



Upward Social Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion as Perceived by the Wife in Swedish Urban Families

Author(s): Everett D. Dyer

Source: *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Nov., 1972), pp. 713-724

Published by: National Council on Family Relations

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/350324>

Accessed: 26-12-2019 09:58 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

National Council on Family Relations is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Marriage and Family*

Upward Social Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion as Perceived by the Wife in Swedish Urban Families*

EVERETT D. DYER

Department of Sociology, The University of Houston

Possible dysfunctional consequences of upward social mobility for extended family cohesion were sought from 89 upwardly mobile families in Uppsala, Sweden. Educational, occupational, and financial mobility were correlated with seven measures of extended family cohesion, which was found to be negatively correlated with differential mobility between the couple and their adult siblings, intergenerational occupational mobility, and spatial separation of the couple and their extended families. However, extended family cohesion was found to be positively correlated with lower or working-class background, and with higher ambitions of the couples. Findings thus tend to support Turner's notion that both "class-consciousness" and "prestige identification" exist together in varying degrees today in urban mobile families.

This is the second of two companion papers, both of which are concerned with the problem of consequences of social mobility for the family. These papers attempt to explore the general hypothesis that there are aspects of upward social mobility which are dysfunctional for family organization and life. (LeMasters, 1954; Janowitz, 1956; Stuckert, 1963; Adams, 1967; Turner, 1970) The first paper explored some of the possible relationships between upward social mobility and nuclear family integration (Dyer, 1970). The present paper is concerned with the question of possible dysfunctional consequences of upward social mobility upon extended family cohesion. Are there consequences of upward social mobility which may be detrimental to the ties and relationships among extended family members? (By extended family we mean a kin group "consisting of 'blood' relatives and their several nuclear family units.") (Broom and Selznick, 1963:355)

The literature reveals some disagreement among sociologists as to the consequences of upward mobility for the extended family. Two opposing views have been put forth, each with some supporting evidence. One approach views social mobility as essentially dysfunctional to a

stable extended family system. Parsons holds the view that occupational mobility is antithetical to extended family relations, and that there is accordingly a basic disharmony between modern democratic industrial society and extended family relations (1949). The child's independent choice of occupation leads to the economic emancipation of the individual from his family of orientation. Vertical mobility tends to separate the individual from his family of orientation, the argument goes. Not only does occupational success bring higher salary and more prestige, it often requires that one move to "better" neighborhoods and move in "better" social circles. According to this view the nuclear family is highly functional since it enables the individual to be occupationally mobile and to center his identification and loyalty within a small household independent of extended family restrictions and obligations. Some evidence in support of this position will be introduced below.

An opposing view holds that a modified extended family is compatible with social mobility, and may be more functional than the isolated nuclear family. The extended family, it is argued, plays an important role for the upwardly mobile person because he can achieve status by gaining deference from his extended family. In addition, the extended family may provide aid to young members who are in the initial stages of mobility.

One of the proponents of this view is Litwak (1960a). According to Litwak, the modern

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by a University of Houston Research Grant which enabled the writer to spend the Spring and Summer of 1964 at the Sociological Institute, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden, and a University of Houston Summer Research Grant, 1966.

urban extended family consists of "a series of nuclear families bound together on an equalitarian basis. It differs from the isolated nuclear family in that it does provide continued and significant aid to the nuclear family" (Litwak, 1960a:10). The nuclear family is permitted to retain its extended family contacts thus, despite differences in class position. He further argues that the disintegrative effects of occupational mobility upon the extended family due to "differential socialization" have greatly diminished today because class differences are shrinking, not growing larger (Litwak, 1960a:12).

Litwak conducted a study of 920 middle-class, native born, white married couples in Buffalo, New York, to test his hypothesis. He found that the mobile families visited their relatives as much as the nonmobile families, and were no less identified with their extended families than the others. He also found no incompatibility between extended family identity and "status orientation" in his sample, and that geographical mobility did not reduce extended family orientation. Those who are geographically distant from their relatives are as likely to retain their extended family identification as are those who live nearby their relatives. His data also showed that close identification with the extended family does not prevent nuclear families who are career oriented from moving away (Litwak, 1960a:13-18).

Litwak feels that his data support his hypothesis. He concludes that it is

probable that Parson's hypothesis is applicable in the earlier stages of industrialization . . . [when] extended family relations were heavily influenced by the peasant farm family which strongly incorporated the values of geographical and occupational closeness. Under such circumstances extended family relations were detrimental to occupational mobility In contemporary society, however, extended family relations do not rely on geographical and occupational proximity for their viability. [Litwak, 1960a: 20]

Litwak admits that the middle class bias of his sample quite likely affected his findings. The writer feels that a more adequate sample in which working-class and other lower-class people are represented is needed to fully test his hypothesis. Without minimizing the significance of his findings that extended family cohesion is possible in middle-class families in spite of occupational or geographical mobility, one suspects the results would be different for a sample representing a greater range of the social class hierarchy.

Stuckert studied occupational mobility and family relationships in Wisconsin in 1952 and

came to the conclusion that social mobility was indeed detrimental to extended family relationships (Stuckert, 1963). This conclusion was based on his study of relationships between occupational mobility and four dimensions of family cohesion. His sample of 266 married couples approximated a random area sample.

Stuckert found an inverse relationship between mobility and contacts with the extended family.

In every case where comparison is possible, the persons in the stable [*i.e.*, nonmobile] categories visit members of their own extended families more frequently than do those in the mobile categories This relation holds regardless of whether or not the respondent has parents or relatives living in the Milwaukee area. [Stuckert, 1963:304]

This last point is interesting in light of Litwak's finding that geographical separation does not lead to a loss of extended family identification. These findings suggest that social factors are probably more important than spatial factors in the retention of contacts and identification with the extended family.

Stuckert also found that mobile families tend to identify with their extended families to a lesser extent than the stable families, regardless of status level; and that stable families use their extended families as reference groups to a greater extent than do mobile families. Stable families are also more concerned with maintaining extended family unity than are mobile families (Stuckert, 1963:305-306).

The investigation showed that extended family cohesion is related to "status" as well as to occupational mobility. Upper status persons tend to visit more often with their extended families than lower status persons; upper status persons are more "extended family oriented" than are middle or lower status people; and upper status people use their extended families as reference groups more (Stuckert, 1963:305-306). This suggests that the negative impact of occupational mobility upon extended family ties is less in the upper status ranges and probably greater in the lower.

Turner sheds additional light on the question of upward social mobility and extended family relationships (Turner, 1970:476). He points out that intergenerational mobility means the development of a divergent class orientation within an established family, which leads eventually to a new nuclear family unit at a different level, while the position of the original unit remains essentially unchanged. So the family involved in intergenerational mobility must develop ways

of coping with the two different class anchorages that become of greater rather than lesser significance during the course of the life cycle of the family (Turner, 1970:476).

How these adjustments can be made are affected by the relationships between social strata that prevail in the society at the time. Turner says there are two ways in which the different strata may view each other, which he calls (1) class consciousness and (2) prestige identification (Turner, 1970:477).

Class consciousness means a highly developed ingroup-outgroup attitude. Members of outgroups (other strata) are viewed with resentment, contempt, suspicion, or fear, all tending toward hostility when any very active inter-class relations are established. The class as ingroup demands first loyalty from its members, and any sign of identification with any other class is disloyalty and betrayal. [Turner, 1970:477]

When such class conscious attitudes are highly developed and preponderant, the disruptive consequence of intergenerational mobility will likely be great.

Prestige identification means that within-class loyalties are subordinated to broader loyalties. Members of lower classes typically find personal gratification and support for these broad loyalties through identifying with conspicuous and successful members of higher classes . . . The more one can establish legitimate claims to identification with a person of high prestige, the more one's own prestige is enhanced. [Turner, 1970:477]

For one to have a relative, and especially a child, who is firmly established in a higher social stratum is a source of prestige for the remaining family members. Under conditions that favor prestige identification, upward social mobility has potentially positive consequences for extended family bonds.

Turner points out that the normal situation in any society is ambivalence, with both class consciousness and prestige identification present in the members' perspectives in varying degrees. "But the mix is quite variable, and the preponderance of one or the other attitude is crucial for family adjustments to mobility" (Turner, 1970:477).

METHOD

The present study pursued the investigation of possible dysfunctional consequences of social mobility for the extended family by obtaining data from a sample of upwardly mobile families living in Uppsala, Sweden. Questions were raised and hypotheses were drawn up suggesting conditions under which

social mobility may be detrimental to extended family cohesion.

Sample

The subjects studied comprised a subsample of 89 urban families selected for evidence of their upward social mobility from a larger random sample of 753 families which had been drawn from the Swedish National Register (*Mantalslängderna*) for Uppsala Stad in 1959 (Junus, 1962:113). A review of the original 753 interview schedules showed 196 families evidencing sufficient upward social mobility for present purposes, using data collected by Junus on the couple's educational attainment, the husband's occupation at different age periods (e.g., ages 20, 30, 40, and 50), and the husband's father's occupation at two different periods. It was decided to use only families where the husband was at present 55 or under, who thus would still probably be looking toward the future. Of 196 upwardly mobile families a total of 89 who were qualified and still living together in Uppsala in 1964 were located and interviewed.

The Interview

A structured interview schedule was carefully developed with the assistance of the faculty at the Sociology Institute at Uppsala University. Effort was made to frame questions and devise measures and categories that would be appropriate for the Swedish culture and population. The schedule was first drawn up in English. Review by the Swedish Sociology faculty resulted in extensive revisions which were made by the Swedish sociologists before the schedule was tested on four Swedish couples. After a few further modifications, the final form was reproduced and used in interviewing the 89 families. The four interviewers were sociology graduate students with training and experience in interviewing.

The interviewers contacted the families and requested an interview with the wife. It is recognized that it would have strengthened the study had the husband as well as the wife been interviewed, but limitations of time and budget precluded this. It was felt that information on educational, occupational, and financial mobility could be obtained with reasonable reliability from the wife. A more difficult problem inhered in obtaining from the wife only the information needed to assess extended family cohesion. Accordingly, it should be made clear that family cohesion in the present study is really the wife's perception of family cohesion.

*Measures and Indices of
Principal Research Variables*

Social Mobility. Three measures were used separately and in various combinations to find both intragenerational and intergenerational mobility: (1) educational mobility, (2) occupational mobility, and (3) financial mobility.

Six educational categories were used, representing ascending levels of educational achievement: (1) Elementary school, (2) Elementary school plus 1-3 years of school, (3) Folk high school, (4) High School, (5) Gymnasium, (6) University. The husband's educational mobility score equaled the difference between his educational achievement and that of his father. The wife's educational mobility score equaled the difference between her educational achievement and that of her mother.

Following Carlsson's (1958) Swedish study, and with assistance from the sociology faculty at Uppsala University, it was possible to rank each occupation so that it fell into one of six occupational categories. The six categories comprised the upper and lower halves of the three Swedish designations for social classes: Social group I (*Bättre situera*), Social group II (*Medelklass*), and Social group III (*Arbetare*). Occupational rankings were patterned after those of the Swedish State Statistical Central-bureau categories, whose rankings are based on the prestige, functional significance, and amount of education required for each occupation. Data were obtained on both the husband's and wife's occupations at three different points: (1) first full-time job, (2) job at marriage, and (3) present occupation. Intragenerational occupational or career mobility equaled the difference between the rank of the first full-time job and that of the present job, using a six-point scale, each point representing the rank position of the occupation. Data were also obtained on the husband's and wife's fathers' occupations at age 30 and age 60, and on their paternal grandfathers' main or last occupation. Intergenerational occupational mobility measures were obtained by comparing the husband's present occupation with the final occupations of his father and paternal grandfather, and those of his wife's father and paternal grandfather.

The income range was broken down into six categories ranging from under 5,000 kroner a year to over 40,000 kroner a year. Income data were obtained for both husband and wife on their occupations in the three career periods. The financial mobility score equaled the difference between the rank of the present income

and that of the income of the first full-time job.

Extended Family Cohesion

Both Litwak (1960a) and Stuckert (1963) use the concept of extended family cohesion, but neither one defines it concisely. Litwak distinguishes between the modified extended family and the classical extended family. "The modified extended family consists of a series of nuclear families bound together on an equalitarian basis, with a strong emphasis on these extended family bonds as an end value" (Litwak, 1960a:10). This type of family "differs from the 'classical extended' family in that it does not demand geographical propinquity, occupational involvement, or nepotism, nor does it have an hierarchical authority structure." As indicators of extended family cohesion Litwak uses extended family visits and extended family identification (Litwak, 1960a: 14-18). Stuckert identifies four divisions of a person's ties with his extended family: (1) extended family contacts, (2) extended family orientation, (3) extended family as a reference group, and (4) concern for extended family unity (Stuckert, 1963:304-306).

For present purposes this working definition is presented: By extending family cohesion is meant the ties and bonds existing among those kin folk constituting the modified extended family. These ties and bonds are manifested through continued identity with and loyalty to the extended family, and continued contacts and communication among its members.

Several measures or indices of extended family cohesion were devised and used separately and in combinations. These measures were based in part on others used by Litwak (1960), Stuckert (1963), Wilkening (1954), and LeMasters (1954). They were (1) the extended family as a reference group, (2) shared activities with extended family members, (3) extended family orientation, (4) frequency and trend of husband and wife visiting family members, (5) frequency of exchanging gifts with extended family members, (6) frequency and trend of husband and wife correspondence with extended family members, and (7) estrangement from extended family members.

The extent to which the husband and wife used their extended families as reference groups was sought by asking a series of questions on if or how much the couple seeks or uses ideas and suggestions from parents or other close relatives when important questions or problems arise regarding areas of family or personal life. (A list of 14 such areas is presented, e.g., "handling family finance," "religious matters,"

“childrearing matters,” etc.)

The degree to which the husband and wife share activities with extended family members was assessed by asking first “What are the things you generally do during your leisure time?” and then asking the respondent to show which of these things he does with close relatives (his or mate’s parents or siblings). Each couple was ranked on a five-point scale ranging from “very frequent” to “very infrequent” on shared activities with extended family members.

Litwak’s family orientation scale (1960a: 116) was used to assess extended family orientation. Respondents were asked to express their degree of agreement with these items: (1) “I want a location which would make it easy for relatives to get together,” (2) “I want a house with room enough for our parents to feel free to move in.” Responses were ranked on a four-point scale ranging from “definitely agree” to “agree very little or not at all.”

Frequency of seeing extended family members was determined for husband and wife by asking how often they visited their parents or other close relatives. Choices given were: “more than once a week,” “one to four times a month,” “one to 12 times a year,” “less than once a year.” The same four choices were given to elicit the frequency of correspondence for the husband and wife and their parents and close relatives. The trends in both visiting and correspondence were sought by asking if each saw (or corresponded with) his parents or other close relatives “less,” “about the same,” or “more,” as the years go by.

The frequency of receiving and giving gifts was determined by asking “How often do you or your husband receive gifts, aid, or services from either your parents or close relatives or from your husband’s parents or close relatives? More than once a week, 1 to 4 times a month, 1 to 12 times a year, less than once a year.” The same question was asked with the same four response choices for giving gifts, etc., to parents and close relatives.

The amount of estrangement of the husband and wife was sought by asking the extent of their agreement or disagreement with a series of questions, such as “As the years go by I seem to have less in common with my parents or other relatives,” and “It is generally better for all concerned if we seldom see my parents or relatives.” Responses were scored on a five-point scale ranging from “very high estrangement” to “very low estrangement.”

Chi-square tests of significance were calculated for each correlation between the various

independent variables and the measures of extended family cohesion. Shortage of time and funds made it impossible to adequately test these measures for reliability and validity. In the time available it was not possible to do a test-retest for reliability on the sample, and none of the measures contained enough items for a split-half reliability test. It was also difficult to assess validity, since there were no independent measures of extended family cohesion available for use as outside criteria for comparison. “Face validity” of the measures may be claimed on the basis that when the couple uses their parents and other close relatives for reference groups, share in numerous activities with them, are oriented toward them, visit them frequently and correspond with them, exchange gifts frequently with them, and are not estranged from them, that these patterns constitute a logical or valid indication of extended family cohesion. The above would be true insofar as correct inferences may be made from information and perceptions gained from one marriage partner.

A further effort to assess the validity of the measures was made by the “jury opinion” method. A jury of four sociologists at the Sociology Institute at Uppsala University were asked to make a judgment and all agreed that the indices should produce valid measures of nuclear family integration. It is readily admitted that the above represents only a limited kind of evidence of validity, and that it would be better if the measures could be validated against external criteria of extended family cohesion.

FINDINGS

Extended Family Cohesion and Differential Mobility

The first hypothesis is that social mobility would be detrimental to extended family cohesion where “differential mobility” exists between the married couple and their adult siblings. The rationale is that such differential mobility will likely reduce the contacts and communication between adult siblings, thus creating social distance and loss of family ties and loyalties. [LeMasters (1954:1-3) defines “differential mobility” as the “different degree or rate of movement between two or more persons or groups up or down an hierarchy of social statuses.”] Differential mobility was measured by comparing the extent of educational and occupational mobility of the husband and wife with that of their adult brothers and sisters.

Differential educational mobility between

the husband and his siblings was not found to be significantly related to any of the measures of extended family cohesion. However, two nonsignificant relations were found here. First, where there is an educational difference between the husband and his siblings the couple is less apt to use his extended family as a reference group ($p < .15$) and second, where there is an educational difference between the husband and his siblings there is somewhat greater estrangement between the husband and his extended family ($p < .10$).

When the wife's educational mobility was compared with that of her siblings, a significant negative relationship was found between higher educational mobility for the wife and extended family cohesion ($p < .02$, Table 1). Where the wife's educational mobility has been greater than that of her siblings, extended family cohesion is lower with the wife's family than where the educational mobility of the wife and her siblings is either the same or that of the siblings is greater. And, although the relationship is not quite significant ($p < .10$), the same trend is seen for the husband and his siblings too. Extended family cohesion is lower with the husband's family where the husband's educational mobility has been greater than that of his siblings.

These findings suggest that where the husband and wife move up educationally further than their adult brothers and sisters, the ties between the couple and their extended families may be weakened.

The husband's occupational mobility was compared with that of his brothers. A significant negative correlation was found between the differential occupational mobility of the husband and his brothers and the couple's use of the husband's extended family as a reference group ($p < .05$). When there is a difference in the occupational mobility of the husband and his brothers, the couple is less apt to turn to his

relatives for guidance and advice, etc., than where there is no difference between the occupational mobility of the husband and his brothers.

The husband's occupational mobility was compared with that of the wife's brothers also. A significant negative relationship was found between higher occupational mobility of the husband and the couple's use of the wife's extended family as a reference group ($p < .05$). The couple is less apt to turn to her relatives for guidance, etc., where the husband's occupational mobility was greater than that of the wife's brothers.

A significant negative correlation was found between the combined educational and occupational differential mobility scores of the husband and wife versus those of their siblings and the use of their extended families as reference groups ($p < .02$, Table 2). The greater the mobility of the couple beyond that of their siblings the less apt the couple is to see their relatives as reference groups. Also, a not quite significant correlation was found between this measure of differential mobility and estrangement from the wife's extended family ($p < .10$). Estrangement between the couple and the wife's extended family tended to increase with an increase in the mobility of the couple over that of their siblings.

The above findings may be taken as evidence lending some support to the hypothesis that social mobility would be detrimental to extended family cohesion where differential mobility exists between the married couple and their adult siblings. These findings tend to support those of Adams (1967), that while mutually upwardly mobile siblings may be

TABLE 1. EXTENDED FAMILY COHESION (WIFE'S FAMILY) BY DIFFERENTIAL EDUCATIONAL MOBILITY—WIFE VERSUS SIBLINGS

Extended Family Cohesion—Wife's Family			
Educational Mobility	High and Moderate	Low	N
Wife Higher	4	18	22
Siblings Same as Wife or Higher	28	32	60
	32	50	82

$$\chi^2 = 5.49; df = 1; p < .02$$

TABLE 2. EXTENDED FAMILIES AS REFERENCE GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY OF HUSBAND AND WIFE VERSUS THEIR SIBLINGS

Extended Families as Reference Groups				
Educational and Occupational Mobility	High and Moderate		Low	N
Husband and Wife 3 or More Steps Higher	9		8	17
Husband and Wife 1 or 2 Steps Higher	25		9	34
No Difference or Siblings Higher	19		1	20
	53		18	71

$$\chi^2 = 8.64; df = 2; p < .02$$

relatively close to each other in their comparable achievements, however, where one sibling is upwardly mobile and the others aren't, he tends to feel less emotional attachment to his lower status siblings (Adams, 1967:367).

It was hypothesized that social mobility would be detrimental to extended family cohesion where differential mobility exists between the married couple and their parents and grandparents.

A significant inverse relationship was observed between the distance separating the husband's present occupation from the last occupation of the husband's father and the degree to which the couple used the husband's extended family as reference group ($p < .02$, Table 3). The higher the husband's present occupation ranked above his father's last occupation the less the couple turn to his extended family for advice or help in solving problems, etc.

Also, an almost significant inverse relationship was found between the same independent variable and the summarized extended family cohesion score for the husband ($p < .10$). As occupational distance between the husband's present job and his father's last job increases, extended family cohesion decreases.

Another inverse relationship (not quite significant at $p < .10$) was found between the combined intergenerational occupational mobility measure and the couple's use of their extended families as reference groups. (The combined intergenerational occupational mobility measure was determined by comparing the ranking of the husband's present occupation with the last jobs of the father and the jobs of the grandfathers of the husband and wife.)

The above findings offer some support to the hypothesis that intergenerational occupational mobility may be dysfunctional to extended family cohesion.

Another hypothesis is that social mobility is

TABLE 3. HUSBAND'S EXTENDED FAMILY AS REFERENCE GROUP BY HUSBAND'S PRESENT OCCUPATION VERSUS HIS FATHER'S LAST OCCUPATION

Husband's Extended Family as Reference Group				
Occupational Differences	High	Moderate	Low	N
Husband 3 or More Steps Higher	3	18	9	30
Husband 1 or 2 Steps Higher or Same	18	27	13	58
	21	45	22	88

$$\chi^2 = 10.21; df = 2; p < .02$$

detrimental to extended family cohesion where intragenerational mobility is great.

An almost significant negative correlation was observed between the occupational mobility of the husband and wife and the trend in the husband's seeing his relatives ($p < .10$). Where the couple have experienced higher occupational mobility the husband tends to see his parents and other kin less frequently than where the couple has experienced moderate or low occupational mobility.

Significant inverse relationships were found between the couple's educational and occupational mobility and the frequency of the husband and wife seeing her extended family members ($p < .05$, $p < .02$, Table 4). Where couples have achieved higher educational and occupational mobility, both the husband and wife see her parents and relatives less frequently than where couples have achieved less educational and occupational mobility. Thus, high educational and occupational advancement in one generation may be detrimental to continued contacts of the couple with the wife's kin.

A nonsignificant inverse relationship was also

TABLE 4. FREQUENCY OF WIFE SEEING HER FAMILY BY COUPLE'S EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Educational and Occupational Mobility	Frequency of Wife Seeing Her Family		N
	Frequently and Occasionally	Infrequently	
High and Moderate	13	17	30
Low	42	17	59
	55	34	89

$$\chi^2 = 6.54; df = 1; p < .02$$

found between the independent variable and the frequency of the husband seeing his extended family ($p < .10$). Also, nonsignificant inverse relationships were found between the educational and occupational mobility of the couple and the frequency of the couple's giving gifts to their parents and relatives ($p < .10$) and the frequency of the couple's receiving gifts from parents and relatives ($p < .15$).

The above findings provide only partial evidence in support of the hypothesis that extended family cohesion is negatively affected by high intragenerational mobility.

Is there any relationship between extended family cohesion and the social class origins of upwardly mobile couples? Is it perhaps true that social mobility is more dysfunctional to extended family cohesion where one or both partners are from the lower or working classes? Is it perhaps more likely that social distance is greater between mobile couples of lower or working class origin and their parents and kin than between mobile couples of middle class origin and their parents and kin? The social class origins of the husband and the wife (measured by the educational level of parents and the father's last occupation) were correlated with selected measures of extended family cohesion.

No significant relationships were found between the social class origins of the couple and the giving or receiving of gifts to and from parents or other close relatives.

Correlations were found between the class origins of the husband and wife and the frequency of their visiting with their parents and close kin. Interestingly, these relationships were all the reverse of what was expected. Positive (but not quite significant) relationships were found between the husband's social class origin and the frequency with which the husband and wife visit their parental families ($p < .10$; $p < .15$). Where the husband was of lower or lower-middle class origin, the couple tended to see both his extended family and his wife's extended family more frequently than when the husband was of upper-middle or upper-class origin. While there was no significant relationship found between the social class origin of the wife and the frequency with which she visited her own parents and kin, a significant direct relationship was found between her class origin and the frequency of her visiting with her husband's kin ($p < .05$, Table 5) and the frequency of her husband's visiting his kin ($p < .02$). Both the wife and husband see his family less frequently where she is of upper-

middle or upper class origin. The sex difference here may be due in part to the greater tendency of women to continue their parental and kin ties into adulthood regardless of social class (Bott, 1964; Young and Wilmot, 1957).

Regarding the social class origin variable, it may be that the pattern of frequent visiting among extended family members is stronger in families of lower class, working class, and rural background in Sweden, and that this persists even when family members "move up" and become urban dwellers. In this connection, the findings of Junus five years earlier on the original larger sample (from which the present sample was drawn) would perhaps help explain the present findings (Junus, 1962:113). Junus found that there was more downward social contact in upwardly mobile families than in nonmobile families; that moving upward did not apparently reduce the ties between the mobile nuclear family and their families of orientation. The present findings are consistent with those of Junus for couples of lower and lower-middle class origins. Unfortunately, data are not available on the distance the couples have moved upward from their classes of origin. It may be that those of lower and lower-middle class origin have not moved up so far or so fast and thus are more apt to retain ties with their kin.

In general, the present findings tend to support Litwak's hypothesis rather than that of Parsons (Litwak, 1960a:9-13). Parents and kin may be supportive of the mobility efforts of their adult children and gain some "prestige identification" with their successful offspring. As Turner points out, it may be that "to have a relative . . . who is in a higher social stratum is a source of prestige for other family members" in the lower classes (Turner, 1970:477).

Is upward social mobility possibly detrimental to extended family cohesion where the

TABLE 5. FREQUENCY OF WIFE SEEING HUSBAND'S EXTENDED FAMILY BY WIFE'S SOCIAL CLASS ORIGIN

Social Class Origin	Frequency of Wife Seeing Family		N
	Once a Month or More	Less than Once a Month	
Upper and Upper-Middle	6	10	16
Lower-Middle	10	19	29
Lower	28	15	43
	44	44	88

$$\chi^2 = 7.74; df = 2; p < .05$$

nuclear family has experienced rural to urban movement? Differences in rural and urban background were not found to be significantly related to any of the measures of extended family cohesion. There was no evidence of greater reduction in contacts or ties between couples who have moved from the country to the city and their kin than between couples who have resided longer in the city and their kin folk.

Is the intensity of the social mobility orientation possibly related to extended family cohesion in these families? It has been suggested that those who are most eager to move upward tend to turn their backs on their families of orientation more so than those who have internalized the mobility values in lesser degree (LeMasters, 1954; McGuire, 1950). The present findings offer little support for this contention. In fact, some of the findings are to the contrary. While there were no significant differences between couples with high or low mobility orientation and the frequency of correspondence or the exchange of gifts with their extended families, there was a significant direct relationship between the mobility orientation of both the husband and wife and the frequency of the wife's seeing both his and her parents and close relatives ($p < .02$, Table 6; $p < .02$). The same pattern held true for the husband but the relationships were not statistically significant ($p < .15$), *i.e.*, where the couple had a high mobility orientation the husband tended to see both his and her families more frequently.

These findings also would appear to support Litwak and Turner's "prestige identification" thesis in a way. Parents and relatives are apparently happy to continue seeing their ambitious offspring, and the couples are glad to retain ties with their relatives who encourage and support their ambitions. The parents, of course, may be an important source of the mobility aspirations of the couple. This line of

reasoning, however, presumes a similarity in mobility value orientations among the classes that may be questionable. We would expect middle-class parents to be apt to share and support the mobility values of their children. But this may be less likely in the lower classes where certain traditions may be less supportive of middle-class type ambitions. Further study is needed here, controlling for social class origin in relation to social mobility orientation.

It was hypothesized that social mobility would be detrimental to extended family cohesion where the couple live farther away from their parents and relatives than where the couple live nearer them.

For both husband and wife, information was obtained as to where their parents (if living) and other close relatives live. Correlations were made between selected measures of extended family cohesion and whether or not these extended family members lived in the Uppsala area (near the couple) or lived elsewhere. The findings strongly support the hypothesis. Significant negative correlations were found between the wife's extended family residence outside of the Uppsala area and the frequency of the husband and wife seeing her family ($p < .01$, Table 7), the amount of the wife's shared activities with her relatives ($p < .05$), and the frequency and trend of the wife's correspondence with her relatives ($p < .01$). Also, the husband's extended family residence outside of the Uppsala area was negatively correlated with the frequency of the husband and wife's seeing his family ($p < .01$, Table 8), the frequency of the couple's receiving gifts from his family ($p < .01$), and the frequency of his correspondence with his relatives ($p < .01$). Also, where the extended families live outside the local area, the trend is for both the husband and wife to see their parents and other kin less as the years go by ($p < .01$; $p < .05$).

For the present sample it appears that social mobility is less detrimental to extended family

TABLE 6. FREQUENCY OF WIFE SEEING HUSBAND'S FAMILY BY WIFE'S SOCIAL MOBILITY ORIENTATION

Wife's Mobility Orientation	Frequency of Wife Seeing Husband's Family		N
	Frequently and Occasionally	Infrequently	
Very High	12	2	14
High	11	17	28
Moderate and Low	21	25	46
	44	44	88

$$\chi^2 = 8.76; df = 2; p < .02$$

TABLE 7. FREQUENCY OF WIFE'S SEEING HER FAMILY BY WIFE'S EXTENDED FAMILY LOCATION

Wife's Family's Location	Frequency of Wife Seeing Her Family			N
	More than Once a Week	Once a Month to Once a Week	Less than Once a Month	
Uppsala Area	19	26	3	48
Elsewhere	0	9	31	40
	19	35	34	88

$$\chi^2 = 50.04; df = 2; p < .01$$

TABLE 8. FREQUENCY OF HUSBAND'S SEEING HIS EXTENDED FAMILY BY HUSBAND'S EXTENDED FAMILY'S LOCATION

Husband's Family's Location	Frequency of Husband Seeing His Family			N
	More than Once a Week	Once a Month to Once a Week	Less than Once a Month	
Uppsala Area	18	18	7	43
Elsewhere	1	10	33	44
	19	28	40	87

$$\chi^2 = 34.38; df = 2; p < .01$$

cohesion where the couple are able to live physically close to their kin. Spatial separation may make it more difficult for the mobile couple to sustain close family and social ties with parents and other relatives. Note that even the frequency of correspondence is greater where the couple's relatives live close by. This may be seen as just one aspect of the social closeness or cohesion of these families. Conversely, where the families are physically separated, their social contacts diminish, including the exchange of letters.

It is entirely understandable that the amount of visiting would be greater where the couple and their kin live in the same area than where they are spatially separated. However, some of the other findings—the trend of seeing relatives less as the years go by, the less frequent receiving of gifts from parents and kin who live away, and the less frequent correspondence—tend to support the hypothesis that spatial separation may be detrimental to extended family cohesion for upwardly mobile families. The present findings do not support Litwak's view that those persons who are physically separated from their relatives are as likely to retain their extended family orientation and ties as are those who live near their relatives (Litwak, 1960b).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Some evidence was found to support the hypothesis that upward social mobility may be

detrimental to extended family cohesion where differential mobility exists between the married couple and their adult siblings. This was especially true for higher educational mobility for the wife and for higher occupational mobility for the husband. These findings tend to support those of Adams (1967:376) that while upwardly mobile siblings tend to remain close, it is less likely for a mobile sibling to remain close to his nonmobile siblings.

The findings also offered some support to the hypothesis that intergenerational occupational mobility may be dysfunctional to extended family cohesion. The higher the husband's present occupation in relation to his father's last occupation the less likely the couple were to use his family as a reference group.

Only partial support was found for the hypothesis that extended family cohesion is negatively affected by high intragenerational mobility.

The findings did not support the hypothesis that social mobility may be dysfunctional to extended family ties where the couple is from lower or working class origins. In fact, extended family cohesion was found to be greater in those families where the couples were from lower or working class background. This was especially true where the wife was of lower rather than middle class background. These findings tend to support Litwak's hypothesis rather than that of Parsons. Evidence showed a

good deal of continued social contact between upwardly mobile lower and working class couples and their parents and kin. One may infer that the parents and kin are to some degree supportive of the mobility efforts of their offspring, and that these parents and relatives realize a measure of prestige identification with their more successful children.

Couples who had moved from rural areas to the city were found to maintain as close ties with their relatives as did couples with longer urban residence. Rural background thus does not appear to be a special disadvantage in maintaining extended family cohesion for these socially mobile urban couples.

There was some evidence that extended family cohesion is greater where the couples' ambitions are higher. Couples with higher mobility orientation sustained contacts with their relatives more than couples with lesser ambitions. This also suggests that the parents of ambitious couples are experiencing a vicarious prestige. Questions still remain as to whether lower and working class parents and kin are equally as supportive of middle-class type mobility values in their offspring as is apparently true of middle class parents.

There was strong support for the hypothesis that social mobility is detrimental to extended family cohesion where the couple is geographically removed from their parents and kin. Not only do the husband and wife see their parents and relatives less, but other kinds of ties and contacts are diminished, including correspondence; and the trend is for the couple to see their parents and relatives less as years go by. These findings appear contradictory to Litwak's position that families which are spatially separated from their kinfolk are as likely to retain their extended family orientation and ties as are those who dwell close to their relatives. The findings seem on the other hand to corroborate the conclusions of Elizabeth Bott, that "physical accessibility of relatives to a family facilitates . . . intimacy. It is very difficult for a family . . . to maintain intimate relationships with geographically distant relatives" (Bott, 1964:128).

Further study is needed to explore other variables that may accentuate or diminish the effects of spatial separation on extended family cohesion for mobile couples. Perhaps the physical separation has less effect where the mobility values and goals of the couple do not become divergent from those of their parents and other kin. This may be more true for white collar workers than for blue collar workers (Adams, 1967:367-368). Also, what are the

conditions under which a mobile couple retains close ties with certain members of their extended families but not others when they are physically separated?

The present findings are not conclusive as to the relationship between upward social mobility and extended family cohesion. While there was evidence to support Stuckert's position that social mobility is detrimental to extended family cohesion, there was also some evidence in support of Litwak's position that upward social mobility today is not necessarily dysfunctional to extended family ties and relationships. The findings would appear to fit Turner's analytical model quite well. Tendencies toward both "class consciousness" and "prestige identification" exist together in varying degrees today in mobile families in urban societies. Further study is needed to seek (1) those conditions under which prestige identification may prevail in family systems where some members are upwardly mobile and others are not, as well as (2) those conditions under which family ties are weakened or severed due to the intensification of class consciousness.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Bert
1967 "Occupational position, mobility, and the kin of orientation." *American Sociological Review* 32 (June): 364-377.
- Bott, Elizabeth
1964 *Family and Social Network*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
1963 *Sociology: A Text with Adapted Readings*. New York: Harper and Row:355.
- Carlsson, Gosta
1958 *Social Mobility and Class Structure*. London: Gleerup.
- Dyer, Everett D.
1970 "Upward social mobility and nuclear family integration as perceived by the wife in Swedish urban families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32 (August):341-350.
- Janowitz, Morris
1956 "Some consequences of social mobility in the United States." *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology* 3:191-196.
- Janus, Olavi
1962 "The composition of leisure time friendships with regard to social status and social classes." Unpublished Licentiate Thesis, Sociologiska Institutionen, Uppsala:113, Table 5.3.
- LeMasters, E. E.
1954 "Social mobility and family integration." *Marriage and Family Living* 16 (August): 1-8.

- Litwak, Eugene
 1960 "Geographical mobility and extended family cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (February).
- McGuire, Carson
 1950 "Social stratification and mobility patterns." *American Sociological Review* 15 (April):195-204.
- Parsons, Talcott
 1949 "The Social structure of the family." Pp. 92ff. in Ruth Anshen (ed.), *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. New York:Harper.
 1963 "Revised analytical approach to the theory of social stratification." Pp. 166ff. in Reinhard Bendix and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Stuckert, Robert P.
 1963 "Occupational mobility and family relationships." *Social Forces* 41 (March):301-308. See 302 for a discussion of the two opposing views.
- Turner, Ralph
 1970 *Family Interaction*. New York:John Wiley and Sons.
- Wilkening, Eugene
 1954 "Changing farm technology as related to familism, family decision making, and family integration." *American Sociological Review* 19:29-37.
- Young, M. and P. Wilmot
 1957 *Kinship and Family in East London*. London:Routledge and Kegan Paul.