



Transformation of Identity, Social Mobility and Kinship Solidarity

Author(s): Mark Hutter

Source: *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Feb., 1970), pp. 133-137

Published by: National Council on Family Relations

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/349984>

Accessed: 22-12-2019 16:21 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>



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

theme "Typical Traits Structure and Role Changes Within the Young Family" were discussed. These were: "Images of Woman's Action" (Dr. C. Carisse); "Early and Enforced Marriages" (Dr. W. Dumon); "The Sexual Image of Marriage Through History" (Dr. B. I. Murstein); "Marital Expectations Discrepancies Between Ideals and Realities" (Dr. C. Safilios-Rothschild); "The Dual Career Family" (Drs. Rhona and Robert Rapoport); "Some Alternative Types of Family Structure" (Dr. M. Young); "Economic Behavior of Young Families" (Dr. T. Walter).³

³ The complete *Transactions* of this Seminar made up of

The last day of the Seminar was devoted to the conclusions drawn from the previous days discussions and to the formulation of research projects.

The main feature of the Second ICOFA Seminar was perhaps its meaningful informal and active character leading to the decision by the participants to further stimulate this type of meeting.

the different papers, the comments of the prepared discussants, the conclusions, and list of participants are available (price \$2.50) from the ICOFA Secretariat, c/o Centre de Recherches Sociologiques, 2B, Van Evenstraat, Louvain, Belgium.

Transformation of Identity, Social Mobility and Kinship Solidarity*

MARK HUTTER**

Differential socialization experiences resulting in a "transformation of identity" is seen to be an intervening variable between social mobility and kinship solidarity. The hypothesis that, when occupationally based pressure for transformation of identity is greatest (i.e., occupational mobility between working or farm class and middle class), there will be a weakening of kinship solidarity, was tested on a comparable sample of American and Japanese students. Findings supported the hypothesis for the American sample but not for the Japanese sample. The great social changes occurring in Japan during the twentieth century is seen to be a factor accounting for differential socialization experiences for the Japanese middle class and its consequent low kinship solidarity.

THE classical sociologists, Durkheim, Simmel, and Tonnies, have stressed that the family in modern urban society is a relatively isolated unit. The American sociologists, Wirth (1938) and Parsons (1943; 1955) have supported this position. As stated by Wirth (1938:21) "The family as a unit of social life is emancipated from the larger kinship group characteristic of the country, and the individual members pursue their own diverging interests in their vocational, educational, religious, recreational, and political life." According to Parsons (1943:28) the isolation of the nuclear family "is the most distinctive feature of the American kinship system and underlies most of its peculiar functional and dynamic problems." Parsons had also suggested that the isolated nuclear family is ideally suited to the demands of occupational

and geographical mobility which are inherent in industrial society.

However, since 1950 a mass of empirical research has accumulated showing that viable relationships do exist among relatives and that they constitute a family's most important social contact (Axelrod, 1956; Bell and Boat, 1957; Greer, 1956; Smith, Form, and Stone, 1954; Stone, 1954; Sussman, 1953). Further, some sociologists (Goode, 1963; Litwak, 1960a, 1960b, 1959-60; Sussman, 1953, 1959) have suggested that the isolated nuclear family is not the most functional type for modern industrial society. They hypothesized that the "modified extended" kinship family is more functional than the isolated nuclear one.

Litwak in his researches (1960a, 1960b) has found that an extended kin family structure exists in a modern urban society (Buffalo, New York). This extended family structure differs from the classical extended family in that there is no authoritarian head, nor is it dependent on geographic mobility or occupational similarity. This "modified extended" family structure consists of a series of nuclear families joined to-

* Research for this paper was done in January and February, 1966. The author is grateful to Murray A. Straus and Robert R. Bell. Dr. Straus provided the data for this paper, and he and Dr. Bell made valuable comments on earlier drafts of it.

** Mark Hutter, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Sociology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

gether on an equalitarian basis for mutual aid. It thus differs from the isolated nuclear family in that considerable mutual aid is assumed to exist between family members, and thus the family does not face the world as an isolated unit.

Litwak (1960a) also disagrees with the suggestion by Warner and Lunt (1941) that individuals who are occupationally mobile will not be able to claim their higher prestige if they associate with their kin who remain behind. Warner and Lunt assumed that status to be achieved requires association with others who occupy the same or higher occupational levels. Litwak notes that middle-class parents often urge their children to prepare for upward mobility and look with admiration on those who succeed. This deference and admiration helps to offset the effects of possible rejection by the higher class into which the mobile person is moving.

Blau (1956) also emphasizes that status is achieved both by deference and by association. He feels that the socially mobile, both upward and downward, may be considered "marginal men." He hypothesizes that the dilemmas faced by mobile individuals in their interpersonal relations inhibit social integration and are responsible for many aspects of their attitudes and conduct. Furthermore, Blau finds that the upwardly mobile express a desire for family identification to a greater extent than the non-mobile. The downwardly mobile, on the other hand, express relatively the same desire as the non-mobile. Blau believes that the upwardly mobile does not derive enough security from close relations with friends, colleagues, and neighbors to support his standing in the community. He thus is apt to turn to his kin for emotional support. The downwardly mobile's social insecurity also increases his need for family identification. However, the process of acculturation to his new style of life exert pressure in the opposite direction. These pressures neutralize each other, which account for the finding that family identification remains the same as those of stationary members of the class of origin.

The question naturally arises as to how these later findings reporting on the viability of extended kinship relationships in contemporary industrial urban society can be reconciled with the earlier sociologists reports of the existence of isolated kinship networks. Key (1961) has suggested that the hypotheses on the disintegration of the extended family, developed early in the history of urban sociology when attention

was focused on immigrant groups coming to the city during the period of urbanization in Western society, and before these individuals had the opportunity to establish families. In addition, this period of industrialization was characterized by rapid social change and great geographical mobility from rural areas to newly urbanized ones.

It is our contention that the earlier theorists, particularly Wirth and Parsons, confounded the effects of differential socialization experiences on intergenerational families when they examined the relationship between industrialization and kinship solidarity. That is, they did not control for the "transformation of identity" of family members as a result of their differential socialization experiences when they looked at that relationship. This belief is shared by Berger (1963). He notes that kinship ties are weakened by social mobility *when* that social mobility has consequences in terms of the reinterpretation of one's life. He believes that one reinterprets his relationship to the people and events that used to be closest to him because one's self image changes as he moves up the occupation and ethnic ladder. "Even Mama, who used to be the orb around which the universe revolved, has become a silly old Italian woman one must pacify occasionally with the fraudulent display of an old self that no longer exists" (Berger, 1963:60).

During this earlier stage of industrialization and urbanization, then, accompanying social mobility was differential socialization experiences which accounted for the "transformation of identity" of the younger family members and the resultant weakening of kinship ties. This period of rapid social change, or great geographical mobility from rural areas to newly urbanized ones, and in the United States, of a great influx of Europeans emigrating from their motherlands, caused great social and cultural mobility among intergenerational families. Today, as Litwak (1960a) contends, in the United States social class differences are moderate or shrinking. They are not growing larger. Litwak believes that social class similarities are sufficiently large to provide cross-class identification by extended family members. He maintains that among white Americanized groups, especially those of the middle class, upward mobility doesn't involve radical shifts in socialization and therefore does not constitute a real barrier to extended family communication. Here then is a key intervening variable between social mobility and kinship solidarity—transformation of identity caused by differential socialization

experiences. It is because differential socialization experiences have been largely absent in urban American society in the last twenty years which helps account for the appearance of the "modified extended" family.

This study will seek to test the hypothesis that when occupationally based pressure for transformation of identity is greatest (i.e., occupational mobility between working or farm classes and middle class) there will be a weakening of kinship ties. We would further hypothesize that mobility between middle and upper classes will have little or no effect on kinship solidarity.

To further test this hypothesis a comparable Japanese sample will be utilized. Goode (1963) has described some interesting differences in his comparison of Japanese and Western families. The Japanese family was feudalistic rather than familistic. Thus "Japan is perhaps the only nation that has been able to use its family system 'positively' in the industrialization process" (Goode, 1963:323). Two great social forces accompanied Japanese industrialization: the first freed the individual to find his own position in society with progressively less dependence upon the elders; the second was a movement toward greater authority by the head of the "ie" (house) and a tightening of the linkage between the family and the state. Eventually, the first force predominated.

We believe that this holds particularly true for Japanese college students. We believe that members of this group who come from middle class backgrounds would be quite similar to a comparable American group of students. In addition, we would suspect that there would be even more striking findings supporting our hypothesis for those individuals whose grandfathers were of the working or farm class and whose fathers were in the middle class. Our reasoning here is that the differential socialization experiences of this group would be greater than a comparable group in the United States.

METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate the hypothesis an analysis was made of questionnaire data gathered in Minneapolis, Minnesota and Tokyo, Japan by Dr. M. A. Straus in 1961-62. The sample consists of 75 students at the University of Minnesota and 56 students at the University of Tokyo.

Although a larger sample would have been preferable, we believe that the hypothesis is of sufficient interest to warrant testing. Social mobility was ascertained by comparing the occupa-

tions of the students' fathers and the fathers' fathers. These occupations were classified according to a modification of the Census Bureau's occupational schema, and were then divided into three overall classes: Middle Class, Farmers, and Working Class. All the students sampled were assigned on the basis of their father's occupation. Our "middle class" includes both members of the Census Bureau's occupational schema of upper class and middle class. Our lumping of this group together is justified by our previous discussion. That is, we assume that there is no transformation of identity of occupationally mobile individuals, upward or downward, and thus there would be no change in kinship solidarity.

After assigning both the father and his father to one of these three classes, three mobility categories were defined: upwardly mobile, stationary, and downwardly mobile; all relative to the particular class groupings. It should be pointed out, that by definition, then, there can be no cases in the upwardly mobile middle class category and in the downwardly mobile working class category.

By necessity, kinship solidarity was measured by patrilineal kinship solidarity. The strength of kinship solidarity (patrilineal) was ascertained by devising a "patrilineal integration index." This index is based on the sum of a score measuring the amount of visiting and liking each patrilineal kin.¹

FINDINGS

In Table 1 we present a summary of patrilineal integration index scores of cases falling into each category. Although the trend of our data seem to support the hypothesis, no meaningful

¹ The Patrilineal Integration Index takes into account both the frequency of interaction with father's kin and the enjoyment of each interaction. It is obtained by first adding the number of times which the respondent visited the father's brothers, sisters, and parents. The questions to obtain this asked: "When you last lived at home, how many times did you see . . . ?" 0 = Never; 1 = Less than once in 3 years; 2 = Every 2 or 3 years; 3 = About once a year; 4 = 2 or 3 times a year; 5 = 4 to 8 times a year; 6 = Once or twice a month; 7 = 3 or more times a month. The scores indicated for each brother, sister, and for the parents were summed. For the enjoyment score, the respondent was asked to indicate for each of his father's brothers, sisters, and parents: "How much did you like . . . ?" 0 = Dislike a great deal; 1 = dislike considerably; 2 = dislike somewhat; 3 = dislike a little; 4 = like a little; 5 = like somewhat; 6 = like considerably; 7 = like extremely well. Finally, the Patrilineal Integration Index was computed by multiplying the sum of the visiting scores by the sum of the liking scores. The rationale for this score is that the concept of integration implies that there is interaction and that this interaction has positive value to the persons involved. For further details of the coding of this variable see Straus, 1957.

TABLE 1. STRATUM OF ORIGIN AND SOCIAL MOBILITY OF AMERICAN AND JAPANESE SAMPLE IN MEAN SCORES ON PATRILINEAL INTEGRATION INDEX

Stratum of Origin	Social Mobility		
	Upward	Stationary	Downward
American Sample			
Middle	—	19.6 (N=23)	50. (N=2)
Farm	13.7 (N=9)	54.4 (N=9)	41.0 (N=10)
Working	17.1 (N=20)	65.0 (N=2)	—
Japanese Sample			
Middle	—	14.1 (N=34)	5.5 (N=2)
Farm	10.0 (N=16)	50.0 (N=2)	1.0 (N=1)
Working	No cases	30.0 (N=1)	—

test of significance can be performed because of the limited size of the sample.

We therefore condensed each sample into four categories: 1) Social Mobility and High Kinship Solidarity; 2) Social Mobility and Low Kinship Solidarity; 3) Stationary and High Kinship Solidarity; and 4) Stationary and Low Kinship Solidarity. Differentiation between high and low kinship solidarity was measured by the median of cases in each cultural sample on the patrilineal integration index. The results of that cross-tabulation are presented in Table 2.

For the American sample's "Socially Mobile" group only 41 percent had high kinship solidarity as compared to 62 percent of the "Stationary" group. The calculated chi-square testing for the significance of a relationship was significant at the .05 level. Thus the hypothesis that when occupationally based pressure for transformation of identity is greatest (i.e., occupational mobility between working or farm class and middle class) there will be a weakening of kinship ties, was supported by the data. This hypothesis also supported our decision to ignore mobility between middle and upper classes and treat those cases as non-mobile (stationary).

For the Japanese sample, 21 percent of the "Socially Mobile" group had high kinship soli-

arity as compared to 46 percent of the "Stationary" group. Although the findings were in the hypothesized direction, they were not significant at the .05 level. An examination of the subcells reveals that for the "Stationary" group a majority of the individuals in this group have low kinship solidarity (20 cases to 17 with high kinship solidarity). By referring back to Table 1 we see that the mean of the 34 cases who are classified as middle class "Stationary," are in the low kinship solidarity range of the continuum on the Patrilineal Integration Index. (The median which differentiated the continuum between high and low kinship solidarity was the interval 10-19). This finding would lead us to believe that we were wrong in ignoring social mobility from middle to upper class (or vice versa) and in treating this group as if there was no social mobility with possible differential socialization experiences. That is, we should not have treated the socially mobile cases within this group as if they were non-mobile. Most likely the differences among the pre-World War II generation, the World War II—American Occupation generation, and the present generation are characterized by still greater cultural differences accounting for different social identifications. The low kinship solidarity of this group, then, most likely arose out of the differential socialization experiences of these three generations.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It seems quite probable that the hypothesis advocated by the classical sociologists and by Wirth and Parsons, that the family in industrial urban society is a relatively isolated one, is only applicable to the earlier stage of urbanization which these men commented upon. That period was characterized by rapid social change with great geographical mobility from rural to newly urbanized areas. In the United States, an added dimension was the migration from Europe of millions of people. The differential socialization experiences of the second and third generations of these newly urbanized groups helped account for the sudden diminishing of extended family ties.

In the last twenty years a mass of empirical evidence has indicated that viable kinship relationships do exist in urban society and frequently provide the foundation of individuals' social ties. A possible explanation is the observation made by numerous sociologists that social class differences are moderate or shrinking in modern urban society. Social mobility as a result of occupational changes becomes an insignifi-

TABLE 2. SOCIAL MOBILITY OF AMERICAN AND JAPANESE SAMPLE AND KINSHIP SOLIDARITY

Kinship Solidarity	American Sample		Japanese Sample	
	Socially Mobile	Stationary	Socially Mobile	Stationary
High	41	62	21	46
Low	59	38	79	54
(N)	(41)	(34)	(19)	(37)
	$\chi^2=3.95$ p<.05		$\chi^2=3.06$ p<.10	

cant factor influencing kinship solidarity because of the rise in educational standards, the development of the mass media, especially of television, and the general rise in the standard of living of individuals. The group most effected by this modernization is suspected to be the white middle class. However, we hypothesized that differential socialization experiences would still be experienced as a result of the movement from working or "farming" class to the middle class or vice versa. In this situation we believe that the individual's sense of identity is transformed as a result of his differential socialization experiences and his ties with his kinship network would be subsequently weakened by his reinterpretation of his life.

The hypothesis that when occupationally based pressure for transformation is greatest (i.e., occupational mobility between working or farm classes and middle class) there will be a weakening of kinship ties, was tested on an American and a Japanese sample of college students. The data supported the hypothesis for the American sample, but not for the Japanese sample. The great social changes occurring in Japan during the twentieth century can be seen to be a factor accounting for differential socialization experiences for the Japanese middle class and its consequent low kinship solidarity. Further research is needed, of course, to adequately support this hypothesis.

REFERENCES

Axelrod, Morris

- 1956 "Urban structure and social participation." *American Sociological Review* 21 (February): 13-18.

Bell, Wendell, and Marion D. Boat

- 1957 "Urban neighborhood and informal social behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 62 (January): 391-398.

Berger, Peter L.

- 1963 *Invitation to Sociology*. New York: Doubleday & Co. Anchor Books.

Blau, Peter M.

- 1956 "Social mobility and interpersonal relations." *American Sociological Review* 21 (June): 290-295.

Goode, William J.

- 1963 *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe

Greer, Scott

- 1956 "Urbanism reconsidered: a comparative study of local areas in a metropolis." *American Sociological Review* 21 (February): 19-25.

Key, William H.

- 1961 "Rural-urban differences and the family." *Sociological Quarterly* 2 (January): 49-56.

Litwak, Eugene

- 1959-60 "The use of extended family groups in the achievement of social goals." *Social Problems* 7 (Winter): 177-188.
 1960a "Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (February): 9-22.
 1960b "Geographical mobility and extended family cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (June): 385-394.

Parsons, Talcott

- 1943 "The kinship system of the contemporary United States." *American Anthropologist* 45 (January-March): 22-38.
 1955 "The American family: its relations to personality and to the social structure." Pp. 3-33 in Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales (eds.) *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York: The Free Press

Smith, Joel, William H. Form, and Gregory P. Stone

- 1954 "Local intimacy in a middle-sized city." *American Journal of Sociology* 60 (November): 276-283.

Stone, Gregory P.

- 1954 "City shoppers and urban identification: observations on the social psychology of city life." *American Journal of Sociology* 60 (July): 36-45.

Straus, Murray A.

- 1967 *Laboratory Problems in Comparative Family Organization*. Minneapolis: Privately Printed (available from author).

Sussman, Marvin B.

- 1953 "The help pattern in the middle class family." *American Sociological Review* 18 (February): 22-28.
 1959 "The isolated nuclear family: fact or fiction." *Social Problems* 6 (Spring): 333-340.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Paul S. Lunt

- 1941 *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wirth, Louis

- 1938 "Urbanism as a way of life." *American Journal of Sociology* 44 (July): 1-24.