIII present changes on certain key variables both for each of the twelve yearly intervals and for two six-year intervals. The F. ratio is a measure of the significance of the difference between the samples of the world output taken for specific periods of time.

Before moving to these tables, Table III allows a comparison of the

TABLE IV

Level of significance of changes in use of conceptual frameworks for world, ex. U.S.A., output of family sociology

Conceptual Framework	F Values	
	twelve single years	two six-year intervals
Sociological	6.74*	7.56*
Institutional	3.96 (n.s.)	7.08*
Psychological	9.07*	8.00*
Ecological	8.60*	9.32**

* significant at $p < .05$ level.

** significant at $p < .01$ level.

n.s. non-significant.

Changes in other conceptual frameworks are non-significant.

TABLE V

Percentage use of different sources of data by geographical area and time

Source of Data	Area and Time					
	Europe and Asia		World ex. U.S.A.	U.S.A.		
	1945-50	1951-56	1957-68	1945-50	1951-56	1957-67
Existing	43	48	49	26	24	25
New	43	39	44	63	62	69
Combinations and no data	14	13	7	11	14	6
N	99	127	1,262	86	110	723

Sources: 1945-50, 1951-56: *Current Sociol.* 7 (1), 1958: p. 13, Table 4.

1957-67: Mogyey, 1969.

1957-68: this study.

Figures are rounded percentages.

percentage frequency in the use of conceptual frameworks for four periods between 1957 and 1968. The cells do not show any marked variability, though the decline in the use of institutional concepts and in developmental concepts should be noted. More striking are the differences between these data and the U.S.A. output for 1957-1967, approximately the same period. The emphasis in the U.S.A. on social psychological and psychoanalytical concepts is extremely marked. A conceptual framework is not a theory

but a group of concepts that tend to be used together. Although not a theory in the sense of a set of propositions from which a researcher may derive specific hypotheses, conceptual frameworks provide a general guide to the theoretical stance that is used by the researcher in problem seeking and data collection.

A single annotation may have a wide variety of concepts. To allow for this, we provided for each annotation two conceptual frameworks. This was normally enough to characterize any one book, article or monograph since, as may be seen from the list, each conceptual framework covers a wide band of potential variables. These two conceptual frameworks were not considered to be more important and less important; they were coded as being equal in their relevance for the research material. One measure of conceptual sophistication is the ability to code a single annotation with one and only one conceptual framework: 11% of these data are so classified, and this proportion remains constant over the whole period.

Table IV incorporates data for the four most frequently used conceptual frameworks. It shows that the difference in output in 1968 is significantly different than would be expected by chance when it is compared with 1957. Sociological, social psychological and ecological concepts all increase in use: institutional concepts decline. Later sections of this analysis will identify which countries and which regions contributed most to these trends. Examples of the type of item classed as sociological are:

- 37 016 BIRZHANOVA, M. A. "The family on the collective farms in Uzbekistan" (Russian) in: *Materials on the collective farms in the Namagansk region*, Tashkent, 1959.
- 35 051 HUNT, Chester C.; COLLIER, R. W. "Inter-marriage and cultural change: a study of Philippine-American marriages". *Soc. Forces* 35 (3), 1957: 223-230.

and as ecological are:

- 33 093 YUAN, D. Y. "Marital characteristics in relation to the rural-urban continuum in Taiwan". *Demography* 5(1), 1968: 93-103.
- 63 092 OLSZEWSKA-LADYKOWA, A.; ZYGULSKI, K. "Mixed marriages in Slask Opolski" (Polish). *Przegląd Socjologiczny* 23 (1), 1959: 89-106.

Research Design

Four important variables of research design indicate that regular and consistent changes take place in these data during the twelve year period. They are: use of existing, or secondary, data; use of new data collected through field studies; the code "no old data" which is a further measure

of the prevalence of field studies; and studies concentrating on collecting family data in the community instead of from schools, hospitals, factories or other settings.

The studies divide roughly in half on the use of existing data, 49% of the total, or the collection of new data, 44% of total; between 5% and 10% of studies combine both sorts of data about equally. Existing data come mainly from official records such as vital statistics of marriages, births and deaths; a minority use social work agency or hospital or school records; census data are used by 6% of all studies; and historical sources by 7%. Later paragraphs on regional and country uses of existing data will present information on at least two traditions in this type of research. Examples of studies using existing data are:

- 10 029 GORIBAULT, Odile. *Perception of marital roles* (French). Thesis, M. A. in social work, University of Montreal, 1966.
- 61 060 DELCOURT, Jacques; LAMARQUE, Gérard. "Evolution in the working class family" (French) in: *Un faux dilemme. Embourgeoisement ou prolétarianisation de la classe ouvrière*. Bruxelles, La pensée catholique, 1963.

New data may be gathered through field surveys using either interviews, questionnaires, or observation: these types of research design account for 86% of all studies that collect any new data. In addition, some 7% are case studies and 3% are classified as experiments. Between 1951 and 1956 a similar proportion of case studies is recorded: this marks a decline from 10% in the 1945-51 period (Hill, 1958). Studies were recorded as using new data wherever its collection was noted: in almost all cases such studies made some reference to existing sources of data, whether historical documents, the census, or official or unofficial records. Very few studies that set out to analyse existing data referred to the secondary analysis of survey data: the use of secondary analysis amounted to 2% from 1957-62 and to 3% from 1963-68.

For these elements of research design it is possible to give percentages from 1945 to 1968. This is done in Table V. The figures are only roughly comparable, since they are from different samples and from different coding processes. Nonetheless, there is an impressive stability in the proportions and the contrast between sociological research on the family in the U.S.A. and in other parts of the world persists throughout this period of almost 25 years. This is especially true for the few replication studies as, for example:

- 64 115 TURNER, Christopher. "Conjugal roles and social networks: a re-examination of an hypothesis". *Hum. Rel.* 20(2), 1967: 121-130.

Studies collecting data in a community context are the most frequent type of research design. Data collection in schools, colleges or hospitals is surprisingly infrequent. One other location increases significantly and that is the factory: the increase here is highly specific and is confined to Japan, U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. Community studies increase from 40% of the total between 1967 and 1962 to 52% between 1963 and 1968. It is evident that the study of one community, or of two communities in the same country, is the most common type of field study in this literature. Examples of community studies are:

- 10 003 BALIKLI, Asen. "Matrimonial rules of the Netsilik Eskimos" (French). *Homme* 3 (3), 1963: 88-101.
- 37 062 KUCHBERIJA, P. E. "Regarding the development of marriage customs and ceremonies among the Abkhazy" (Russian), pages 125-175 in: *The Contemporary Abkhazy Village*, Tbilisi, 1967.
- 61 047 DE BIE, Pierre; HAESAERT, J.; LEPLAE, Claire. *Analytical study of social stratification agents of direct contribution in Belgium* (French). Liège, Centre inter-universitaire de sociologie, 1959, 100 p. and 149 tables.
- 50 057 ZUBRZYCKI, Jerzy. *Settlers of the Latrobe valley. A sociological study of immigrants in the brown coal industry in Australia*. Canberra, Australian National University, 1964.
- 50 032 MARTIN, Jean I. "Extended kinship ties: an Adelaide study". *The Australian and New Zealand J. of Sociol.* 3, 1967: 44-63.

All of these research design variables show a significant increase over the twelve year period. This is shown in Table VI.

Data Collection

The key variables for this section are: sample size; use of random samples; measurement of structural and systemic variables; and data collection from the spouse role.

The size of the sample may vary from one unit as in a case study of a single family to the entire universe of families as when the census is used, or when all of a village community is surveyed. The significant change in the period is the increase in the use of samples of 100-499 units: this is a general trend. The use of small samples, both of under 10 and of under 100 units, did not increase more than would be expected given the overall increase in all sorts of studies.

Statisticians and methodologists remind sociologists that only random probability samples permit the testing of hypotheses. In these data, the proportion of non-random types of sampling does not vary significantly:

of the total 20% of studies use random samples, 6% use the whole universe without sampling, and 29% select non-representatively from the universe. Examination of Table VIII shows that, unlike the previous table on type of data, the use of random sampling techniques has become much more frequent, by family sociologists both in the U.S.A. and in all other parts of the world. This is a major gain in research sophistication. One example is: 61 039 CREUSEN, Joseph. *Observation in the process of socialization and extra-professional life of young workers in an industrial milieu* (French). Louvain, Université Catholique, Institut des sciences politiques et sociales, thesis, 1964, 324 p.

Reliability in the coding of the number of independent, intervening or dependent variables used in these studies was poor, largely because of lack of detail in the reports. However, it was possible to get reliable counts of the type of variable measured. These could be: (1) an attribute of an individual such as age, intelligence, or attitude; (2) structural, an attribute of family role structure such as measures of marital adjustment or parental satisfaction; or (3) systemic, an attribute of the family as a small social system such as cohesion, or integration, or socioeconomic status. Almost half of all studies use a combination of structural and systemic variables: the systemic variable is not normally social class for 55% of all studies do not report on social class. These structural and systemic variables are central to sociology as an intellectual enterprise and the fact that 53% of studies report their use, and that the trend is towards an increase in their use, is encouraging. Variables that refer to individual attributes appear in 24% of the studies, though those that measure individual attributes and no others make up only 7% or 8% of this literature. Examples of entries that use structural and systemic variables are:

- 32 001 ABE, Toshiki. "Income structure and family types of contemporary, urban families in Sapporo City - the single-earner type and the plural-earner type -". (Japanese). *Jap. sociol. R.* 54, 1963: 18-41.
- 33 066 ROH, Chang shub. *A study of urban community* (Korean). Seoul, Ewha Woman's University Press, 1963.
- 35 031 FORTIER, David H. *Culture change among Chinese agricultural settlers in British North Borneo*. New York City, Columbia University (Doctoral Dissertation), 1964.

By far the most frequent role for the respondent in these field studies is that of adult: as the period progressed this declined from 35% to 30% of the annotations. The significant increase was in asking specifically about the role of the spouse, rather than the role of the parent. Children were said to be respondents in less than 5% of the studies, and the proportion

TABLE VI

*Level of significance of changes in use of research design for world,
ex. U.S.A., output of family sociology*

Research Design	F Values	
	single years	six year intervals
Use of existing data	10.75**	6.61*
No use of existing data	8.08*	8.71*
Field study with new data	6.52*	7.64*
One community	8.90*	7.81*

* significant at $p < .05$ level.

** significant at $p < .01$ level.

TABLE VII

*Level of significance of changes in data collection for world,
ex. U.S.A., output of family sociology*

Data Collection	F Values	
	single years	six year intervals
Sample size 100-500	8.43*	14.66**
Random samples	7.35*	7.24*
Structural and systemic variables	7.42*	7.91*
Spouse role	—	14.26**

* significant at $p < .05$ level.

** significant at $p < .01$ level.

TABLE VIII

*Percentage distribution of use of sampling for world and for U.S.A.
in different time intervals*

Type of Samples	Europe and Asia		World ex. U.S.A.	U.S.A.		
	1945-50	1951-56	1957-68	1945-50	1951-56	1957-67
	Random samples	14	11	20	6	10
Non-Representative samples	35	36	36	67	61	38

Sources: see Table V.

Percentages do not add to 100% because other types of sampling are omitted.

declined over these years. These indicators point to a significant increase in studies of the family as a unit of marital relations: studies of the family as a social institution decline, as do studies of parental relations. The trends in data collection mentioned in these paragraphs are illustrated by the statistics in Table VII. As an illustration of a study using the spouse as informant, there is:

- 64 053 JEPHCOTT, Pearl; SEGAR, Nancy; SMITH, John H. *Married Women Working*. London, Allen and Unwin, 1962.
- 64 089 ROSSER, C.; HARRIS, C. C. *The Family and Social Change. A Study of Family and Kinship in a South Wales Town*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965, XIV + 340 p.

Data analysis

Although all the elements of research are important, the heart of an empirical research study lies in the methods used for data analysis. On this depends the quality of the information on which conclusions have to be based. A count of frequency of use of particular methods of data analysis, as presented in Table IX, shows that the increase in use of statistical tests for measures of probability or association, first reported in 1958, continues. The drop from 11% in 1951-56 to 8% in 1957-68 could be due to sampling variability.

Descriptive statistics in the form of means, averages, percentages or standard deviations, are the most common mathematical device used in data analysis. The most common form of data presentation is simply verbal summaries that are expected to be acceptable to the reader because they are based on experience, or on a summary of reading, or on personal intuition. Experience, reading and intuition, all have a legitimate contribution to make in sociological research, but statements based only on these types of data and supported by selected illustrative material, or by anecdotes, have to be accepted by the reader without the possibility of testing them. This is part of a pre-scientific tradition. Cases in point seem to be:

- 37 014 BELICER, V. N. "Family living style and spiritual culture" (Russian), pp. 285-315 in: *Sketches of the ethnography of the peoples of Komi, 19th and early 20th centuries. Papers of the Ethnographic Institute of the Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.*, 10, 1958.
- 33 072 TSAI, Wen hui "Changing attitudes towards marriage and the family in Taiwan" (Chinese). *Hsu Yu Yan* 2 (3), 1964: 39-42.

Table IX gives a final class called typologies: this class includes causal inferences that are not supported by statistical tests, the construction of typologies for large scale family research, and the making of theoretical

TABLE IX

Percentage distribution of use of data analysis for world and for U.S.A. in different time intervals

Data Analysis	Europe and Asia		World ex. U.S.A.	U.S.A.		
	1945-50	1951-56	1957-68	1945-50	1951-56	1957-67
Statistical tests	2	11	8	32	45	43
Descriptive statistics	26	24	26	36	22	23
Verbal summaries	33	34	33	14	15	31
Typologies	35	27	12	11	4	4

Sources: see Table V.

paradigms to be used later in research. Many of the macroscopic studies of social change and the family and of ethnographic comparisons of the duties of familial roles in several kinship systems are placed here, as for example: 32 039 HATTORI, Harunori. "Some problems of the *oyabun-kobun* relationship in Yamanashi-Ken (3): introduction to the typology of *ogaito* type and *kamiyushiina* type" (Japanese). *Mem. College of Liberal Arts*, Yamanashi University, 12, 1961.

The figures in Table IX show that the construction of such typologies has declined markedly all over the world since 1945. The use of verbal statements and the use of descriptive statistics has not varied very much.

TABLE X

Level of significance of changes in the use of data analysis for world, ex. U.S.A., output of family sociology

Data Analysis	F Values	
	single years	six year intervals
Ordinal scales	11.46**	6.49*
Descriptive statistics	(n.s.)	9.27**
Verbal analysis only	6.91*	8.08*
One author	7.55*	8.59*

* significant at $p < .05$ level.

** significant at $p < .01$ level.

Within the present body of data, significant changes take place in four variables that are indicators of data analysis: Table X. The use of an ordinal scale of measurement increases significantly, displacing relatively the use of nominal or intuitive assessments. Further, the appearance of interval, cumulative, and other more sophisticated levels of measurement, is confined to the years between 1963 and 1968: during this six year period the use of better than the ordinal level of measurement rises rapidly to 11% of all studies.

It is safe to say that the literature on the sociology of the family between 1957 and 1968 has been marked both by a continuity in data analysis and also by innovation which is particularly marked by the use of interval measurements in the data collection stage and by statistical tests in the data analysis stage.

In Table X the number of studies signed by one author increases significantly over the period. Some 84% of all studies are by a single author, and 10% by two authors. While the number of studies by three or more authors increases rapidly between 1963 and 1968, indicating the rise of team research, in 1968 only 6% of the total output is so signed.

Subject matter trends

The sociology of the family covers a wide band of topical areas. To deal with this range of topics, the 1958 report created a special set of classifications. This classification system has been used continuously since that time and will also be used in this report. Some minor changes in sub-classification have been made from time to time as the list of studies being classified increased from under 1,000 (Hill, 1958) to over 13,000. (Aldous & Hill, 1967) The full list is included with the bibliography, since each item has a number code to indicate its subject matter on this classification system.

Changes in the proportions in seven major headings of this classification system for the period 1945 to 1968 in the U.S.A. and in other parts of the world are shown in Table XI. *Macroscopic* studies decreased between 1957 and 1968: the increasing vogue for studies of the effects of social changes like industrialization or urbanization or modernization on the family together with a small increase in the number of comparative studies is not enough to counteract the greater decline in historical and descriptive studies of whole societies. Bibliographic examples are:

- 37 011 ARST, X. "Marriage in the collective farm". In Honor of Edward Vilde (Russian). *Trudy ètnograficheskogo museja* 19, 1964: 20-36.
- 61 163 ROEMER, Klaus. "L'influence de la technique sur les familles montagnardes". *R. Inst. Sociol.* 31 (1), 1958: 49-69.

- 35 010 CARROLL, John J. and others. "The family", sections IV, pages 1-5 and XII, pages 1-9 in: *Provisional papers on changing patterns of social structure in the Philippines 1896-1963*. Delhi, Unesco Research Centre, 1963.

TABLE XI

Percentage distribution of use of subject matter categories for world and for U.S.A in different time intervals

Subject Matter Category	Europe		World			
	India	Japan	ex. U.S.A.	U.S.A.		
	1945-56	1957-62	1963-68	1945-56	1957-62	1963-67
Macroscopic	26	47	41	3	6	4
Family Transactions	15	16	18	8	20	15
Family as a Small Group	28	14	15	39	30	41
Marriage	17	13	16	42	16	16
Special Problems	3	5	5	1	15	15
Applied Fields	9	0	1	1	4	4
Aids to Research	2	3	3	6	7	4
N	561	447	791	199	394	316

Sources: see Table V.

Subject matter categories: see List of Descriptors in Bibliography.

Studies of family *transactions* with other agencies and institutions of the society, such as measurements, or statements, about the effects of family law or family policy, community-family relations and of the consequences of changes in occupational factors both for man and wife on the family group, have increased: this increase is most noticeable in the U.S.A. To illustrate, these two items may be cited:

- 61 025 CALAN-VIVAS, Marta C. "Some aspects of the relation between the level of studies of the father and fecundity" (French). *Recherches économiques de Louvain* 34 (4), 1968: 411-429.
- 63 047 KŁOSKOWSKA, Antonina. "The family of textile workers of Lodz" (Polish), pages 446-462 in: *Włokniarze łodzcy* (Textile workers of Lodz), 1966.

The family as a *small group* includes studies of kinship networks, of parental relations, of stages in the family cycle, and of such topics as family decision making. Relatively speaking this type of subject matter increases in the U.S.A. but between 1957 and 1968 barely changes in other parts of the

world. Table XII shows that no significant trend is at work here. For this subject matter, three examples may be given:

- 35 051 JIMINEZ, Ramon T. "The Filipino working mother and the children she sends to school". *Contemporary Studies* (Makati, San Carlos Seminary) 2 (2-3), 1965: 126-135.
- 64 025 GRØNSETH, Erik. "Family, marriage, and kinship in Norway" (Norwegian), pages 52-91 in: RAMSØY, Natalie Rogoff (ed.), *Det norske samfund* [Norwegian Society]. Oslo, Gyldendal, 1968.
- 32 208 MORIOKA, Kiyomi. "Family change and modification of life cycle stage" (Japanese). *J. soc. Sci.* (Tokyo) 6, 1965: 317-349.

TABLE XII

Level of significance of changes in the use of subject matter categories in world, ex. U.S.A., output of family sociology

Subject Matter Category	F Values	
	single years	six year intervals
Macroscopic Studies	4.91 (n.s.)	4.48 (n.s.)
Family Transactions	9.53*	7.56*
Family as a Small Group	2.85 (n.s.)	2.74 (n.s.)
Marriage	9.23*	16.68**

* significant at $p < .05$ level.

** significant at $p < .01$ level.

n.s. non-significant.

All other subject matter categories have non-significant changes.

Marriage as a topic embraces husband-wife relations, mate selection, marriage adjustment, reproductive behavior, sex and birth control. All parts of the world seem to produce such studies at about the same rate: the 1945-56 U.S.A. total of 42% is so unusual that coding problems must be suspected. The difference in these data used in this report as between the 13% for 1957-62 and the 16% in 1963-68 is statistically highly significant: this comparison is based on columns 2 and 3 of Table XI; the value F appears in Table XII. These studies may be illustrated by:

- 61 045 DE BIE, Pierre; DOBBELAERE, K.; LEPLAE, Claire; PIEL, J. *Conjugal dyad. A sociological study*. Bruxelles, Les éditions vie ouvrière, 1968, 137 p.
- 10 010 CARISSE, Colette. "Fecundity and the family in French Canada" (French). *R. Inst. Sociol.* 1, 1968: 52-65.

Special problems, as for instance family disorganization, divorce, economic or marital stress, health, geographical mobility, are not a very frequent type of contribution. They seem to constitute about 4% of the literature in the U.S.A. and about 1% in the rest of the world. This is related to the infrequent use of social work agency records as a source of research data, 9% to 10% of studies, as compared with official vital statistics, 14% to 16%. Two examples are:

- 63 024 GRABOWICZ, J.; TRYFAN, B. "The growth of divorces and the crisis of youth" (Polish). *Wies Wspoleczesna* [The modern village] 8, 1962: 82-93.
- 33 001 CHANG, Shung chao. "The problem of the adopted daughter in Taiwan" (Chinese). *Tai wan wen hsien chung k'an* (Taipei) 14 (3), 1963: 97-127.

Table XII gives the position clearly for the annotations used in this report. Neither of the totals for single years, nor for the two six-year intervals, for *macroscopic* nor for family as a *small group*, show significant changes. The trends are towards an increasing concentration on studies of family *transactions* and of *marriage*.

While *aids to research*, that is to say, papers devoted to methodology for family research, or to theory, or to a critique of the literature of a particular country or region, are about twice as frequent in the U.S.A. as in other parts of the world, this category is important beyond its statistical frequency. The point has been made when describing the contributions of countries to regions that a few such papers in the total output verifies the existence of a band of researchers interested in the development of the specialized area of the sociology of the family. Although the statistical measures give a non-significant trend for the period of this study, looking back at 1945-50 there has been a significant change. Since 1951, then, a few centers of family research have existed around the world. The next section on countries will try to identify them and to illustrate their characteristics. Examples of titles in this subject matter category are:

- 35 011 CASTILLO, Celia T.; CORDERO, Felicidad V.; TANCO, Manuel R. "A scale to measure family level of living in four barrios of Los Banos, Laguna". *Philippine sociol. R.* 15 (3-4), 1967: 67-87.
- 32 081 KAMIKO, Takeji. "Trends of the Japanese post-war family research" (Japanese). *Studies in the Humanities*, Osaka Univ., 13 (9), 1962: 67-81.
- 63 006 ADAMSKI, Franciszek. "The model of the family in the opinion of contemporary youth" (Polish). *Kult i Spolecz* 12 (1), 1968: 185-191.