CURRENT ITEMS

HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY DEMOGRAPHY: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

Thomas K. Burch*

Introduction

Household and family demography is one of the least codified subfields of demography. Standard texts and compendia generally lack separate chapters on the topic, although there are some notable exceptions (Bogue, 1969; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973; Spiegelman, 1968; United Nations, 1973a).

The distinguishing feature of household and family demography has been aptly stated by Glick:

> Instead of treating individuals as units of observation, the family statistician more often considers as basic units the natural groups in which people live. Thus, the household, the family, the married couple, or the person living alone is generally the unit of analysis. (Glick, 1959, p. 576)

Household and family demography is concerned with:

(1) the size and composition of households, families, and related groups;

(2) their variation among nations and among subgroups within nations (differential size and structure);

(3) variation over time, both secular changes and variation over the life cycle;

(4) the determinants of change and variation, both demographic (age structure and the basic demographic processes of fertility, mortality, marriage and divorce, and migration) and socioeconomic determinants (such as income or wealth, occupation, industry, rural or urban residence, and culture);

(5) socioeconomic consequences of household variation and change (for example, patterns of child care, age and sex roles, intergenerational relations, isolation, and dependency among the elderly); and

(6) demographic measures and models of household and family structure and change.

Perhaps the most substantial effort to define the scope of household and family demography and to relate it to traditional demographic concerns is by Taeuber (1971b; see also Glick, 1977a; and Wargon, 1974). A review article by Sweet (1977) provides excellent coverage, with emphasis on age at marriage, marital disruption, and remarriage, and on empirical studies of contemporary developed societies. Sweet excludes literature relating to less developed societies and historical literature and thus gives relatively little attention to broad comparative issues.

This essay is complementary to Sweet's and emphasizes comparative and historical questions. Marriage and marital dissolution are treated only in passing. Attention is given to a growing technical literature on models and measures of household, family, and kinship. As in Sweet's review article, no attempt is made to deal with the extensive demographic literature on fertility, even though the topic is central to many aspects of household and family formation. Coverage generally is limited to the years since 1960, a period of substantial growth in the literature.

---

* The author is affiliated with the Department of Sociology and the Population Studies Centre, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont., Canada N6A 5C2.

Work by historians and historical demographers has proliferated in recent years, and it is impossible to do it justice here. A selection has been made of items with strong demographic relevance. More extensive discussions of this historical literature would include: Berkner, 1973; Goubert, 1970; Henry, 1968; Hareven, 1971; Mendels, 1970; Milden, 1977; Sharlin, 1977; Van de Walle, 1976; Vinovskis, 1971, 1974, 1978; Wheaton, 1975; and special issues of the American Journal of Sociology (Demos and Boocock, 1978), the Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations (1972), and Population (1977).

There are several reasons for the increasing interest in quantitative analyses of the household and family, but two are especially relevant to this essay. The first is the increasing availability of data sets and computational equipment which allow for the identification and description of distinct households by the researcher. The second is a growing theoretical focus on the household as a key decision-making unit in demographic behavior. This is best illustrated by work on the microeconomics of fertility (Becker, 1976; Schultz, 1974; Easterlin, 1969, 1978), but there is also a large psychological literature (Fawcett, 1973; Newman and Thompson, 1976). The household decision-making approach has also been applied to the study of other demographic behavior such as family planning and abortion, marriage, migration and moving, and departure from the parental home.

Basic Concepts

In common usage and in social science literature, "family" refers quite generally to a group of kin, i.e., persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption. Its demographic usage has been dictated partly by everyday language and partly by the methodology of modern population censuses and surveys, which use the housekeeping or dwelling unit as the unit of enumeration. The definitions of Glick (1959) are representative (but see also United Nations, 1958; Taeuber, 1971a). The unit of census enumeration is central to this system of definitions. "Family" refers only to those kin with whom one co-resides. Persons living in the same dwelling unit comprise a "household", whether they all are related or not. Most important for the present essay, kin with whom one does not share the same dwelling unit are not part of one's "family" in the demographic sense, even though they may live close by (sometimes in adjacent dwellings), and even though there may be considerable social and economic integration among them. This demographic usage has been reinforced by the work of some family sociologists (Goode, 1963, 1964; Levy, 1965) and more recently by demographic historians (Laslett, 1972b).

This current usage has been sharply criticized by Berkner (1975) on the grounds that the delimitation of separate households by blocks of data in nominal lists often is questionable or arbitrary, and by Wheaton (1975) and Plakans (1975b) on the grounds that focus on the co-resident domestic group to the neglect of a wider circle of kin can be substantively misleading (see also Kapadia, 1959). That the issue is more than just terminological can be seen by contrasting the views of Laslett (1972b) and Plakans (1975b) on the nature of the group "within" which the majority of children were socialized in the past. Taeuber (1971a) admits the limitations of traditional census data but argues for their full analysis partly because the household is an important group in its own right and partly because data on the household constitute such a large untapped resource. Wheaton (1975) argues, to the contrary, that household structure and kinship are so intertwined that they must not be separated for analytic purposes, and that standard demographic data must be supplemented. A recent study of the extended family network in France is an excellent example of the kinds of data needed (Gokalp, 1978), as are the studies in Taiwan by Freedman et al. (1978) and by Plakans (1977).

Measurement of Family and Household Structure

Size

Given unambiguous concepts of "family" and "household", the measurement of size is relatively straightforward. A distinction has been made, however,

between two closely related measures, "mean household size", or the unweighted average of the distribution of households by size, and "size of household of the average member of the population", or a weighted average household size using the number of individuals in each size of household category as weights (Halpern, 1972; Burch, 1976; Preston, 1976). Laslett and Halpern have termed this "mean experienced household size" (Laslett, 1972b, p. 40). Schnaiberg (1973) and Ryder (1975) have suggested combining cross-sectional measures of size with time in order to arrive at measures of person-years of family life lived or person-years of dependency.

Structure

The measurement of household and family structure centers around the notion of departures from what is presumed to be the simplest, or rudimentary form, the nuclear group of an adult couple and their children. More complex structures are seen as the result of additions of other kin (parents of the couple, grandchildren, uncles, etc., i.e., any non-nuclear kin) or the addition of unrelated persons such as servants (Laslett, 1972c), boarders, lodgers, or roomers (Modell and Hareven, 1973; Castillo et al., 1968). A related notion, a rough obverse of complexity, centers around the extent to which adults other than husband-wife couples tend to maintain separate households. Kobrin, using U.S. Census Bureau terminology, has referred to the large increase in such separateness, especially among young adult males and older women, as the "rise of the primary individual" (Kobrin, 1976). Kuznets (1978) refers to it as the "jointness or apartness of adults factor".

Measures of household and family complexity can be classified into two broad categories, based on the type of data used. The first uses information on relationships among persons in the household, based on an explicit census or survey item on relationship to household head. The second class of measures, in the absence of a direct question on relationship, uses other, more routine information either as a basis for inferring, or as a proxy for relationship data (Burch, 1976).

To the first class belong measures expressing household or family complexity in the form of ratios showing the frequency of various kinds of relatives or non-relatives per household or family. Extensive use was made of these ratios in a pioneering article by Siegel (1963).

Traditionally, census tabulations of relationship data have not been fully cross-tabulated with age, sex, and marital status or with socioeconomic characteristics of the head or of other household members. The limitations of measures based on such data have been noted by Burch (1967) and by Kuznets (1978). The analytic possibilities of more fully cross-tabulated data have been illustrated by Arriaga (1961), who used Venezuelan census materials to infer several complex aspects of household and family structure. Relationship data are also used in the computation of "headship" rates, the ratio of heads to population, often for specific age, sex, or marital status categories. Proportions of persons who are heads of household or family are in effect inverse measures of complexity, since the more persons who head their own households, the fewer remain to add to the complexity of households and families of others (Burch, 1976). Since minor children virtually never head their own households, headship rates are confined to the adult population (United Nations, 1973a, 1973b).

A third use of relationship data is for the development of typologies of families and households. Apart from occasional tabulations of households and families by number of generations, most typologies are based on Le Play's classic distinction among nuclear/conjugal, stem, and consanguine/extended families. These typologies differ considerably, however, in basic concepts and in the degree of detail, and there is no standard system (Castillo et al., 1968). Some recent attempts at detailed classification are by Laslett (1972b), Gendell and Burch (1976), Levy (1965), Eslao (1966), Pantelides (1976), Lira (1976), and United Nations (1959).

In the absence of a census or survey question on relationship to head of household or family, various analysts have used other, more routine demographic information either to infer relationships among individuals, or to derive proxy measures of relationship. The former approach uses such information as an individual's age, sex, marital status, surname, fertility, etc., and is represented in its most elaborate form in procedures of "family

reconstitution" (International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, 1977; Population, 1977; Wrigley, 1966). It has also been used successfully with population census manuscripts, where individual households are identified but relationship within the household is not explicitly measured (B. Laslett, 1977).

Some authors have suggested that age, sex, and marital status data be used to compute aggregate measures of household structure. Burch (1970) suggested the ratio of adults per household; the United Nations used an overall adult headship rate (United Nations, 1973a, 1973b; Dandekar and Unde, 1967). Such measures have been used extensively by Parish and Schwartz (1972) in a historical study of family structure in nineteenth-century France, and by Kuznets (1978) in a study of the contribution of adults to differences and changes in average household size. These ratios, however, are analogous to crude rates, so that some of their variation reflects differing or changing age, sex, or marital status distributions within the adult population rather than differences or changes in category-specific rates of headship (Burch, 1976).

Parish and Schwartz (1972) also used a measure of the "number of marital units per household", where the number of marital units is defined as the number of married males, plus the number of widowed and divorced males and females. A ratio of greater than one indicates doubling up of marital units and thus household complexity. Where a size distribution of households is available, it has been suggested that the proportion of one-person households be used as a measure of the weakness of the extended family household pattern (Lewis, 1958). Similarly, in Kuznets' recent analysis, the relative number of one- and two-person households is one of the main components of his measure of the "jointness or apartness of adults" (Kuznets, 1978).

Regardless of measures used, the characterization of large populations in terms of average, typical, or dominant household or family structure increasingly has been seen as problematic for a number of reasons. One is that there are large changes in household/family structure over the family or individual life cycle, documented in detail by demographers and sociologists (Glick, 1957; Pantelides, 1976; Lira, 1976) and by anthropologists (Goody, 1971). The implications of this fact have been discussed by Berkner (1972a), Nag (1975b), and Laslett (1972b). Thus, at any given time, a cross-sectional measure of household complexity (e.g., non-nuclear relatives per household, percent of extended family households) may be relatively low, even though most families or households achieve a high degree of complexity at some point in their life cycle, or most persons spend some of their early years in a relatively complex co-resident group. Laslett (1972b) suggests that the latter criterion be used in designating what is "the familial institution of a society" (p. 65, emphasis in original).

Another problem is that some complex family or household form may predominate as a cultural ideal, even though only a minority of households or persons achieve it, just as a society may be characterized as polygynous, even though only a minority of men have more than one wife (Levy, 1965; Laslett, 1972b; Nag, 1975b; Burch, 1976).

Problems also arise from the looseness with which family types or family household systems are often described. Hammel and Wachter (1977) give a powerful demonstration of this point with reference to the so-called stem family of traditional European society (see below, pp. 181-182).

Macro-Variation: Secular Trends and Inter-Societal Differences

A central substantive theme in recent demographic writing on the household and family is that of the relative invariance in structure among societies. Despite popular and scientific impressions of a wide variety of family forms (United Nations, 1959, p. 76), it is argued that household and family structures have looked fairly similar in a number of respects in all human societies past and present.

Family sociologists had already corrected what was seen to be an exaggerated emphasis on the isolation of the nuclear family in developed societies by documenting patterns of interaction among extended kin (e.g.,

Goode, 1963; Sussman and Burchinal, 1962; Litwak, 1960a, 1960b; Townsend, 1957). It has also been argued that both past and contemporary family systems in developing nations involved or involve less complexity than is commonly believed. Goode (1963), for example, speaks of the "classical family of Western nostalgia", suggesting that the multigenerational family living under one roof was often more an idealized memory than a common reality (see also Bogue, 1969; Goode, 1964; Hareven, 1971).

An even stronger assertion of the relative invariance of family structure came in a theoretical essay by Levy (1965):

> The general outlines and nature of the actual family structures have been virtually identical in certain strategic respects [viz., size, age and sex composition, generational composition, number of marital pairs, number of siblings] in all known societies in world history for well over 50 percent of the members of those societies. (pp. 41-42; see also Levy, 1970)

In speaking of the "family", Levy (1965) meant the residential group of kin living in the same dwelling. Levy qualifies the generalization by excepting what he terms transitional populations, namely, those in which mortality has declined while fertility remains high. This thesis was based on a sharp distinction between ideal and actual patterns of co-residence. Developing an earlier argument of Hsu (1943), he asserted that admitted cultural ideals of large complex residential groups commonly were not attained due to pyschological, economic, or demographic constraints. In particular, in premodern societies, high mortality prevents their attainment insofar as it reduces the likelihood of the simultaneous survival of kin (see below, pp. 180-181).

Levy's strongly stated hypothesis has helped guide later analyses of household statistics. Burch (1967) essayed a more or less direct test using readily available census data for contemporary nations and concluded with qualified support for the hypothesis as stated. Added force was given to the argument for the relative constancy of family structure by Laslett, in an edited volume of detailed empirical studies, including his own analysis of the history of the English household (1972c, 1970):

> We shall try to prove in this chapter how questionable it would be to assert that the transformation of English society by industrialisation was accompanied by any decrease in the size of the average household until very late on in that process....There is no sign of the large extended coresidential family group of the traditional peasant world giving way to the small, nuclear, conjugal household of modern industrial society. (Laslett, 1972c, p. 126; see also Fine-Souriac, 1977)

Attempts to resolve the issues surrounding this thesis founder partly due to a lack of relevant empirical data and insufficient analysis of what exists, and partly due to a lack of clear criteria for assessing the size of observed variation; e.g., how much is "a lot"? Clearly this depends on substantive perspective, and most of the discussions mentioned have proceeded more or less descriptively, with the issue of amount of variation floating free from the clear theoretical issues which could provide the necessary quantitative standards (see Hammel and Laslett, 1974).

Micro-Variation: Change Over the Family Life Cycle

As noted above (p. 176), the attempt to characterize a whole society in terms of its family or household structure is complicated by the occurrence of substantial changes during the lifetime of an individual family or household. Aggregate data at one point in time catch households at different stages of this life cycle and thus may obscure important temporal variations.

The concept of family life cycle is most closely associated with Glick, who has pioneered the conceptualization and measurement of family life cycles and undertaken empirical studies concerning the United States (Glick, 1957, 1964, 1977b). Early tabulations of household size and structure by age of household head provided presumptive evidence for similar variations within real cohorts. More recent studies by Glick (1977b; Glick and Parke, 1965) and

others (Uhlenberg, 1969; Norton, 1974) have constructed life-cycle measures on real cohorts. Still further developments are presented by Kono (1977) and by Santini (1977).

Comparative studies of the life cycle are rare, but those by Collver (1963) and by Wells (1971) are particularly noteworthy (see also Lamontagne and Falardeau, 1947). Collver contrasted data for the life cycle of the United States with that for Varanasi (Banares), India, in 1956, derived from a large sample survey. He finds that life-cycle stages are much less clearly defined in India and that the long period of childbearing combined with high mortality yields a high proportion of orphans and widows. Wells, using genealogical data for 276 Quaker families in colonial North America, demonstrated the virtual absence of marital life for a couple after their children were grown, given high mortality and the prolonged reproductive period. In the comparative study of household and family structure, strong impetus for the adoption of a life-cycle perspective has come from anthropological work, especially by Goody (1971), and from historical work, notably by Berkner (1972a). Berkner, using data from eighteenth-century Austria, argues that "the stem family structure does not necessarily emerge from empirical studies of demographic statistics unless the development cycle of the family and household are taken into consideration" (p. 399). Freedman et al. (1978) found that in Taiwan most married couples of reproductive age had lived at one time in extended households, even though in a cross-sectional view of the sample data 60 percent of households were nuclear (see also Goode, 1963). The analytic importance of life-cycle stage has beeen summarized by Nag:

> Just as we would be loathe to make generalizations about groups of individuals without controlling for age, we should refrain from generating statements about family types and associated sociocultural variables without examining for the effects of phase in the life cycle. (1975a, p. 26)

Differentials Within Societies

Detailed studies of differentials in family and household structure among subgroups within populations are not abundant, due to the absence of detailed cross-tabulations in traditional census publications. Prevailing generalizations, derived from survey data which are often of limited comparability, tend to associate large and complex family forms with rural residence and with wealth. There are supporting data, but there are also many exceptions, and the empirical base for precise generalization remains sparse.

Type of Head

Households tend to be more complex when their head lacks a spouse (single parent households) than when they are headed by a man and wife. This tendency is more pronounced when the single parent is male (Van der Tak and Gendell, 1973). Truncated nuclear families (as they have sometimes been called) frequently try to improve their ability to perform normal household/family functions by adding non-nuclear relatives to the residential group. This tendency probably explains in part the greater complexity of households among U.S. blacks (Taeuber, 1971a).

Marital Status

Headship rates are closely associated with marital status, being highest for married males, lowest for single adults, and intermediate for widowed and divorced persons (United Nations, 1973b). Group differences in marital status, therefore, might be reflected in differences in household complexity. But the associations with marital status as such are modified by culture and by economic and demographic structure, so that the picture is clouded. The U.N. Population Division presents striking comparative data for Sweden and

Japan at recent censuses (United Nations, 1973a). For both nations, the differentials in headship rates among marital status categories follow the same order, but within specific marital status categories the rates are consistently lower for Japan than for Sweden. The differences are especially pronounced for older females. For the United States, Kobrin (1976) suggests that headship rates for older widowed and divorced women might be lower if they had more adult children with whom they might live. In a detailed study of the living arrangements of separated, divorced, and widowed mothers, Sweet (1972) found that most (approximately 80 percent) headed their own households. Differences among marital status categories were due largely to differences in the number and ages of children (see also Chevan and Korson, 1975).

Rural-Urban Residence

Households and residential families typically are larger and more complex in rural areas than in cities (Taeuber, 1971a, 1971b; Dandekar and Unde, 1967; Pantiledes, 1976; Parish and Schwartz, 1972), but there are many exceptions (Burch, 1967). Sjoberg (1960) associates family complexity with urban residence, interpreting the association as reflecting greater wealth and power in urban areas. Concepcion and Landa-Jocano (1975) present data for several Asian nations showing no consistent relationship between rural or urban residence and percent of extended families. Arguments have been advanced as to why households might be more complex in urban areas, especially in the face of large rural-urban migration: (a) newly arrived migrants to the city may tend to live with relatives until they are established; and (b) city residents may be forced by the available housing supply to double up, whereas it is easier to build new housing in rural areas (Burch, 1967; Nag, 1975b; Concepcion and Landa-Jocano, 1975; Sjoberg, 1960; Kapadia, 1966; Nimkoff, 1959).

Income/Wealth

A common assumption is that large and complex residential families tend to be associated with wealth and high income (Hsu, 1943; Sjoberg, 1960; Goode, 1963; Pitts, 1964; Hsu, 1959; Nag, 1975b; Bogue, 1969), although some see extreme poverty leading to co-residence as a matter of necessity and mutual help (Berelson and Steiner, 1964). The prevailing view is well summarized by Wheaton (1975): "Mean household size is larger among the rich than the poor, and complexity of household structure is greater" (p. 627). Limited demographic data are consistent with this generalization. The United Nations (1973b) presents data for several nations showing a moderately strong, positive relation between income and headship rates. Pryor (1972) finds a consistent relationship between income and occupation and presence of extended kin or the number of generations for two widely separated dates in Rhode Island.

Determinants of Household Structure

Although the theory of household formation is not well developed, it clearly lends itself to a broad behavioral model of choice guided by tastes or preferences in the face of constraints. Burch (1976) has essayed an outline of various factors affecting household structure using this approach. Sweet's study of the living arrangements of widowed, separated, and divorced mothers uses such a decision-making approach (1972), emphasizing economic constraints and the accessibility of relatives. Hammel and Wachter (1977) speak of "the interaction of ideology, environmental constraints and [household formation] behaviour" (p. 113). A microeconomic model is used by Hill and Hill (1976; see also Young, 1975). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of headship in the United States is provided by Carliner (1975).

In a discussion of constraints, it is convenient to distinguish two broad classes: (1) biological or demographic, relating to the number and type of

persons, especially related persons, with whom one might choose to live; and (2) economic, relating to the availability of resources with which to establish households, both at the macro level (for example, the stock of housing) or at the micro level (for example, one's income). Demography has an especially crucial role to play in clarifying the former.

Demographic Constraints: The Supply of Kin

As Sweet puts it with admirable simplicity: "In order to move in with relatives, it is necessary to have accessible relatives" (1972, p. 144). A growing body of demographic literature explores the coexistence of kin, or the simultaneous survival of kin of specified types.

One of the earliest formal approaches to this problem was Lotka's estimate of rates of orphanhood from data on mortality and the average age of childbearing (1931). A pioneering article by Fourastié is broader in scope (1959), dealing with the effects of lower mortality on various aspects of the typical family life cycle, including marriage duration (the coexistence of husband and wife) and probabilities of orphanhood. Kunstadter et al. (1963) noted the effects of demographic variation (in fertility and mortality) on the realization of culturally preferred marriage patterns. This and closely related themes have been pursued by cultural anthropologists (Adams and Kasakoff, 1975; Dyke, 1971; Goldberg, 1967; Romney, 1971; Yengoyan, 1968).

Heer and Smith (1968, 1969) demonstrated the effects of mortality level on the likelihood of a man being survived by at least one son during his old age (see also Wrigley, 1969; Immerwahr, 1967; Le Bras, 1973; May and Heer, 1968). Levy (1965) pointed to high mortality as a major constraint on the complexity of actual household structure in premodern populations. Coale (1965) calculated average household size in a stationary population with high mortality ($\mathring{e}_0 = 20$) and different rules of household residence for married persons. Burch (1970) extended Coale's analysis to stable populations, allowing mortality and fertility to vary across wide ranges (gross reproduction rates from 1.0 to 4.0 and life expectancy at birth from 20 to 77.5 years). A central substantive conclusion was the strong independent effect of fertility level on household size and structure, primarily through its influence on age composition. This theme has been pursued effectively by Kobrin in empirical studies of the U.S. population (1973, 1976). The earlier work showed, for the period 1940 to 1970, broad increases in headship rates for adults, which the author interpreted as "...privacy...being increasingly achieved at the expense of family membership" (p. 800). In a later analysis, Kobrin (1976) showed that the rise in the proportion of older women living alone is probably attributable in part to a decline in the relative number of younger female relatives, due to earlier fertility declines.

A sizable advance in demographic thinking about kinship is found in Goodman, Keyfitz, and Pullum (1974, 1975 addendum). Using one-sex stable population models for three major population types (high fertility-high mortality, high fertility-low mortality, low fertility-low mortality), they calculate the number of surviving kin of each type that a woman would have at each age of her life. Their results demonstrate that mortality does indeed sharply limit the number of kin, both overall and of any one type. But they also demonstrate, more pointedly than previous work, the powerful influence of fertility level on the number of kin of all types except ascendants in the direct line. The maximum number of kin occurs with high fertility and low mortality, and thus would tend to characterize populations in the early stage of demographic transition. Some anthropological implications of this work are discussed by Kasakoff (1974). Goldman (1978) illustrates some demographic applications.

A similar approach to the study of demographic determinants of household and family size has been taken by Ryder (1975). The analysis is restricted to the nuclear family of husband, wife, and own children, and "family size" is defined in terms of person-years of family life lived over time, as well as the number of persons alive at any one point (see also Schnaiberg, 1973). Ryder's results show a general increase in person-years of family life as mortality declines from high to moderately low levels, for example:

> The proportion of fathers without a male heir is reduced by one half, the length of joint married life increases from 19 to 36

> years, [and] each child lives almost twice as long within the family setting. (1975, p. 288)

Methodologically, Ryder's work pioneers as one of the first modeling exercises to calculate variances as well as mean values for several of the household and family measures derived, and to emphasize the important role of variation in household decision-making. Bradley and Mendels (1978) have recently shown how such variation might invalidate generalizations based on small samples. There remains the task of integrating Ryder's results, which focus on nuclear kin, with the work of Coale (1965) and Burch (1970), which focuses on extended family households, and with that of Goodman, Keyfitz, and Pullum (1974), which focuses on extended kin regardless of residence (see also Gilbert and Hammel, 1966).

Equilibrating Processes: Offsetting Demographic Constraints

The literature reviewed in the previous section emphasizes limitations imposed by demographic conditions on household and family structure. A qualifying theme in the literature emphasizes the fluidity of household, family, and kinship structures, and how they can be and often have been modified, independently of biological or demographic constraints, to accord more closely with functional need or convenience. This theme may be summarized in two brief propositions: (1) in many, perhaps most, societies the viable or optimal household is one which is neither too large nor too small, but medium-sized, say in the range four to six, with at least two adults (Goody, 1972, p. 124); and (2) there is a widespread tendency for people to strive to reach such optimum-sized households by the addition or subtraction of kin or non-kin, in keeping with institutionalized rules for such additions or subtractions.

Fallers contradicted Levy's assertion of mortality restrictions on extended family households by pointing to the widespread use of fictive kinship practices (Fallers, 1965). Burch (1967) noted that in Panama, households with smaller numbers of children were more apt to include non-nuclear relatives, and suggested: "It is possible that there exists fairly generally a complex process whereby kin aggregate so as to avoid very large or very small households" (p. 360). Eng and Smith (1976) found strong evidence for such processes in eighteenth-century Japan. Wrigley (1978, p. 147) discusses similar practices in historical Europe. Van der Tak and Gendell analyzed census micro-data for Guatemala City and found evidence for adjustments in household size and composition by "incomplete" or "truncated" nuclear families (1973). Households headed by either a male or female with no spouse present were more apt to contain one or more non-nuclear relatives. Laslett (1972c) attributes some of the constancy in average household size in England over long periods to the addition of domestic servants to many households. Taeuber (1971a) notes: "Norms and mechanisms for the exodus or inclusion of family members and for the division of families are conducive to family continuity and group survival in traditional societies", and cites Japan as the "definitive example" (p. 39 and note No. 15).

Inheritance and Land Tenure Systems

Patterns of land tenure and inheritance are commonly assumed to have important implications for family and household structure. Systems that discourage division of holdings among heirs are thought to result in larger and more complex households.

Berkner (1976, 1977; Berkner and Mendels, 1978) has recently presented evidence from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Germany showing how inheritance systems (partible or impartible) affect marriage patterns and out-migration rates, and through these both family/household structure and rates of population increase. Hammel and Wachter (1977) have used micro-simulation (their SOCSIM--see Hammel et al., 1976) to study the effects of variations in the form of impartible inheritance on the relative number of stem families in a population. They demonstrate how what they term a

"relatively minor shift from primonuptial rules [first son marrying inherits farm] to ultimonuptial rules [last son marrying inherits]..." leads to a sharp drop in the proportion of stem family households, from 46 to 21 percent.

Consequences of Family and Household Structure

A complete review of the consequences of household and family structure would require more space than is available here. There are large bodies of literature on the effects of family composition and formation on intelligence and personality (Clausen and Clausen, 1973), on the economic implications of household structure (Reed and McIntosh, 1972; Freedman and Coombs, 1966; David, 1962; Coombs and Freedman, 1970; Lorimer, 1967), on the implications of family composition for female labor force participation (Sweet, 1970; Scott and Tilly, 1975), and on problems of dependency and isolation, especially among the aged (Beresford and Rivlin, 1964, 1966), to mention only a few major topics. The focus here will be limited to the effects of family/household composition on two other demographic variables, fertility and physical mobility.

Household Structure, Migration, and Moving

In his pioneering work on physical mobility, Why Families Move, Rossi (1955) found that many moves were related to life-cycle stages, and thus to household size and composition. A number of later empirical studies have sought to clarify these interrelationships.

In a detailed British survey, Donnison (1961) found that "...households were at their most mobile in the early stages of family growth..." (p. 77). Leslie and Richardson (1961) found by contrast that life-cycle variables had relatively little predictive power as compared to career variables or intervening variables related to residential satisfaction. Simmons' review of intra-urban mobility (1968) and Sabagh, Van Arsdol, and Butler's theoretical article (1969) both emphasize the importance of household composition, especially the number and ages of children. Speare (1970) found a marked effect of life-cycle stage on moving independent of age, marital status, tenure, or duration of residence. In a later study (1974), he found a moderate negative relationship between a crowding ratio (persons per room) and residential satisfaction, and between the latter and actual mobility, suggesting mobility is a response to increasing household size. Chevan (1971) found: (a) that rates of moving declined sharply during the early years of marriage, more slowly after the tenth year; (b) that for any given duration, mobility rates were higher for persons who had recently had a child; and (c) that movers had initial densities (persons per room) higher than non-movers. Long (1972) found that for couples with children, the presence of school-age children (between ages 6 and 17) tends to restrict both short-distance and long-distance moves. The relationship of number of children to mobility was more complex. Ladinsky (1967) found an inconsistent relationship between number of persons in the family or number of own children and local moves but found a definite curvilinear relationship, increasing with age, between inter-county migration and number of persons in the family. It is generally thought that changes in household size and composition motivate local moves as a form of housing adjustment, whereas larger and more complex households discourage migration because of the costs. But the findings of Ladinsky and of Long illustrate the difficulties of generalizations.

Family Structure and Fertility

One of the most widely cited theses on the consequences of family structure is that extended family systems promote early marriage and high marital fertility. Early systematic discussions of the issue are by Lorimer (1954), Davis (1955), and Davis and Blake (1956). Empirical studies of this relationship generally have failed to support the Lorimer-Davis thesis (Nag,

1967, 1975a; Rele, 1963; Liu, 1967; and for additional references Burch and Gendell, 1970). But as Burch and Gendell (1970) point out, most studies have confined their analysis to residential households, ignoring interrelations within kin networks, and many have used variables whose temporal reference was inappropriate. A recent monograph by Bebarta (1977) deals with this problem by relating cumulative fertility to the woman's residential household history. Empirical studies to date, while interesting in their own right as investigations of the interrelations of fertility and residential household formation, have largely failed to deal with the broader questions of how social and economic interdependencies among dispersed kin groups affect marriage and fertility decisions.

Concluding Comment

The last two decades have seen a substantial increase in demographic and closely related literature on households and families. But compared to the subfields of natality or migration, household and family demography is still immature. Documentation of key generalizations is spotty, measurement conventions are not yet firmly established, and theory of determinants and consequences is sketchy and ad hoc.

Over the next years, the following would seem especially important tasks:

(1) There is need for recognition once and for all that co-residence of kin and interaction among kin living in different households or communities are both important aspects of human family life, with important social and economic implications.

(2) Related to this is the need to relate descriptive demographic studies of the household and family to the broader perspectives of economics, anthropology, and sociology, partly in order to highlight the substantive importance of the former.

(3) There is need for further clarification of the basic interrelations among fertility, nuptiality, and mortality on the one hand and household/family size and structure on the other--what might be called the substantive formal demography of the family. Most modeling to date has dealt with comparative statics, using stable population models; clarification of household and family demographic dynamics during periods of demographic transition is needed.

(4) Theoretically, there is need to develop explicitly the model of couple and individual decision-making that is implicit in existing literature on household structure and change, a development that would parallel that of explicit decision-making models in the study of fertility and migration or moving.

Bibliography

Adams, John W.; and Kasakoff, Alice B. 1975. Factors underlying endogamous group size. In Population and Social Organization, edited by Moni Nag, pp. 147-174. The Hague: Mouton. Distributed in the United States and Canada by Aldine, Chicago.

Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations (Paris). 1972. Famille et société [Family and society]. Vol. 27, No. 4-5, special issue. Pp. 799-1,234.

Anshen, Ruth N., Editor. 1959. The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Rev. ed. Science of Culture Series, Vol. 5. New York: Harper. 538 pp.

Arriaga, Eduardo E. 1968. Some aspects of family composition in Venezuela. Eugenics Quarterly (New York) 15(3):177-190.

Beauchamp, Pierre; Charbonneau, Hubert; Desjardins, Bertrand; and Légaré, Jacques. 1977. La reconstitution automatique des familles: un fait acquis [The automatic reconstitution of families: an accomplished fact]. Population (Paris), Vol. 32, special issue, September. Pp. 375-399.

Bebarta, Prafulla C. 1977. Family Type and Fertility in India. North Quincy, Mass.: Christopher Publishing. 147 pp.

Becker, Gary S. 1976. The Economic Approach to Human Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 314 pp.

Bender, Donald R. 1967. A refinement of the concept of household: families, co-residence, and domestic function. American Anthropologist (Washington) 69(5):493-504.

Berelson, Bernard; and Steiner, Gary A. 1964. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. xxiii, 712 pp.

Beresford, John C.; and Rivlin, Alice M. 1964. Characteristics of "other" families. Demography (Washington) 1(1):242-246.

Beresford, John C.; and Rivlin, Alice M. 1966. Privacy, poverty, and old age. Demography (Washington) 3(1):247-258.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1972a. Rural family organization in Europe: a problem in comparative history. Peasant Studies Newsletter (Pittsburgh) 1(4):145-156.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1972b. The stem family and the developmental cycle of the peasant household: an eighteenth-century Austrian example. American Historical Review (Washington) 77(2):398-418.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1973. Recent research on the history of the family in Western Europe. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 35(3):395-405.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1975. The use and misuse of census data for the historical analysis of family structure. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 5(4):721-738.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1976. Inheritance, land tenure, and peasant family structure: a German regional comparison. In Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800, edited by Jack Goody, Joan Thirsk, and E. P. Thompson. Cambridge, England/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berkner, Lutz K. 1977. Peasant household organization and demographic change in Lower Saxony (1689-1766). In Population Patterns in the Past, edited by Ronald D. Lee, pp. 53-69. New York: Academic Press.

Berkner, Lutz K.; and Mendels, Franklin F. 1978. Inheritance systems, family structure, and demographic patterns in Western Europe, 1700-1900. In Historical Studies of Changing Fertility, edited by Charles Tilly, pp. 209-223. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bogue, Donald J. 1969. Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons. xiii, 917 pp.

Bohannan, Paul. 1968. An alternate residence classification. In Marriage, Family, and Residence, edited by Paul Bohannan and John Middleton, pp. 317-323. Garden City, N.Y.: Natural History Press.

Bradley, Brian P.; and Mendels, Franklin F. 1978. Can the hypothesis of a nuclear family organization be tested statistically? Population Studies (London) 32(2):381-394.

Burch, Thomas K. 1967. The size and structure of families: a comparative analysis of census data. American Sociological Review (Washington) 32(3):347-363.

Burch, Thomas K.; and Gendell, Murray. 1970. Extended family structure and fertility: some conceptual and methodological issues. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 32(2):227-236.

Burch, Thomas K. 1970. Some demographic determinants of average household size: an analytic approach. Demography (Washington) 7(1):61-69.

Burch, Thomas K. 1976. Consideraciones sobre el análisis de la estructura del hogar y de la familia [Considerations relevant to the analysis of the structure of households and the family]. In La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demográfico [The Family as a Unit for Demographic Study], edited by Thomas K. Burch, Luis F. Lira, and Valdecir F. Lopes, pp. 121-140. Series E, No. 1001. San José: U.N., Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía.

Burch, Thomas K.; Lira, Luis F.; and Lopes, Valdecir F., Editors. 1976. La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demográfico [The Family as a Unit for Demographic Study]. Series E, No. 1001. San José: U.N., Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía. x, 467 pp.

Campbell, Arthur A.; Kantner, John; Kincaid, Harry V.; Ridley, Jeanne C.; et al., Editors. 1971. The Family in Transition. Fogarty International Center Proceedings, No. 3. Washington: Govt. Printing Office. x, 342 pp.

Carliner, Geoffrey. 1975. Determinants of household headship. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 37(1):28-38.

Castillo, Gelia T.; Weisblat, Abraham M.; and Villareal, Felicidad. 1968. The concepts of nuclear and extended family: an exploration of empirical referents. International Journal of Comparative Sociology (Leiden) 9(1):1-40.

Chevan, Albert. 1971. Family growth, household density, and moving. Demography (Washington) 8(4):451-458.

Chevan, Albert; and Korson, J. Henry. 1975. Living arrangements of widows in the United States and Israel, 1960 and 1961. Demography (Washington) 12(3):505-518.

Clausen, John A.; and Clausen, Suzanne R. 1973. The effects of family size on parents and children. In Psychological Perspectives on Population, edited by James T. Fawcett, pp. 185-208. New York: Basic Books.

Coale, Ansley J. 1965. Appendix: estimates of average size of household. In Aspects of the Analysis of Family Structure, edited by Ansley J. Coale, Lloyd A. Fallers, Marion J. Levy, Jr., David M. Schneider, et al., pp. 64-69. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Coale, Ansley J.; Fallers, Lloyd A.; Levy, Marion J., Jr; Schneider, David M.; et al. 1965. Aspects of the Analysis of Family Structure. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. xiii, 248 pp.

Collver, Andrew. 1963. The family cycle in India and the United States. American Sociological Review (Washington) 28(1):86-96.

Concepcion, Mercedes B.; and Landa-Jocano, Felipe. 1975. Demographic factors influencing the family cycle. In The Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives. Papers of the World Population Conference, Bucharest, 1974, Vol. 2, pp. 252-262. Population Studies, No. 57. ST/ESA/SER.A/57/Add.1. Sales No. E/F/S.75.XIII.5. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Coombs, Lolagene G.; and Freedman, Ronald. 1970. Pre-marital pregnancy, childspacing, and later economic achievement. Population Studies (London) 24(3):389-412.

Cuisenier, Jean, Editor. 1977. The Family Life Cycle in European Societies. New Babylon, Studies in the Social Sciences, No. 28. The Hague/Paris: Mouton. xvi, 494 pp.

Dandekar, Kumudini; and Unde, D. B. 1967. Inter-state and intra-state differentials in household formation rates. In Patterns of Population Change in India, 1951-61, edited by Ashish Bose, pp. 315-333. Bombay: Allied Publishers.

David, Martin, H. 1962. Family Composition and Consumption. Contributions to Economic Analysis, No. 25. Amsterdam: North-Holland. xii, 109 pp.

Davis, Kingsley. 1955. Institutional patterns favoring high fertility in underdeveloped areas. Eugenics Quarterly (New York) 2(1):33-39.

Davis, Kingsley; and Blake, Judith. 1956. Social structure and fertility: an analytic framework. Economic Development and Cultural Change (Chicago) 4(3):211-235.

Demos, John; and Boocock, Sarane S., Editors. 1978. Turning points: historical and sociological essays on the family. American Journal of Sociology (Chicago), Vol. 84, special issue, September.

Donnison, D. V. 1961. The movement of households in England. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A (London) 124(1):60-80.

Dyke, Bennett. 1971. Potential mates in a small human population. Social Biology (Madison, Wis.) 18(1):28-39.

Easterlin, Richard A. 1969. Towards a socioeconomic theory of fertility: a survey of recent research on economic factors in American fertility. In Fertility and Family Planning: A World View, edited by S. J. Behrman, Leslie Corsa, Jr., and Ronald Freedman, pp. 127-156. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Easterlin, Richard A. 1978. The economics and sociology of fertility: a synthesis. In Historical Studies of Changing Fertility, edited by Charles Tilly, pp. 57-133. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Eng, Robert Y.; and Smith, Thomas C. 1976. Peasant families and population control in eighteenth-century Japan. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 6(3):417-445.

Eslao, Nena B. 1966. The developmental cycle of the Philippine household in an urban setting. Philippine Sociological Review (Manila) 14:198-208.

Fallers, Lloyd A. 1965. The range of variation in actual family size: a critique of Marion Levy Jr.'s argument. In Aspects of the Analysis of Family Structure, edited by Ansley J. Coale, Lloyd A. Fallers, Marion J. Levy, Jr., David M. Schneider, et al., pp. 70-82. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Fawcett, James T., Editor. 1973. Psychological Perspectives on Population. New York: Basic Books. xvii, 522 pp.

Fine-Souriac, Agnès. 1977. La famille-souche pyrénéenne au XIXe siècle: quelques réflexions de méthode [Stem-families in the Pyrenees in the nineteenth century: some reflections on methodology]. Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations (Paris) 32(3):478-487.

Foote, Nelson, Editor. 1961. Consumer Behavior: Models of Household Decision-Making. New York: New York University Press.

Fourastié, Jean. 1959. De la vie traditionelle à la vie "tertiaire": recherches sur le calendrier démographique de l'homme moyen [From the traditional life to the "tertiary" life: research on the demographic calendar of the average man]. Population (Paris) 14(3):417-432.

Freedman, Ronald; and Coombs, Lolagene. 1966. Economic considerations in family growth decisions. Population Studies (London) 20(2):197-222.

Freedman, Ronald; Moots, Baron; Sun, Te-hsiung; and Weinberger, Mary B. 1978. Household composition and extended kinship in Taiwan. Population Studies (London) 32(1):65-80.

Fried, Morton H. 1959. The family in China: the People's Republic. In The Family: Its Function and Destiny, edited by Ruth N. Anshen, pp. 146-166. New York: Harper.

Gendell, Murray; and Burch, Thomas K. 1976. Familia de residencia y fecundidad, Ciudad de Guatemala, 1964 [Resident families and fertility, Guatemala City, 1964]. In La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demográfico [The Family as a Unit for Demographic Study], edited by Thomas K. Burch, Luis F. Lira, and Valdecir F. Lopes, pp. 427-442. Series E, No. 1001. San José: U.N., Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía.

Gilbert, John P.; and Hammel, E. A. 1966. Computer simulation and analysis of problems in kinship and social structure. American Anthropologist (Washington) 68(1):71-93.

Glick, Paul C. 1957. American Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons; London: Chapman and Hall. xvi, 240 pp.

Glick, Paul C. 1959. Family statistics. In The Study of Population: An Inventory and Appraisal, edited by Philip M. Hauser and Otis D. Duncan, pp. 576-603. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glick, Paul C. 1964. Demographic analysis of family data. In Handbook of Marriage and the Family, edited by Harold T. Christensen, pp. 300-334. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Glick, Paul C.; and Parke, Robert, Jr. 1965. New approaches in studying the life cycle of the family. Demography (Washington) 2:187-202.

Glick, Paul C. 1977a. Dimensions of the fields of family demography. In International Population Conference / Congrès International de la Population, Mexico, 1977, Vol. 1, pp. 389-404. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Glick, Paul C. 1977b. Updating the life cycle of the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 39(1):5-13.

Gokalp, Catherine. 1978. Le réseau familial [The extended family network]. Population (Paris) 33(6):1,077-1,094.

Goldberg, Harvey. 1967. FBD marriage and demography among Tripolitanian Jews in Israel. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology (Albuquerque) 23:176-191.

Goldman, Noreen. 1978. Estimating the intrinsic rate of increase of population from the average numbers of younger and older sisters. Demography (Washington) 15(4):499-507.

Goode, William J. 1963. World Revolution and Family Patterns. New York: Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan. xiii, 432 pp.

Goode, William J. 1964. The Family. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. viii, 120 pp.

Goodman, Leo A.; Keyfitz, Nathan; and Pullum, Thomas W. 1974. Family formation and the frequency of various kinship relationships. Theoretical Population Biology (New York) 5(1):1-27. See also Addendum. 1975. 8(3):376-381.

Goody, Jack, Editor. 1971. The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. vii, 145 pp.

Goody, Jack. 1972. The evolution of the family. In Household and Family in Past Time, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 103-124. London: Cambridge University Press.

Goody, Jack; Thirsk, Joan; and Thompson, E. P., Editors. 1976. Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800. Cambridge, England/New York: Cambridge University Press. vi, 421 pp.

Goubert, Pierre. 1970. Historical demography and the reinterpretation of early modern French history: a research review. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 1(1):37-48.

Halpern, Joel M. 1972. Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth century: social and household structure as reflected in the census of 1863. In Household and Family in Past Time, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 401-427. London: Cambridge University Press.

Hammel, Eugene A.; and Laslett, Peter. 1974. Comparing household structure over time and between cultures. Comparative Studies in Society and History (London) 16(1):73-109.

Hammel, E. A.; Hutchinson, D. W.; Wachter, K. W.; Lundy, R. T.; et al. 1976. The SOCSIM Demographic-Sociological Microsimulation Program: Operating Manual. Research Series, No. 27. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, Institute of International Studies. vii, 204 pp.

Hammel, E. A.; and Wachter, Kenneth W. 1977. Primonuptiality and ultimonuptiality: their effects on stem-family-household frequencies. In Population Patterns in the Past, edited by Ronald D. Lee, pp. 113-134. New York: Academic Press.

Hareven, Tamara K. 1971. The history of the family as an interdisciplinary field. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 2(2):399-414.

Heer, David M.; and Smith, Dean O. 1968. Mortality level, desired family size, and population increase. Demography (Washington) 5(1):104-121.

Heer, David M.; and Smith, Dean O. 1969. Mortality level, desired family size and population increase: further variations on a basic model. Demography (Washington) 6(2):141-149.

Henry, Louis. 1968. Historical demography. Translated by Patricia Cumming. Daedalus (Boston) 97(2):385-396.

Hill, Daniel H.; and Hill, Martha S. 1976. Older children and splitting off. In Five Thousand American Families--Patterns of Economic Progress. Vol. 4: Family Composition Change and Other Analyses of the First Seven Years of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, edited by Greg J. Duncan and James N. Morgan, pp. 117-153. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.

Hill, Reuben. 1961. Patterns of decision-making and the accumulation of family assets: a longitudinal and intergenerational study. In Consumer Behavior: Models of Household Decision-Making, edited by Nelson Foote, pp. 57-80. New York: New York University Press.

Hill, Reuben. 1965. Decision making and the family cycle. In Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations, edited by Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib, pp. 112-139. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hsu, Francis L. K. 1943. The myth of Chinese family size. American Journal of Sociology (Chicago) 48(5):555-562.

Hsu, Francis L. K. 1959. The family in China: the classical form. In The Family: Its Function and Destiny, rev. ed., edited by Ruth N. Anshen, pp. 123-145. Science of Culture Series, Vol. 5. New York: Harper.

Immerwahr, George E. 1967. Survivorship of sons under conditions of improving mortality. Demography (Washington) 4(2):710-720.

International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. 1977. Conference on Methods of Automatic Family Reconstitution, Florence, Italy, April, 1977. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Kapadia, K. M. 1959. The family in transition. Sociological Bulletin (New Delhi) 8(2):68-99.

Kapadia, K. M. 1966. Marriage and the Family in India. 3rd ed. Bombay: Oxford University Press. xxxii, 395 pp.

Kasakoff, Alice B. 1974. How many relatives? In Genealogical Mathematics: Proceedings of the MSSB Conference on Genealogical Mathematics, February 28-March 3, 1974, at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Center for Demographic and Population Genetics, edited by Paul A. Ballonoff, pp. 215-235. Paris/The Hague: Mouton.

Kobrin, Frances E. 1973. Household headship and its changes in the United States, 1940-1960, 1970. Journal of the American Statistical Association (Washington) 68(344):793-800.

Kobrin, Frances E. 1976. The fall in household size and the rise of the primary individual in the United States. Demography (Washington) 13(1):127-138.

Kono, Shigemi. 1977. The concept of the family life cycle as a bridge between demography and sociology. In International Population Conference / Congrès International de la Population, Mexico, 1977, Vol. 1, pp. 355-370. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Kunstadter, Peter; Buhler, Roald; Stephen, Frederick F.; and Westoff, Charles F. 1963. Demographic variability and preferential marriage patterns. American Journal of Physical Anthropology (Philadelphia) 21(4):511-519.

Kuznets, Simon. 1978. Size and age structure of family households: exploratory comparisons. Population and Development Review (New York) 4(2):187-223.

Ladinsky, Jack. 1967. Sources of geographic mobility among professional workers: a multivariate analysis. Demography (Washington) 4(1):293-309.

Lamontagne, Maurice; and Falardeau, Jean-Charles. 1947. The life cycle of French-Canadian urban families. Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science (Toronto) 13(2):233-247.

Laslett, Barbara. 1977. Social change and the family: Los Angeles, California, 1850-1870. American Sociological Review (Washington) 42(1):268-291.

Laslett, Peter. 1970. "The decline of the size of the domestic group in England": a comment on J. W. Nixon's note. Population Studies (London) 24(3):449-454.

Laslett, Peter; and Wall, Richard, Editors. 1972a. Household and Family in Past Time. London: Cambridge University Press. xii, 623 pp.

Laslett, Peter. 1972b. Introduction: the history of the family. In Household and Family in Past Time, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 1-89. London: Cambridge University Press.

Laslett, Peter. 1972c. Mean household size in England since the sixteenth century. In Household and Family in Past Time, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 125-158. London: Cambridge University Press.

Le Bras, Hervé. 1973. Parents, grand-parents, bisaieux [Parents, grandparents, great-grandparents]. Population (Paris) 28(1):9-38.

Lee, Ronald D., Editor. 1977. Population Patterns in the Past. New York: Academic Press. x, 376 pp.

Leslie, Gerald R.; and Richardson, Arthur H. 1961. Life-cycle, career pattern, and the decision to move. American Sociological Review (Washington) 26(6):894-902.

Levy, Marion J., Jr. 1965. Aspects of the analysis of family structure. In Aspects of the Analysis of Family Structure, edited by Ansley J. Coale, Lloyd A. Fallers, Marion J. Levy, Jr., David M. Schneider, et al., pp. 1-63. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Levy, Marion J., Jr. 1970. Some hypotheses about the family. Journal of Comparative Family Studies (Calgary, Alta.) 1(1):119-131.

Lewis, Oscar. 1958. Village Life in Northern India: Studieu in a Delhi Village. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press. xiii, 384 pp.

Lira, Luis F. 1976. Introducción al estudio de la familia y el hogar [Introduction to the study of the family and household]. In La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demográfico [The Family as a Unit for Demographic Study], edited by Thomas K. Burch, Luis F. Lira, and Valdecir F. Lopes, pp. 3-46. Series E, No. 1001. San José: U.N., Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía.

Litwak, Eugene. 1960a. Geographical mobility and extended family cohesion. American Sociological Review (Washington) 25(3):385-394.

Litwak, Eugene. 1960b. Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion. American Sociological Review (Washington) 25(1):9-21.

Liu, Paul K. C. 1967. Differential fertility in Taiwan. In Contributed Papers: Sydney Conference, Australia, 21 to 25 August 1967, pp. 363-370. [Liège]: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Long, Larry H. 1972. The influence of number and ages of children on residential mobility. Demography (Washington) 9(3):371-382.

Lorimer, Frank; with contributions by Fortes, Meyer; Busia, K. A.; Richards Audrey I.; et al. 1954. Culture and Human Fertility: A Study of the Relation of Cultural Conditions to Fertility in Non-Industrial and Transitional Societies. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. 514 pp.

Lorimer, Frank. 1967. The economics of family formation under different conditions. In Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Belgrade, 30 August-10 September 1965, Vol. 2, pp. 92-95. E/CONF.41/3. Sales No. 66.XIII.6. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Lotka, A. J. 1931. Orphanhood in relation to demographic factors: a study in population analysis. Metron (Rome) 9:37-109.

May, David A.; and Heer, David M. 1968. Son survivorship motivation and family size in India: a computer simulation. Population Studies (London) 22(2):199-210.

Mendels, Franklin F. 1970. Recent research in historical demography. American Historical Review (Washington) 75(4):1,065-1,073.

Milden, James W. 1977. The Family in Past Time: A Guide to the Literature. Garland Reference Library of Social Science, Vol. 32. New York/London: Garland Publishing. xix, 200 pp.

Miner, Horace. 1938. The French-Canadian family cycle. American Sociological Review (Washington) 3(5):700-708.

Modell, John; and Hareven, Tamara K. 1973. Urbanization and the malleable household: an examination of boarding and lodging in American families. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 35(3):467-479.

Nag, Moni. 1967. Family type and fertility. In Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Belgrade, 30 August-10 September 1965, Vol. 2, pp. 160-163. E/CONF.41/3. Sales No. 66.XIII.6. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Nag, Moni. 1975a. Marriage and kinship in relation to human fertility. In Population and Social Organization, edited by Moni Nag, pp. 11-54. The Hague: Mouton. Distributed in the United States and Canada by Aldine, Chicago.

Nag, Moni. 1975b. Socio-cultural patterns, family cycle and fertility. In The Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives. Papers of the World Population Conference, Bucharest, 1974, Vol. 2, pp. 289-312. Population Studies, No. 57. ST/ESA/SER.A/57/Add.1. Sales No. E/F/S.75.XIII.5. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Newman, Sidney H.; and Thompson, Vaida D., Editors. 1976. Population Psychology: Research and Educational Issues. Center for Population Research Monograph. DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 76-574. Washington: Govt. Printing Office. vi, 234 pp.

Nimkoff, M. F. 1959. Some problems concerning research on the changing family in India. Sociological Bulletin (New Delhi) 8(2):32-38.

Norton, A. J. 1974. The family life-cycle updated: components and uses. In Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family, 4th ed., edited by Robert F. Winch and Graham B. Spanier, pp. 162-170. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Otterbein, Keith F. 1970. The developmental cycle of the Andros household: a diachronic analysis. American Anthropologist (Washington) 72(6):1,412-1,419.

Pantelides, Edith A. 1976. El hogar como unidad de análisis de los datos censales: importancia y posibilidades [The household as a unit of analysis for census data: importance and possibilities]. In La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demográfico [The Family as a Unit for Demographic Study], edited by Thomas K. Burch, Luis F. Lira, and Valdecir F. Lopes, pp. 47-102. Series E, No. 1001. San José: U.N., Centro Latinoamericano de Demografía.

Parish, William L., Jr.; and Schwartz, Moshe. 1972. Household complexity in nineteenth century France. American Sociological Review (Washington) 37(2):154-173.

Pitts, Jesse R. 1964. The structural-functional approach. In Handbook of Marriage and the Family, edited by Harold T. Christensen, pp. 51-124. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Plakans, Andrejs. 1973. Peasant families East and West: a comment on Lutz K. Berkner's "Rural family organization in Europe: a problem in comparative history". Peasant Studies Newsletter (Pittsburgh) 2(3):11-16.

Plakans, Andrejs. 1975a. Peasant farmsteads and households in the Baltic littoral, 1797. Comparative Studies in Society and History (London) 17(1):2-35.

Plakans, Andrejs. 1975b. Seigneurial authority and peasant family life: the Baltic area in the eighteenth century. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 5(4):629-654.

Plakans, Andrejs. 1977. Indentifying kinfolk beyond the household. Journal of Family History (Minneapolis) 2(1):3-27.

Population (Paris). 1977. La mesure des phénomènes démographiques: hommage à Louis Henry [The measurement of demographic phenomena: hommage to Louis Henry]. Vol. 32, special issue, September. 506 pp.

Preston, Samuel H. 1976. Family sizes of children and family sizes of women. Demography (Washington) 13(1):105-114.

Pryor, Edward T., Jr. 1972. Rhode Island family structure: 1875 and 1960. In Household and Family in Past Time, edited by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, pp. 571-589. London: Cambridge University Press.

Reed, Ritchie H.; and McIntosh, Susan. 1972. Costs of children. In Economic Aspects of Population Change, edited by Elliott R. Morss and Ritchie H. Reed, pp. 333-350. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Research Reports, Vol. 2. Washington: Govt. Printing Office.

Rele, J. R. 1963. Fertility differentials in India: evidence from a rural background. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly (New York) 41(2):183-199.

Romney, A. Kimball. 1971. Measuring endogamy. In Explorations in Mathematical Anthropology, edited by Paul Kay, pp. 191-213. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rossi, Peter H. 1955. Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press. x, 220 pp.

Ryder, Norman B. 1975. Reproductive behaviour and the family life cycle. In The Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives. Papers of the World Population Conference, Bucharest, 1974, Vol. 2, pp. 278-288. Population Studies, No. 57. ST/ESA/SER.A/57/Add.1. Sales No. E/F/S.75.XIII.5. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Sabagh, Georges; Van Arsdol, Maurice D., Jr.; and Butler, Edgar W. 1969. Some determinants of intrametropolitan residential mobility: conceptual considerations. Social Forces (Chapel Hill, N.C.) 48(1):88-98.

Santini, Antonio. 1977. The family life cycle as a context for the measurement of nuptiality and fertility. In International Population Conference / Congrès International de la Population, Mexico, 1977, Vol. 1, pp. 371-387. Liège: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

Schnaiberg, Allan. 1973. The concept and measurement of child dependency: an approach to family formation analysis. Population Studies (London) 27(1):69-84.

Schultz, Theodore W., Editor. 1974. Economics of the Family: Marriage, Children, and Human Capital. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [for] National Bureau of Economic Research. ix, 504 pp.

Scott, Joan W.; and Tilly, Louise A. 1975. Women's work and the family in nineteenth-century Europe. Comparative Studies in Society and History (London) 17(1):36-64.

Sharlin, Allan N. 1977. Historical demography as history and demography. American Behavioral Scientist (Beverly Hills, Calif.) 21(2):245-262.

Shorter, Edward. 1975. The Making of the Modern Family. New York: Basic Books. xiv, 369 pp.

Siegel, Jacob S. 1963. Informaciones demográficas para la formulación de programas de vivienda con especial referencia a América Latina [Demographic information for formulating housing programs with special reference to Latin America]. Estadística (Washington) 21(79):227-281.

Simmons, James W. 1968. Changing residence in the city: a review of intraurban mobility. Geographical Review (New York) 58(4):622-651.

Sjoberg, Gideon. 1960. The Pre-Industrial City, Past and Present. New York: Free Press. xii, 353 pp.

Speare, Alden, Jr. 1970. Home ownership, life cycle stage, and residential mobility. Demography (Washington) 7(4):449-458.

Speare, Alden, Jr. 1974. Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility. Demography (Washington) 11(2):173-188.

Spiegelman, Mortimer. 1968. Introduction to Demography. Rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. xix, 514 pp.

Sussman, Marvin B; and Burchinal, Lee. 1962. Kin family network: unheralded structure in current conceptualizations of family functioning. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 24(3):231-240.

Sweet, James A. 1970. Family composition and the labor force activity of American wives. Demography (Washington) 7(2):195-209.

Sweet, James A. 1972. The living arrangements of separated, widowed, and divorced mothers. Demography (Washington) 9(1):143-157.

Sweet, James A. 1977. Demography and the family. In Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 3, edited by Alex Inkeles, James Coleman, and Neil Smelser, pp. 363-405. Palo Alto, Calif.: Annual Reviews. Also published as Working Paper Series, No. 77-7. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, Center for Demography and Ecology.

Taeuber, Irene B. 1971a. Change and transition in family structures. In The Family in Transition, edited by Arthur A. Campbell, John Kantner, Harry V. Kincaid, Jeanne C. Ridley, et al., pp. 35-97. Fogarty International Center Proceedings, No. 3. Washington: Govt. Printing Office.

Taeuber, Irene B. 1971b. Continuity, change, and transition in population and family: interrelations and priorities in research. In The Family in Transition, edited by Arthur A. Campbell, John Kantner, Harry V. Kincaid, Jeanne C. Ridley, et al., pp. 317-342. Fogarty International Center Proceedings, No. 3. Washington: Govt. Printing Office.

Tilly, Charles, Editor. 1978. Historical Studies of Changing Fertility. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. ix, 390 pp.

Townsend, Peter. 1957. The Family Life of Old People: An Inquiry in East London. London: Routledge. 284 pp.

Uhlenberg, Peter R. 1969. A study of cohort life cycles: cohorts of native born Massachusetts women, 1830-1920. Population Studies (London) 23(3):407-420.

U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1958. Multilingual Demographic Dictionary. Prepared by the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Demographic Dictionary Committee. Population Studies, No. 29. ST/SOA/SER.A/29. Sales No. 58.XIII.4. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs. viii, 77 pp. English, French, Russian, and Spanish editions.

U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1973a. The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends: New Summary of Findings on Interaction of Demographic, Economic and Social Factors, Vol. 1. Population Studies, No. 50. ST/SOA/SER.A/50. Sales No. E.71.XIII.5. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs. xvi, 661 pp. Chapter 10. Families and households, pp. 336-367.

U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1973b. Manuals on Methods of Estimating Population. Manual VII: Methods of Projecting Households and Families. Population Studies, No. 54. ST/SOA/SER.A/54. Sales No. E.73.XIII.2. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs. viii, 100 pp.

U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1975. The Population Debate: Dimensions and Perspectives. Papers of the World Population Conference, Bucharest, 1974, Vol. 2. Population Studies, No. 57. ST/ESA/SER.A/57/Add.1. Sales No. E/F/S.75.XIII.5. New York: U.N., Department of Economic and Social Affairs. viii, 726 pp.

U.N. Statistical Office. 1959. Handbook of Population Census Methods. Vol. 3: Demographic and Social Characteristics of the Population. Studies in Methods, Series F, No. 5, Rev. 1. ST/STAT/SER.F/5/Rev.1. Sales No. 58.XVII.6(Vol. III). New York: U.N., Statistical Office. vi, 78 pp.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1973. The Methods and Materials of Demography. By Henry S. Shryock, Jacob S. Siegel, et al. In 2 vols. 2nd printing (rev.). Washington: Govt. Printing Office. xvi, 888 pp. plus indexes.

Van der Tak, Jean; and Gendell, Murray. 1973. The size and structure of residential families, Guatemala City, 1964. Population Studies (London) 27(2):305-322.

Van de Walle, Etienne. 1976. The current state of historical demography. Review of Public Data Use (Arlington, Va.) 4(4):8-11.

Vinovskis, Maris. 1971. American historical demography: a review essay. Historical Methods Newsletter (Pittsburgh) 4(4):141-148.

Vinovskis, Maris A. 1974. The field of early American family history: a methodological critique. Family in Historical Perspective (Chicago) 7:2-8.

Vinovskis, Maris A. 1978. Recent trends in American historical demography: some methodological and conceptual considerations. In Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 4, edited by Ralph H. Turner, James Coleman, and Renée C. Fox, pp. 603-627. Palo Alto, Calif.: Annual Reviews.

Wargon, Sylvia J. 1974. The study of household and family units in demography. Journal of Marriage and the Family (Minneapolis) 36(3):560-564.

Wells, Robert V. 1971. Demographic change and the life cycle of American families. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 2:273-282.

Wheaton, Robert. 1975. Family and kinship in Western Europe: the problem of the joint family household. Journal of Interdisciplinary History (Cambridge, Mass.) 5(4):601-628.

Wrigley, E. A. 1966. Family reconstitution. In An Introduction to English Historical Demography: From the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, edited by E. A. Wrigley, pp. 96-159. Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, Publication No. 1. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Wrigley, E. A. 1969. Population and History. New York: McGraw-Hill. 256 pp.

Wrigley, E. A., Editor. 1973. Identifying People in the Past. London: Edward Arnold.

Wrigley, E. A. 1978. Fertility strategy for the individual and the group. In Historical Studies of Changing Fertility, edited by Charles Tilly, pp. 135-154. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Yengoyan, Aram A. 1968. Demographic and ecological influences on aboriginal Australian marriage selections. In Man the Hunter, edited by Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, pp. 185-199. Chicago: Aldine.

Young, Christabel M. 1975. Factors associated with the timing and duration of the leaving-home stage of the family life cycle. Population Studies (London) 29(1):61-73.

INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY

The first issue of a new serial entitled Bibliographie Internationale de la Démographie Historique / International Bibliography of Historical Demography has recently been published by the International Committee of Historical Sciences, the Société de Démographie Historique, and the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) (see this issue, Title 2591). The bibliography, covering worldwide literature on historical demography, will be published annually as a section of the journal Annales de Démographie Historique and as a separate offprint issued by the IUSSP. Citations are arranged under 10 broad subject categories, subdivided into narrower topics. Selected abstracts in English or French are included, as well as geographic, chronological, and author indexes. Plans are also underway to cumulate the citations and make them available to users in the form of a computerized data base.