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A typology of diverse family forms, based on past research studies of family functions and structure, is developed to help researchers and theorists organize and classify family type. The matrix, based upon traditional and emerging family functions and structures, appears superficially to follow the mold of the traditional structural/functional framework, with each type of family fitting into one mutually exclusive quadrant. However, unlike earlier applications of structural-functional analysis, this typology is applied to a range of variant family forms instead of treating non-nuclear families as problematic.

Family scientists face a unique challenge today. As individuals have searched for more meaningful ways of living in contemporary society, the traditional nuclear family has given way to a wide variety of family forms based on the needs of different lifestyles, such as cohabitants, childless couples, single parents, and blended families. Unfortunately, supposedly state-of-the-art listing of topics to be included in family life curricula (Arcus, 1987) and the most recent textbooks have not adequately emphasized this great diversity in family forms. When these various forms are discussed it is usually in separate chapters, with an emphasis on problematic aspects. This leads the student to assume that the maritaly intact nuclear family, composed of a never divorced, sexually exclusive married couple with their children, in which the male is the primary breadwinner and the woman is the primary homemaker, is the predominate, most preferred, family form. While this may be the societal ideal, only a very small minority of all families in the United States conform to this type.

Contemporary families exhibit a wide range of structures and the members find unique ways of fulfilling functional and expressive needs, making any discussion of "the family" extremely complex. The purpose of this article is to provide a typology which family scientists could use, not only for research purposes but as a mechanism for communicating to their students the great diversity and legitimacy of all forms of family life.
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DEFINING FAMILY

One of the prime responsibilities of the family scientist is to help students understand exactly what "family" is. This article will first discuss what a family is, how it differs from individuals sharing a household, and how many contemporary families do not fit the traditional definition of family based on the nuclear family as an ideal type. The assumption made in this analysis is that what defines individuals as a family is often in the eyes of its members. Thus although some may balk at the idea of a childless couple or even a single individual being considered a type of family, individuals in these types of units are having their basic needs met through these structures. A matrix, by which all forms of family can be classified in terms of traditional and emerging structures and functions is presented.

Differentiating Household and Family

While all families who live together in a common residence may be considered a household, the opposite, that all households are families is not valid. A household is a collection of people who live together in a dwelling unit. A family, for purposes of this article will be defined as a unit of intimate, transacting and interdependent persons who share some values, goals, resources, and responsibility for decisions, as well as have a commitment to one another over time. The assumption of continuity is also important in differentiating households from families. For example, consider the case of roommates who might share a household for several years for economic reasons, versus a couple who divorce after a year of marriage. Although the relationship between roommates outlasted that of the couple, the continuity of the relationship, beyond a specified period of time, was not a major condition of the roommates' relationship. We imagine that the couple, at least in the early stages of the marriage, assumed they would be together until "death do us part."

The Census definition, limited to structural consideration, defines a family as two or more individuals who share a housing unit and are related by blood, marriage or adoption (Bureau of the Census, 1983). While structurally a family may appear on the surface to look like a household, there are important differences. While members of a household are primarily concerned with his/her own life and little personal resources are transferred to other members, except as agreed upon to maintain household expenses, families not only share resources but also help each member achieve economic and social satisfaction through cooperation, giving, and caring (Stein, 1984).

Family versus lifestyle

The argument could be raised than many of the family forms described in the typology below, such as commuter marriages, voluntary child-free marriages or swingers, are actually examples of lifestyles not families. A lifestyle, however, comprises more than just one aspect such as common residence, household composition or multiple sexual partners. While it is acknowledged that for some families these specific aspects may evolve into a "lifestyle," such as when the commuter couple not only maintain separate households but have developed separate groups of friends and work and friends or limited to others, represented by the prerequisites identified for classifying families as a unit and its daily activities.

The "Universal" Family

We usually refer to the nuclear family as consisting of two adults, while "family" is a broader concept than this mean that two adults and children. To what extent do the two adults constitute a family? Are roommates who share a household considered to constitute a family? Are the commuter couple who have developed separate social and economic circles considered to constitute a family? Are the divorced couple who maintain separate households still considered to constitute a family? The answer to these questions is, of course, dependent upon the rules and norms of each society, as the Nayars of India, the Trobriands, and the Israeli kibbutzim, for example, have different rules and norms regarding family structure and function.

A concern for the family as a unit pertained to the economic responsibility. But does this hold for all family functions, the emotional, social, and economic? Is the family a flexible interpretation of social rules? The answer to many options for family organization is yes!

One case of flexibility may be seen in the Nayars of India, a marriage ceremony usually limited to the wife and her adult children. But in the Israeli kibbutzim, marriage and family existence is totally redefined (Murdock, 1957; Levi's (1949) study of the Trobrianders).
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groups of friends and completely unique leisure activities revolving around their work and friendships, this represents a specific couple’s choice not resulting from or limited to commuter marriages. In this article, we will use the structures represented by various family types and the way in which the functional prerequisites identified by Murdock and elaborated by others are fulfilled as a basis for classifying families. The dynamics and processes by which the family conducts its daily activities—the lifestyle component—is a topic for future analysis.

The "Universal" Structure and Function of Family

We usually think of the term "marriage" as the legal relationship between two adults, while "family" typically refers to an adult couple and their children. Does this mean that a childless couple is not a family? Must the couple depend entirely on each other for fulfilling their sexual needs? Does one adult plus children constitute a family? If not, what do we call these arrangements? What about two adults plus other relatives? Do individuals have to live together to be considered a family? Are foster children or adopted children and their adult caregivers considered to constitute a family? To approach an answer to these questions, it is necessary to examine the structure of the unit as well as the functions performed by the members.

The structure and function of a family has been a topic of long standing interest. In his examination of societies, Murdock (1949) proclaimed that all societies, as they moved towards modernization, became nuclear families—a husband, wife, and children sharing a single residence. He defined this nuclear family form as universal since it fulfilled four functional prerequisites that a society needs in order to survive: control of sexual relations, reproduction, socialization of the young, and economic cooperation.

A concern revolved around Murdock's use of the term "universal" as it pertained to the nuclear family unit and the four functions for which it has responsibility. Generally, "universal" is interpreted to mean "without exception." But does this mean that all societies have nuclear units which carry out the four functions, the most restrictive interpretation of Murdock's term "universal," or is the family held responsible for seeing that these functions are performed, a more flexible interpretation which recognizes the nuclear family as an ideal type with many options for emulating approximation?

One case usually cited as an example of a society without a nuclear family is the Nayars of India, a society in which children were "married" in a tallis-tying ceremony usually before puberty. The couple were not expected to live together or even to consummate the relationship. Thus, the Nayars not only lacked the nuclear family structure, but the four functions were performed by different family members (Murdock, 1957). Other exceptions often cited include: Spiro's (1958) study of the Israeli kibbutzim, in which the husband and wife live together, but the childrearing and economic support are provided by the community; Malinowski's (1930) study of the Trobriand Islanders in which the mother's brother provides the socialization; and Levy's (1949) study of the extended patrilineal Chinese family.
Reiss (1965), in an attempt to resolve the controversy over the universality of the nuclear family, suggests that we look for the functional prerequisites, i.e. survival needs, of the society which the family fulfills and search for the full range of structures which may fulfill the functions. Three of Murdock's four functions are found to be absent in some cultures. For example, sex and reproduction occur outside the family and economic support is provided by the maternal uncle in the Nayar society, while economic cooperation and communal socialization occur in the Israeli kibbutz.

The family structure which fulfills the nurturant socialization function in these examples, according to Reiss (1963), would be the small kinship group, especially the mother-child dyad. Reiss suggests that socialization and nurturance are universal functions of the family institution.

A broader, more adaptable definition of the family is provided by Weigart and Thomas (1971), who reject the notion of kin structure for structural universality. They note that mechanical reproduction could replace "parents" as we know them today. They suggest that the most elementary form is one caregiving adult and infant(s), thus avoiding specific biological and social links which may be changed by culture and technology in the future.

Unfortunately, Weigart and Thomas's (1971) definition requires the presence of a child to be considered a "family." Thus, situations such as the child-free couples or single adults who are caring for elderly parents, as well as all adults in the post-parental stage, become problematic under this definition. What is required is a classification system that will enable families to be defined in the broadest possible way, yet have easily identifiable, objective definitional boundaries for research, educational, and service purposes.

Contemporary Family Structure and Function

As noted in the studies cited above, Murdock's original definition of family in terms of a universal structure and functions has been widely disputed. However, the problem with Murdock as well as others who attempted to resolve the definitional and categorization problem is that they considered functions in terms of a specific family structure. The "deviant" cases were those in which the functions were not fulfilled by the intact marital unit.

In post-industrial society, many people who consider themselves to be a family do not fit Murdock's traditional definition of structure and function. In a society characterized by high divorce and remarriage rates, and a growing number of blended families and stepparents, our practice of serial monogamy has resulted in certain individuals (and extended kin groups) providing economic and socialization supports to children, while other individuals are involved in sexual relations and are responsible for reproduction. With the high teenage pregnancy rate, a growing segment of society, typically poor and holding minority status, is characterized by mothers caring for children fathered by different men. Economic support, in most cases, is provided by the State.

Thus, for the family defined by Murdock and as a whole, the family's functions sexual relations, -are not present.

Family Structure and Function

Families in a world of "emerging" structures, of these contemporary times. Murdock's definition of family was that of the "emerging" family forms, and the classical definition of the "family" is wholly traditional.

Figure 1. Family Structure and Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key: A = Economy</th>
<th>B = Group 1</th>
<th>C = Kibbutz</th>
<th>D = &quot;Hippie&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Thus, for many segments of America, the structure and the four functions defined by Murdock as the functional prerequisites of a nuclear family—control of sexual relations, reproduction, socialization of the young, and economic cooperation—are not present. What do we call these growing number of non-traditional units?

A MATRIX FOR IDENTIFYING FAMILY DIVERSITY

Family Scientists need to communicate to their students the complexity of families in a way that is meaningful and legitimizes all family types. A typology is needed which allows one to recognize the similarities and differences among diverse family forms. To this end, a matrix comprised of combinations of “traditional” and “emerging” structures and functions has been developed to enable the categorization of these contemporary family forms (see Figure 1). Families that adhere to Murdock’s definition of a nuclear family unit fulfilling the four functional prerequisites are classified as “traditional” in both structure and function, while “emerging” families have functions and/or structure that deviate from Murdock’s classical definition. The matrix recognizes that most family forms are neither wholly traditional nor emerging in nature, but contain elements of both.

Figure 1. Family Typology of Structures and Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Single parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communes</td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open marriage</td>
<td>Gay, Lesbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing marriage</td>
<td>Voluntary child-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group marriages</td>
<td>lessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singlehood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A = Economic-Based Communes (Hutterite)
B = Group Marriages
C = Kibbutz
D = "Hippie" Communes
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Family types in each quadrant of the matrix will be discussed. The center of the matrix demonstrates the special case of communes, which can exhibit all combinations of traditional and emerging structures and functions.

**Traditional Structure/Traditional Function**

The most common family type characterized by both traditional structure and function is the maritally intact nuclear family with children. This family type emulates the traditional family structure of husband, wife and children, and the four functions described by Murdock as universal are fulfilled by the family unit. However, a less typical family form, renesting, also fits the definition set forth by Murdock. While viewed as the "typical family," it should be recognized that only 28% of families in 1985 were maritally intact with children under 18 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1986). Furthermore, if we were to limit this category to biological parenthood, only 22% of all households fit this description (Moorman & Hernandez, 1985; S. Rawlings, Personal communication, April 5, 1988). Finally, if this discussion were focused on single earner households, only 8.9 million of the 88 million households, or 10%, are intact marital couples with children under 18 in which the husband is the primary earner (S. Rawlings, Personnel Communication, April 5, 1988).

Renesting. Renesters are adult children, over 18 years of age, who have left home, only to return to their parents' residence to live, a lifestyle that maintains the structure and function of the traditional family, with a slight twist. Usually temporary, renesting is a way of overcoming some emotional or financial difficulty such as unemployment, accumulating money needed for a deposit or down payment on an apartment or house, or help with child care after the death of a spouse or divorce.

It is estimated that between 1970 and 1985, there was a 25% increase in the number of adult children who moved back and lived with their parents, including 36% of the approximately 50 million young people 18-29 years old in 1984 (Glick & Lin, 1986).

**Emerging Structure/Traditional Function**

These family forms are characterized by non-traditional family structures that fulfill traditional functions.

Single parent. A single parent family is composed of one parent and one or more minor children for whom the adult is responsible. Although the traditional functions are (or have been) fulfilled by a nuclear unit, a single parent, not the traditional husband/wife unit, is the adult head of this family form.

Single parent families are rapidly increasing: 17% of all white families and 52% of all black families were headed by a single parent in 1983 (Households and Families, 1985), representing a 58% increase since 1970 for black families, and a 90% increase for white families. Between 1960-1983, the number of single parent families increased almost 200% (Glick, 1984). Single parent females who never married experienced a 585% increase from 1960-1983. It is estimated that 37% of all women who will live with a primary earner family will live with a single parent family. For many females, that means their adult children will leave their own homes to live in a stepfamily with a stepparent or other adult.

Blended familes. For many females, that means their adult children will leave their own homes to live in a stepfamily with a stepparent or other adult.

In about a third of these families, the married adult's children are from a previous marriage. For many females, that means their adult children will leave their own homes to live in a stepfamily with a stepparent or other adult.

Intergenerational families. In many cases, extended family structures are the result of children representing members of multiple generations. Typically, temporary, e.g., military duties, or permanent, e.g., the Old Order Amish who may remain in the main farm household in order to provide care to the main structural unit.

Generation families. These family forms are characterized by non-traditional family structures that fulfill traditional functions.
women who were at least 25 years old in 1984 will become the head of a single parent family. If current trends continue, by 1990, 27% of all children under 18 will live with a single parent. Of these, 24% will live with their mothers and 3% will live with their fathers (Glick 1985).

**Blended families.** Blended, or stepfamilies, are those in which one or both of the married adults are living with children from a previous marriage or relationship. For many female single parents, marrying and forming a blended family is their one road out of poverty. Furstenberg (1987) estimates that between 15-20% of all children will spend a part of their childhoods in a blended family. Each year, nearly one-half million children under 18 see a parent remarry and over one-half million adults become step-parents, creating 250,000 blended families each year.

In about one-third to one-half of these marriages, both partners have children from a previous marriage or relationship. Furthermore, one of every eight children is a stepchild. Many of these families contain "his," "her's" and "their's", making the family structure quite complex.

**Intergenerational families.** Intergenerational families also might be called extended families since they usually are composed of marital (and family) units representing more than two generations. Today, these families are usually temporary, e.g., when the young married children are completing their education or military duties or experiencing financial difficulties. However, some groups, such as the Old Order Amish, retain the traditional pattern of a married son moving into the main farm house while the parents take up residence in a small house adjacent to the main structure.

**Generationally inverse.** A generationally inverse family includes parents, adult children, and perhaps grandchildren living in the same residence. In composition or structure, it is identical to the renesting or extended family. It differs, however, because in this alternative family form, the adult children assume the "parental" role and are the heads of the households. The elderly parent(s) usually move into the adult child's home, and rely on this adult child for some social, emotional, physical or financial support. Steinmetz (1988) estimates that approximately 1 out of 36 households are likely to be generationally inverse families. Nationwide this represents over 2 1/4 million households. In some cases, however, adult children, usually those unmarried and childless, may return to the parent's home in order to provide care to the aging parents (Shehan et al., 1984).

**Traditional Structure/Emerging Function**

The following family types are characterized by having a traditional structure, that is, an intact marital unit as head. However, at least one of the functions filled by the family members deviate from those described by Murdock as the "universal" four functional prerequisites. If we were to precisely ascribe to Murdock's definition of functional prerequisites, then families that turn to adoption, foster care, or surrogate mothers as a mechanism for fulfilling the "reproductive" function would be subsumed under this category. Likewise, a maritally intact family unit that is dependent on the state for fulfilling its economic function could be viewed as belonging in this category. However, the more flexible perspective, that
the adult family members are responsible for seeing that the functions are fulfilled, not necessarily responsible for fulfilling each function themselves, would result in these families being categorized under traditional structures/traditional functions.

**Open marriage.** Open marriage was a term used in the 1970s to describe a marital relationship based on equality and a commitment to growth. The goal of an open marriage is to grant each partner the opportunity to develop individual self-fulfillment as well as warm and intimate relationships with significant others. Open marriage deviates from the traditional expectations that one's partner will be able to fulfill all of one's emotional, social, sexual, economic, and intellectual needs.

**Swinging.** Swinging, or mate swapping, for purely sexual gratification differs from the open marriage concept in two major ways. First, while only one partner in an open marriage may have a sexually intimate relationship outside of the marriage, swinging involves both spouses. Second, non-marital relationships in an open marriage are not limited to sexual intimacy and, in fact, may not be sexual at all. Swinging has only one goal: sexual gratification with many different partners. While relatively few couples engage in swinging, current concern over AIDS will no doubt further inhibit this activity.

**Emerging Structure/ Emerging Function**

These types of families are most different from the traditional norm in both structure and functions. The intact marital unit may not be the head of the "family" unit, and the functions that the family members perform may include only a few, if any, of those identified by Murdock.

**Homosexual/lesbian families.** Sixteen percent of gay men and 24% of lesbian women have been married and divorced. Of that group, 14% of the marriages involved children (Macklin, 1987). Although statistics are not readily available, there is a growing trend for single gay women to become impregnated by a friend or through artificial insemination to fulfill their desire for motherhood. Adoption, especially of older, hard-to-place children, is also an option.

**Singleness.** It might be argued that singleness can not be considered a family form. However, a 1985 Census Report states that 18% of all births were to unwed mothers and an increasing number of singles are becoming adoptive parents. In 1980, there were 31 million never-married individuals. The U. S. Census Bureau reports that between 1970-1985, the percentage of men between the ages of 25-29 who never married doubled, while the percentage of women in that same age group who never married more than doubled. A similar pattern was observed for men and women between the ages of 30-34 (Cruver, 1986). Shostak (1987) found that "committed singles" (as opposed to those who are single but actively seeking mates or regret never having had the opportunity to marry) increased by 64% between 1970-1980. Glick predicted that 9% of all adults who are in their twenties and unmarried will remain unmarried throughout their lifetimes (Glick, 1979). As the data clearly indicate, marital status and parental status are not necessarily linked.

**Nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation.** Cohabitation involves an unmarried and unrelated male and a female living together. This lifestyle gained great popularity in the early 1980s. In 1989, 1.9 million couples were living together; in 1950, only 1% of the cases, childbearing/raising/medical reasons, and technical reasons. Women are volunteering their bodies to men with collagen.

**Communes: A Study**

Communes, or communal societies, expanded and multiplied during the mid 1960s as a result of disillusionment with traditional expectations and communal societies were popular among the youth of that era. The Israels had, in turn, diminished today by the divorce rates of nuclear families. They do differ from those of the traditional type.

We are concerned with the commune as it is used today, and not as it was used in the 1960s. The commune is used to its best advantage when it is planned by the commune members themselves, and the commune members utilize traditional, community, and communal configurations. It is considered to be expressive, rather than restrictive.

**Economic configurations.** The configurations of a commune can vary widely. These configurations can be grouped into traditional, contemporary, and simultaneous configurations. Communes can be categorized, depending on their purpose. In the early 1980s, only 17% of the cases, childbearing/medical reasons, and nuclear families.

Group marriage and simultaneous configurations. Communes can vary widely in contemporaneous configurations. The commune is a group of people who share the same communal values or beliefs. They share the same beliefs or values in the commune, and they share the same values with the same community as the commune.

The Israels, the commune members, and the total commune have been active in communes since the late 1940s.
in the early 1970s, and has continued to grow, tripling between 1970-1984 to 1.8 million couples. In 75% of the cases, cohabitation involves only the couple; in 25% of the cases, children live with them (Statistical Abstracts of the U.S., 1985).

Cohabitation is usually not seen as a permanent alternative to marriage. Rather, it is a temporary situation, with most couples either dissolving the relationship or marrying within two years (Macklin, 1987).

Voluntary childlessness. Voluntary childlessness describes couples who choose not to bear or adopt children, as opposed to those who may be delaying childbearing/rearing because of financial, career or emotional concerns, or who, for medical reasons, are unable to have children. Approximately 5% of all ever-married women are voluntarily child-free and 1981 Census Bureau data indicates that 16% of women with college degrees expect or prefer to remain child-free.

Communes: A Special Case

Communes, sometimes called intentional communities, were extremely popular in the mid 1960s to mid 1970s, enjoying a resurrection nearly equalling that of the messianic and communal movement of the mid and later 1800s. Religious based communal societies such as the Hutterites in United States and Canada, the Kibbutzim of Israel, and the Zagrada in Hungary are well established in their respective societies. Communes established during the mid-sixties and seventies are largely diminished today. However, communal living is still a way of life for individuals and families, who, in group-designed communities, share values and lifestyles that differ from those of the general society.

We are considering communes to be a special case of family because the entire commune is usually considered to be the family unit. As illustrated on Figure 1, communes may have both traditional and emerging structures, and the members utilize traditional as well as emerging options for fulfilling the functional and expressive prerequisites.

Economic-based communes, cell A, have traditional structures and functions. These communes, for example the Hutterites, are generally composed of individuals and nuclear families who live in their own households. What mainly differentiates them from any other community is the sharing of economic resources, such as skills, tools, and income, which are put to use for the betterment of the entire commune.

Group marriages, cell B, are illustrations of communes with emerging structures and traditional functions. Although relatively infrequent, group marriage, the simultaneous marriage of several males to several females, does occur in contemporary Western society (Ramey, 1972, 1976). Typically, members of these communes also share economic and childcare responsibilities, in addition to sexual partners. In the early 1970s, at the apex of the contemporary communal movement, only 17% of communes in which group marriage was practiced lasted longer than three years (Constantine, 1973).

The Israeli Kibbutz, in which the adult couple live in their own residence but the total community shares in the economic production and rearing of children, is
an example of a commune with a traditional structure and emerging functions. In the Kibbutzim, cell C in Figure 1, children live in age-grouped housing, and production and consumption decisions are seen as the responsibility of the entire commune.

"Hippie" communes, those most written about in popular literature, and highly visible during the latter 1960s and early 1970s, are examples of emerging structures and emerging functions, cell D. Unlike most of the other types of communes discussed above, the unrelated individuals who join these communes often lack a cohesive set of values and goals, which might account for their relatively short duration.

However, a new type of commune with an emerging structure and function is flourishing. Communes composed of elderly persons, often promulgated through the share-a-home concept, are gaining in popularity among elders who want to maintain their independence yet are physically and financially unable to do so unassisted. Companionship, shared daily household responsibilities, and economic resources are accomplished through sharing a home (Kantor, 1977).

CONCLUSION

The above matrix can be used by Family Scientists in many ways. First, it can serve as an organizing mechanism for materials and discussions about family types. Second, it raises student awareness of similarities and differences inherent in family diversity, and allows the educator to place this material within a framework of past family research and studies. Third, the matrix allows the discussion of a variety of family types in a context that avoids the labeling of specific family types as problematic or deviant. Thus, the matrix provides a scholarly basis for discussing material that some might find objectionable. Finally, the matrix is open; thus, it allows for the inclusion of both new family structures as well as unique mechanisms for fulfilling functional and expressive prerequisites.
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Two assumptions which need to be made are valid and useful as we know: fathers may be recognized fathers, or as in the case of mothers, no other legal parent is filling their role.

The second assumption, that families are unbreakable, means that in families, it ceases to be intentional, mobility, and concern for “family” into emerging "parallel," coexisting families.

This paper, "necessarily excludes the called "wider" family in concerns over establishment, the family as a conditional universal. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 443-453.


