

PATTERNS OF GENERATIONALITY, LINEALITY, AND
MARITAL STATUS IN CONTEMPORARY
AMERICAN MULTIGENERATIONAL
FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

By

CONSTANCE LIZOTTE SPREADBURY

Bachelor of Science

Sam Houston State Teachers College

Huntsville, Texas

1965

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1967

Thesis
1967
S7680
cop. 2

JAN 18 1968

PATTERNS OF GENERATIONALITY, LINEALITY, AND
MARITAL STATUS IN CONTEMPORARY
AMERICAN MULTIGENERATIONAL
FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

Thesis Approved:

Sara Smith Suther

Thesis Adviser

Gerald R. Leslie

D. D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

660179

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to study patterns which exist in American multigenerational family households by using the 1960 Census One-In-A-Thousand sample. The three patterns which will be studied are: (1) generationality--whether younger-generational subfamilies live with parent primary families or older-generation subfamilies live with child primary families; (2) lineality--whether younger and older subfamilies live with the female line or the male line relatives, and (3) marital status--whether subfamilies who share the home of related primary families are married couples or single remaining spouses. Ethnic background and size of community are introduced into the analysis to determine whether specifying conditions modify the patterns of generationality, lineality, and marital status.

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her adviser, Dr. Sara Smith Sutker, for her competent guidance, helpful suggestions, and cooperation throughout the study. Indebtedness is acknowledged to Drs. Gerald R. Leslie and Benjamin Gorman for their contribution as members of the advisory committee. Gratitude is also expressed to the staff of the computing center of Oklahoma State University for processing the data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Hypotheses to be Tested	3
Purpose and Contribution of the Study	4
Scope of the Study	4
Definition of Terms and Concepts	4
Organization of the Thesis	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	7
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE.	14
Source of Data	14
Selection of Subjects	15
Hypotheses	15
Treatment of the Data	16
IV. RESULTS	18
Generationality Pattern	19
Lineal Preference Pattern	22
Marital Status Pattern	24
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
Summary	29
Summary of Findings and Conclusions	30
Recommendations	31
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Types of Subfamilies Who Share the Home of a Primary Family.	18
II. Generational Pattern in American Multigenerational Family Households.	19
III. Effect of Ethnicity on Generational Pattern	20
IV. Effect of Size of Community on Generational Pattern	21
V. Pattern of Lineal Preference in American Multigenerational Family Households	22
VI. Effect of Generationality and Marital Status on Lineal Preference Pattern.	23
VII. Effect of Ethnic Background on Lineal Preference Pattern.	24
VIII. Effect of Size of Community on Lineal Preference Pattern.	25
IX. Marital Status Pattern in American Subfamilies.	26
X. Effect of Marital Status on Generationality	26
XI. Effect of Ethnic Background on Marital Status Pattern of Subfamilies	27
XII. Effect of Size of Community on Marital Status Pattern	28

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The traditional rural family, in which a son moved to the parents' home with his bride to manage the farm and take care of the parents in their old age, has virtually disappeared from the American scene. As a result of increasing urbanization and industrialization with its consequential high mobility, nuclear families living independently of each other have become the predominant type of family in the United States.¹ Unemployment pensions, medicare, old-age assistance, and old-age and survivor's benefits under the Social Security Act are helping to make this possible by enabling people to remain independent even during times of unemployment and retirement.²

A certain amount of "doubling up" in the home still remains, however. Elderly parents still move in with middle-aged children and young married children still move in with middle-aged parents. There is interest in ascertaining the patterns of family structure in these multigenerational family households. Specifically, the interest is in

¹Jan Stehouwer, "Relations Between Generations and the Three-Generation Household in Denmark," Social Structure and the Family, Ed. Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 144-146.

²Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, The Family, (3rd. ed., American Book Company, 1963), p. 466.

the following:

1. Is the predominant pattern formed by younger-generation subfamilies moving in with older-generation primary families; or is it formed by older-generation subfamilies moving in with younger-generation primary families; or are both of the above generational patterns important?
2. Is the predominant pattern formed by the younger and older-generation subfamilies living with the female line or with the male line, or are both patterns equally important?
3. Is the predominant marital status pattern formed by married couple subfamilies or by single or remaining spouse subfamilies, with or without children, or are both marital status patterns important?

Ethnicity and size of community will be studied as modifying factors in the above-mentioned patterns of multigenerational households. In this thesis ethnicity will refer to both race and nationality, including native or foreign born. Twelve categories of size of community will be employed to test for the modifying effects community size may have on the patterns. These two modifying factors were chosen because the review of literature indicated that multigenerational families were a traditional pattern found in rural areas and also that nationality and/or race often determined the type of household patterns which are established within families.

Statement of the Problem

This thesis involves the study of multigenerational family household patterns by generationality, lineality, and marital status in the United States as evidenced in the family characteristics provided by the 1960 Census of Population. After these three patterned aspects of the household are isolated, ethnic background and size of community have been selected as specifying factors to ascertain how the patterns are or are not modified by varying conditions.

Hypotheses to be Tested

From inadequacies and criticisms in the literature emerged the following hypotheses with which to investigate multigenerational family household patterns:

H_1 : There exists a pattern of generationality in American multigenerational family households; i.e., either of younger-generation subfamilies living with parent primary families or of older-generation subfamilies living with child primary families.

H_{1a} : The generational pattern remains when the households are classified as native born white, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{1b} : The generational pattern remains when the households are specified by size of community.

H_2 : There exists a pattern of lineal preference; i.e., significantly more subfamilies live with either female line or male line relatives.

H_{2a} : The lineal preference pattern is maintained when the households are classified as native born white, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{2b} : The lineal preference pattern is maintained when the households are specified by size of community.

H_3 : There exists a pattern of marital status in American subfamilies; i.e., either significantly more married couple subfamilies or single spouse subfamilies.

H_{3a} : The marital status pattern is maintained when the households are classified as native born white, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{3b} : The marital status pattern is maintained when the households are specified by size of community.

Purpose and Contribution of the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to enrich the sociological knowledge of the contemporary American family by studying the extent and pattern of variations in multigenerational family households. Because of the opportunity to control variables in the 1960 Census One-In-A-Thousand sample, more precise information is obtainable. The importance of the family as the basic socializing institution has been well documented, but further research into multigenerational households is important because the family is usually a two-generation conjugal unit.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study includes approximately 6,700 heads of subfamilies and single-individual subfamilies who are or have been married, male or female, with or without children, living with a related primary family. The related primary family will not be studied, but information concerning them will be gained indirectly through the investigation of patterns in two-or-more-persons subfamilies and single-individual subfamilies. The term "subfamilies" will be employed as the general term for both single-individual subfamilies and two-or-more-persons subfamilies.

Definition of Terms and Concepts

Definition of terms and concepts used in this thesis are explained below:

1. Multigenerational family household -- household being shared by a primary family and a related subfamily.

2. Subfamily -- two parent families with or without children, one parent families with children, and single ever-married individuals sharing the home of a related primary family.

3. Younger-generation subfamily -- ever married children with or without spouse, with or without children, living with parents.

4. Older-generation subfamily -- parent subfamilies with or without spouse living with children.

5. Primary family -- head of the household and other persons in the household related to the head and not included in the subfamily.

6. Female line -- younger-generation subfamilies living with the wife's family or older-generation subfamilies living with a daughter's family.

7. Male line -- younger-generation subfamilies living with husband's family or older-generation subfamilies living with a son's family.

8. Married couple subfamily -- subfamily composed of husband and wife, with or without children.

9. Single or remaining spouse subfamilies -- ever-married individual, either of one parent with children or remaining spouse with no children.

10. Head -- the person so reported by the household respondent in the 1960 Census. (Where a male was present in married couple families, the male was designated as head, where he was absent the female was reported as head, and where there was no male spouse, the female spouse was designated as head.)

11. Other ethnic -- Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, American Indian, foreign born whites, and whites with one or both parents foreign born.

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is composed of five chapters. Chapter I is the introductory chapter stating the problem and its purpose, scope and definition of terms. Chapter II is entitled "Review of the Literature." In this chapter the researcher attempts to determine whether or not similar or identical studies have been conducted. Also, reviewed literature provided a basis, in some instances, for devising the hypotheses to be tested in this study. Chapter III concerns the design of the study and includes the hypotheses tested and the procedure for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter IV follows the general procedure of presenting data pertaining to each selected statement in a table and analyzing the findings concerning the statement. Chapter V is the concluding and summarizing chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A survey of the literature indicates that very little research has recently been attempted relating to this particular aspect of familial living.¹ Two reasons would seem to be prominent in accounting for the lack of material. First, there has been a growing tendency for the family in the United States and Europe, irrespective of generation, to maintain its own home. This movement toward independence in the living arrangements is manifested in the increased proportion of aged couples who have separate living quarters and in the young adults who marry and maintain their own home or apartment.² Secondly, the movement toward unemployment and retirement insurance has enabled people to remain independent even during times of unemployment.³

Thomas P. Monahan maintains that in 1910, families started "doubling up" and continued this practice until 1947, at which time one out of ten families were sharing their home. According to him, there were

¹Dissertation Abstracts list only one study for the years 1964-1966. Sociological Abstracts list none from 1953-1962 which deal with intergenerational family households.

²Jan Stehouwer, "Relations Between Generations and the Three-Generation Household in Denmark," Social Structure and the Family, Ed. Ethel Shanas and Gordon Streib (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 145-146.

³Ibid.

several motives for domicile sharing, the first of which was precipitated by the depression. With no job, no home, and no money, many families were forced to look to relatives for a place to stay. Immediately following the depression, was World War II which caused many young wives to go live with their families or their husbands' families, and finally the post-war boom resulted in many more new families being created than were new homes. However, Monahan says that sharing declined after 1947, dropping below the rate which prevailed before 1910. He predicts that this decline will continue.⁴

By 1955, John Kosa declares that only one family out of twenty lived with relatives, and this practice was most evident in ethnic neighborhoods as a result of more solid kinship ties. Many Italian families had old parents living with them. Hungarians doubled up during the depression, but separated afterwards. In his studies of two Pennsylvania cities, he found that the size of the community, age, education, and occupation of father did not influence sharing the home; however, birthplace and ethnic origin did. The English, German, and Dutch doubled up more often than other nationalities.⁵

Jan Stehouwer maintains that although elderly persons want to live near their children, they would rather retain their independence and not live with them. The ability of young adults not yet at work, as well as retired persons, to maintain separate homes for their families, has been greatly enhanced by the economic transition of the post-war

⁴Thomas Monahan, "The Number of Children in American Families and the Sharing of Households," Marriage and Family Living, 18 (August, 1956), pp. 201-204.

⁵John Kosa, Leo D. Rachiele, Cyril O. Schommer, "Sharing the Home with Relatives," Marriage and Family Living, 22 (May, 1960), pp. 129-131.

era. As a result of medicare, social security, and retirement insurance, even though the United States has more people living beyond the age of 65, more can take care of their financial necessities and it is not until they are in their eighties or sickly that they turn to their middle-aged children or institutions for help.⁶

Marvin Koller says that a modern household generally consists of two generations but he adds, "the desire to establish a household which is residentially separate from other households in increasingly being frustrated by reasons of the lack of housing facilities in crowded cities."⁷ To complicate matters further, according to this writer, more people in our population are living beyond 65 years of age. Some who are parents are looking to their children to satisfy their needs. One solution has been to create a three-generational household. Koller conducted a survey in northeast Ohio in 1952. He found that most three-generational households were created by having the mother of the wife move into her married daughter's home. One unexpected finding was that the three-generational units did not last very long. Most of them lasted from one to five years. He advances the theory that a possible explanation was a high death rate in the older generation.⁸

Carol L. Stone in 1962 agreed with Koller that many families were still faced with three-generational living. She says that even though

⁶Jan Stehouwer, "Relations Between Generations and the Three-Generation Household in Denmark," Social Structure and the Family, Ed. Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib (Prentice-Hall), 1965), pp. 142-162.

⁷Marvin Koller, "Studies of Three-Generation Household," Marriage and Family Living, 16 (August, 1954), p. 205.

⁸Ibid.

three-generational living has decreased in the United States, our increasing life span keeps more and more older people in the population and, therefore, requires some sort of living arrangement for these older people. Many of these people are not eager to live with their adult children, according to her study of older people.⁹ Only a few seem to maintain the idea of living with their children and grandchildren as members of a large intergenerational family group. Most seem to prefer living apart from their children as long as they can take care of themselves.

Talcott Parsons, twenty years before Carol Stone, maintained that independence is the preferred pattern for an elderly couple, particularly from the point of view of the children.¹⁰

It is impossible to say that with us it is 'natural' for any other group than husband and wife and their dependent children to maintain a common household. Hence when the children of a couple have become independent through marriage and occupational status, the parental couple is left without attachment to any continuous kinship group.

He goes on to say that it is, of course, common for other relatives to share a household with the conjugal family, but this scarcely ever occurs without some important element of strain.¹¹

Patricia Rabinovitz, writing at the same time as Parsons, agreed with him. She declared that when it becomes necessary for old people to live with others, problems of personal adjustment assume major

⁹ Carol L. Stone, "Three Generation Influences on Teen-Agers' Conceptions of Family Culture Patterns and Parent-Child Relationships," Marriage and Family Living, 24 (August, 1962), pp. 287-289.

¹⁰ Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," American Sociological Review, 7 (October, 1942), pp. 604-618.

¹¹ Ibid.

importance.¹² One factor that operates against success, she said, is the tendency of older people to live in the past, to cling to fixed routines, to be irritated by change, and to dwell on past achievements instead of remaining effective in the "reality of the present."

Rabinovitz went on to say that because of the long period of dependency in our society and the emotional ties involved, it is not possible to regard parents or children just the same as we regard other adults. Both parents and children find it difficult to reverse the dependency where physical or financial help is involved. Children frequently have "old hangovers of resentment to authority" which makes it impossible for them to offer needed assistance, in turn, leading them either to dominate or to smother the parents with care so that the older person retains no independence.

Another aspect of this problem, according to Rabinovitz, is that care of parents does not carry with it the satisfaction of caring for a child, and there is frequently resentment on the part of the adult children that this care is necessary. Still another problem is that personal ego of parents is often involved in attitudes toward children. These attitudes may work against acceptance of children as they are. Parents are also apt to become involved in rivalry relationships in connection with in-laws and grandchildren. She concluded that living with children seldom works out successfully. Women stand a somewhat better chance of being genuinely welcomed than men because of their helpfulness with household tasks.¹³

¹²Patricia Rabinovitz, "Living Arrangements for Older People," Living Through the Older Years, Ed. Ewan Clague, (1942), p. 131.

¹³Ibid.

William M. Smith, Jr. in 1950 studied 490 families in two Pennsylvania cities. When he asked if they planned eventually to live with children, only 15 percent answered "yes," while 85 percent said "no." When asked what they liked most about living with relatives, 37 percent said "the companionship." Of the complaints, the largest number said it was too crowded. Others said there was no privacy, and that relatives interfered. Some added that it made extra work, and others complained of crabby parents.¹⁴

Gordon F. Streib says that "the fact that aid is more likely to flow from parents to children is particularly striking if it is recalled that upon retirement parental income, on the average, is cut about in half."¹⁵ He adds, however, that it should be pointed out that financial demands made upon the older generation are in a declining stage as compared to their adult children who have families of their own. A large number of the parents own their own home, while the children are much more likely to be involved in amortizing a substantial mortgage for they are probably at the period of their greatest housing needs in regard to space. The adult children may also be involved in educational expenses for their offspring, but older parents are on the other hand more likely to have expensive medical bills.¹⁶

¹⁴William M. Smith, "Family Plans for Later Years," Marriage and Family Living, 16 (February, 1954), pp. 36-41.

¹⁵Gordon F. Streib, "Intergenerational Relations: Perspective on the Two Generations of the Older Parent," Marriage and Family Living, 27 (November, 1955), p. 472.

¹⁶Ibid.

There is also another type of intergenerational family; that of the young moving in with their parents. Paul C. Glick maintained in 1955 that there seldom are any additional relatives living with a couple while the husband is under 40 years of age.¹⁷ From that time until old age approaches, however, there are likely to be adult relatives (usually grown children) in about one-half of the homes and other young relatives (usually grandchildren) in about one home out of ten. He adds that when a young married couple live with the husband's or wife's parents, the chances are nearly two out of three that the couple will be with the wife's parents. This arrangement is most common perhaps because the wife is likely to spend more time in the home than the husband and because close daily contacts between a mother and her daughter are less likely to create troubles than those between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law.¹⁸

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Paul C. Glick, "The Life Cycle of the Family," Marriage and Family Living, 17 (February, 1955), p. 7.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Cross-tabulation analysis will be used in this study because it allows for controlling variables in order to test the relation between the patterns of generationality, lineality, marital status, and the specifying factors of ethnicity and size of community.

The One-In-A-Thousand sample of the 1960 United States population as recorded on IBM magnetic tapes by the Census Bureau is especially useful in permitting cross-tabulation of the several family structure in a way that is not possible from published census data.

Source of Data

Although the United States Census Bureau in 1960 collected certain information from all housing units, most of the detailed characteristics were secured from 20 and 5 percent samples.

The One-In-A-Thousand sample used for this thesis was selected by the United States Census Bureau from a source file of the records of the 5 percent sample of the population of the United States. This sample provided most of the statistical data for the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. This source file had been stratified by color and tenure of household head and size of household. The records in the source file were grouped by households so that the record for a

household head was followed by the records for all other members of the head's household.

Selection of Subjects

The unit of analysis in this study is all heads of subfamilies and single-individual subfamilies who are or have been married. These will include males and females with or without children, living with a primary family who is related to them. The relationship will be that of child or parent by blood, marriage, or adoption. The One-In-A-Thousand sample IBM magnetic tape was run to place all of the subfamilies and single-individual subfamilies onto a smaller tape.¹ The study subsample represents approximately 6,700 multigenerational family households, of which 5,269 are children or parent subfamilies, the types which will be analyzed further.

Family income, number of children, number of rooms, and ownership of primary family home will be excluded from investigation on the assumption that these would better serve as indicators of the conditions which produce intergenerational familial households rather than as factors affecting the structural patterns of intergenerational families.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses stated in Chapter I may be formulated as null hypotheses for testing:

H_1 : There is no pattern of generationality in contemporary

¹Single-individual subfamilies will be included in the general classification of subfamily, although not included in the census volumes.

American multigenerational family households; i.e., significantly more younger-generation subfamilies living with older primary families or older-generation subfamilies living with younger primary families.

H_{1a}: There is no generational pattern when the households are classified as native born white, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{1b}: There is no generational pattern when the households are specified for size of community.

H₂: There is no pattern of lineal preference; i.e., significantly more subfamilies living with female line or male line relatives.

H_{2a}: There is no lineal preference pattern when the households are classified as native born, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{2b}: There is no lineal preference pattern when households are specified for size of community.

H₃: There is no pattern of marital status in American subfamilies; i.e., significantly more married couple subfamilies or single-remaining spouse subfamilies.

H_{3a}: There is no marital status pattern when the households are classified as native born white, Negro, or other ethnic.

H_{3b}: There is no pattern of marital status pattern when households are specified for size of community.

Treatment of the Data

Cross-tabulation will be used with chi-square to test whether the results obtained could have occurred by chance alone. Cross-tabulation is a numerical tabular presentation of data, usually in frequency or percentage form, in which variables are juxtaposed in order to study

the relation between them. The most important reason for using cross-tabulation is that it facilitates the study and analysis of relations; in addition, a chi-square test can easily be applied to such tables. Another reason is that cross-tabulation allows for testing a relationship between two variables while controlling one or two other variables.

The chi-square test is suitable for nominal data of a nonparametric nature in which the frequencies are in discrete categories.² It is also suitable for large size samples, such as this one. The technique is of the goodness of fit in that it may be used to test whether a significant difference exists between an observed number of objects or responses falling in each category and an expected number. Two specifying factors, ethnic background and size of community, will be included in the statistical analysis to describe the conditions under which a particular pattern may or may not exist, or may exist to a greater or lesser degree.

The level of significance was set at the .05 level for the two tail test. This test of significance will be applied because the study does not specify in which direction the patterns will be found, but merely that they will be found.

²Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistic for the Behavioral Sciences, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 36-42.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Of the total 6,738 number of subfamilies in the study sample, 5,269 are child or parent subfamilies; 39.6% child and 38.5% parent. These types of multigenerational family households will be the focus of the analysis.¹

TABLE I
TYPES OF SUBFAMILIES WHO SHARE THE HOME OF A
PRIMARY FAMILY
(N = 6,738)

Type of Subfamilies	Number	Percent
Child-Parent Subfamilies		
Child	2674	39.6
Parent	2595	38.5
Brother-Sister Subfamily*	820	12.2
Other Relative Subfamilies*	598	08.9
Grandchild Subfamilies*	51	00.8
Total	6738	100.0

*Since brother-sister and other relative subfamilies are not clearly defined as multigenerational households, they will not be studied further. Grandchildren subfamilies are too few in number to consider.

¹The child-parent subfamilies in this thesis are 10 percent of the total families in the One-In-A-Thousand sample.

Generational Pattern

There seems to be no generational pattern in American multigenerational family households, whether in the form of younger-generation subfamilies living with parents or older-generation subfamilies living with children. (See Table II.)

TABLE II
 GENERATIONAL PATTERN IN AMERICAN MULTIGENERATIONAL
 FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS
 (N = 5269)

Generation of Subfamily	Number	Percent	
Younger	2674	50.7	
Older	2595	49.3	
Total	5269	100.0	$\chi^2 = 1.18$

Saying that there is no generational pattern means that the number of younger subfamilies does not differ significantly from the number of older-generation subfamilies; i.e., parents tend to live with their children as much as ever-married children live with their parents.

Ethnic background as a specifying condition reveals two separate patterns in generational aspect of multigenerational families. There is one common to native born white and Negro and another for other ethnic background.

It is interesting to note in Table III that while the native born white and Negro subfamilies have more younger-generation subfamilies, the opposite is true of subfamilies with other ethnic background. It appears that the white and Negro subfamilies, who were born in the

United States culture are more likely to have children living with parents, but persons born outside the United States culture, or who have been brought up under the influence of a foreign culture, are more likely to have parents sharing the home of children. It is usually an American pattern for children to live with their parents after they are married, divorced, or widowed, but it is a pattern of foreign-born or foreign-influenced for parents to live with children.

TABLE III
EFFECT OF ETHNICITY ON GENERATIONAL PATTERN
(N = 5269)

Ethnic Background	Younger-Generation Subfamilies		Older Generation Subfamilies		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Native Born White	1695	55.2	1372	44.8	34.00*
Negro	481	66.1	246	43.9	75.42*
Other Ethnic	498	33.8	977	66.2	155.84*

*Significant at .05 level

To test for modifying effects of size of community, the twelve census categories were used in this thesis. (See Table IV.) Of the twelve, only four show a significant difference between the primacy of younger-generation and older-generation subfamilies. Rural farm and rural nonfarm categories have a predominance of younger-generation subfamilies while the cities of between 50,000 to 100,000 and those of 1,000,000 and more have an older-generation predominance. This indicates that the child subfamilies are found in rural areas, whereas the parent subfamilies are associated with urban living. The remaining

TABLE IV
EFFECT OF SIZE OF COMMUNITY ON GENERATIONAL PATTERN
(N = 5269)

Size of Community	Younger-Generation Subfamilies		Older-Generation Subfamilies		χ^2
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Rural Farm	243	55.3	196	44.7	5.20*
Rural Nonfarm	637	57.8	464	42.2	27.18*
Urban Territory Outside Places	112	47.2	125	52.0	.71
Places of 2,500 to 4,999	117	52.0	108	48.0	.36
Places of 5,000 to 9,999	136	50.5	133	49.5	.03
Places of 10,000 to 24,999	254	50.4	249	49.6	.05
Places of 25,000 to 49,999	213	48.1	229	51.9	.56
Places of 50,000 to 99,999	176	44.6	218	55.4	4.48*
Places of 100,000 to 249,999	179	46.8	203	53.2	1.50
Places of 250,000 to 499,999	170	50.4	167	49.6	.03
Places of 500,000 to 999,999	167	48.9	179	51.1	.41
Places of 1,000,000 or More	270	45.4	324	54.6	4.91*

* Significant at .05 level

eight categories do not show a significant difference between the older and younger-generation subfamilies; i.e., there are nearly an equal number of younger-generation subfamilies as there are older-generation subfamilies.

Lineal Preference Pattern

There exists a pattern of lineality in American multigenerational family households in the form of preference for the female line; i.e., younger and older subfamilies are more apt to live with relatives of the female line. (See Table V.)

TABLE V
PATTERN OF LINEAL PREFERENCE IN AMERICAN MULTIGENERATIONAL
FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS
(N = 5269)

Lineal Preference	Number	Percent	
Family of Female Relative	2759	52.3	
Family of Male Relative	2510	47.7	
Total	5269	100.0	$\chi^2 = 11.76^*$

*Significant at .05 level

When the lineal preference pattern is specified for generationality and marital status, a pattern of the younger-generation's preference for living with wife's family and older-generation's preference for

son's family is revealed.² Although there is no significant difference in lineality for single spouse subfamilies, married couples tend toward living with the female line relative of either generation. (See Table VI.)

TABLE VI
EFFECT OF GENERATIONALITY AND MARITAL STATUS
ON LINEAL PREFERENCE PATTERN
(N = 5269)

Generation and Marital Status of Subfamily	Preference for Female Line		Preference for Male Line		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Generation					
Younger	1518	56.7	1156	43.3	49.55*
Older	1241	47.9	1354	52.1	4.92*
Marital Status					
Married Couple	1103	55.4	887	44.6	23.44*
Single Spouse	1656	50.5	1623	49.5	.33

*Significant at .05 level

Ethnic background as a specifying condition does not influence the principal lineal pattern. (See Table VII.) All three differing racial and ethnic background subfamilies show a female line preference pattern.

²When these older-generation subfamilies are held constant and specified for marital status and ethnicity, the pattern of preference for male line relatives disappears in both conditions of marital status and in two of three types of ethnic background subfamilies. Older-generation Negro subfamilies maintain the male line preference, even though the younger-generation Negro households were found to prefer living with female line relatives.

TABLE VII
EFFECT OF ETHNIC BACKGROUND ON LINEAL
PREFERENCE PATTERN
(N = 5269)

Ethnic Background	Preference for Female Line		Preference for Male Line		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Native Born White	934	55.0	762	45.0	17.44*
Negro	303	63.9	178	37.1	32.48*
Other Ethnic	281	56.4	217	43.6	8.22*

*Significant at .05 level

It would appear from Table VIII that nine categories of communities have no significant preference in female or male lines for multigenerational family living. Three categories demonstrate a significant difference for the female line. All three of these categories are found in communities of fewer than 25,000 inhabitants or in other words in small towns or rural areas. If the three areas which show a significant difference in lineal preference are specified for ethnic background, it is found that all three types of ethnicity are found to prefer the female line. In the other nine categories of communities, every type of ethnic background shows no significant preference in lineality.

Marital Status Pattern

There is found to exist a marital status pattern in American subfamilies, which takes the form of single or remaining spouse subfamilies, (i.e., those sharing a home). This means that the majority of subfamilies in the United States are single spouses remaining from

TABLE VIII
 EFFECT OF SIZE OF COMMUNITY ON LINEAL PREFERENCE PATTERN
 (N = 5269)

Size of Community	Preference for Female Line		Preference for Male Line		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Rural Farm	213	48.6	226	51.4	2.36
Rural Nonfarm	586	53.2	515	46.8	4.56*
Urban Territory Outside Places	144	60.8	93	39.2	10.98*
Places of 2,500 to 4,999	111	49.4	114	50.6	.02
Places of 5,000 to 9,999	134	50.0	135	50.0	.002
Places of 10,000 to 24,999	288	57.2	215	42.8	10.50*
Places of 25,000 to 49,999	228	51.5	214	48.5	.44
Places of 50,000 to 99,999	205	52.0	189	48.0	.65
Places of 100,000 to 249,999	196	51.5	186	48.5	.26
Places of 250,000 to 499,999	158	48.7	179	51.3	1.07
Places of 500,000 to 999,999	182	52.6	164	47.4	.94
Places of 1,000,000 or More	314	52.8	280	47.2	1.46

* Significant at the .05 level

divorce, separation, or death. Table IX indicates that there are nearly twice as many single spouse subfamilies as there are married couple subfamilies.

TABLE IX
MARITAL STATUS PATTERN IN AMERICAN SUBFAMILIES
(N = 5269)

Marital Status of Subfamily Head	Percent		
Married Couple	1990	37.8	
Single Spouse	3279	62.2	
Total	5269	100.0	$\chi^2 = 315.32^*$

* Significant at .05 level

The majority of persons in single spouse subfamilies are older-generation persons. (See Table X.) The married couple subfamilies are younger-generation subfamilies, i.e., there are nearly 82.5% younger-generation subfamilies compared to 17.5% older-generation married subfamilies. An unexpected finding is that Negro subfamilies have the least amount of difference in generational primacy.

TABLE X
EFFECT OF MARITAL STATUS ON GENERATIONALITY
(N = 5269)

Marital Status	Younger-Generation Subfamilies		Older-Generation Subfamilies		χ^2
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Married Couple	1643	82.5	347	17.5	844.02*
Single Spouse	1031	31.5	2248	68.5	451.08*

* Significant at .05 level

Table XI demonstrates that ethnic background does not change the pattern of marital status found previously in subfamilies. All subfamilies, no matter what racial or ethnic background they have, show more single spouse persons than married couple persons. Community size also has no influence on marital pattern. This means that in all sizes of community, the single spouse pattern is maintained. (See Table XII.)

TABLE XI
EFFECT OF ETHNIC BACKGROUND ON MARITAL STATUS PATTERN
OF SUBFAMILIES
(N = 5269)

Ethnic Background	Married Couple Subfamilies		Single Spouse Subfamilies		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Native Born White	1213	39.6	1854	60.4	133.96*
Negro	329	45.3	398	54.7	6.54*
Other Ethnic	448	30.4	1027	69.6	227.28*

*Significant at .05 level

TABLE XII
EFFECT OF SIZE OF COMMUNITY ON MARITAL STATUS PATTERN
(N = 5269)

Size of Community	Married Couple Subfamilies		Single Spouse Subfamilies		X ²
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Rural Farm	192	35.6	347	64.4	44.44*
Rural Nonfarm	484	43.9	617	56.1	16.06*
Urban Territory Outside Places	82	34.6	155	65.4	22.48*
Places of 2,500 to 4,999	92	41.2	133	59.8	7.46*
Places of 5,000 to 9,999	99	36.8	170	63.2	18.74*
Places of 10,000 to 24,999	188	34.7	315	65.3	32.06*
Places of 25,000 to 49,999	148	33.5	294	66.5	48.22*
Places of 50,000 to 99,999	128	32.5	266	67.5	48.32*
Places of 100,000 to 249,000	119	31.2	263	68.8	54.06*
Places of 250,000 to 499,999	126	37.4	211	62.6	21.44*
Places of 500,000 to 999,999	130	37.6	216	62.4	21.36*
Places of 1,000,000 or More	202	40.9	292	59.1	16.40*

* Significant at .05 level

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study is concerned with patterns of generationality, lineality, and marital status in contemporary multigenerational family households. Ethnicity and size of community have been considered as modifying factors in the above mentioned patterns.

The purpose of the study is to enrich the sociological knowledge of the current American family by studying the extent and pattern variation in multigenerational households.

The sample includes approximately 6,700 heads of subfamilies and single-individual subfamilies who are or have been married, male or female, with or without children, living with a related primary family.

The hypotheses tested were formulated as null hypotheses; there are no patterns of generationality, lineality, and marital status in American multigenerational family households, and ethnicity and size of community does not influence the patterns.

The 1960 Census One-In-A-Thousand sample recorded in the Oklahoma State University computer center on magnetic tape provided material for the thesis.

Cross-tabulation was used with chi-square to test whether the results obtained could have occurred by chance alone. The level of significance was set at .05 for the two tail test.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The research data and the statistical findings resulting from the present study suggest the following conclusions. Although there is no generational pattern of either younger-generation subfamilies living with parent primary families or of older-generation subfamilies sharing the home of a married child, ethnicity as a specifying condition reveals two patterns to exist. Native born white and Negro households have a common pattern of younger-generation subfamilies, while subfamilies of other ethnic background, (i.e., foreign born or influenced), have the opposite pattern of older-generation. Younger-generation subfamilies are found to be a rural pattern. Parents living with children, on the other hand, seem to be associated with urban living.

A pattern of lineal preference for the female line is found to exist. If, however, generation is specified, the parents are found to prefer living with a son and his family, while the younger-generation maintains the preference for female line, i.e., living with the wife's family. Although no such pattern is found to exist in households shared with a single spouse, a pattern of female line preference emerges when married couples live with relatives. Ethnic background of subfamilies does not change the pattern of female line preference. On the other hand, only three of the twelve categories of community size maintain this pattern. In all three of these categories, every type of ethnic household reveals this preference for the female line.

The marital status pattern is that of single or remaining spouse subfamilies. All three types of ethnic background and all twelve communities maintain the same pattern.

The Census Bureau, as well as the studies conducted by Thomas P. Monahan and John Kosa, defines subfamilies as husband-wife families with or without children, and one-parent families with children. Monahan, as explained in the second chapter, maintains that from 1910 to 1947, ten percent of Americans were sharing their homes with relatives. In 1955 John Kosa found only five percent of the population living with relatives. This thesis, by adding remaining spouses without children to the above categories, has found that "doubling up" is more common than would otherwise be expected. Subfamilies, according to the findings, amount to 10.8 percent of the total families in the United States.

Although this study finds support for Paul C. Glick's statement that younger-generation subfamilies tend to live with the wife's family, it does not find any evidence to uphold Marvin Koller's finding that older generations tend to live with a married daughter and her family. This thesis finds evidence which indicates that older-generation subfamilies have a lineal preference for the male line, or in other words tend to live with a son and his family.

Recommendations

It would seem to be important that an investigation be conducted to determine why multigenerational family households continue to exist despite the fact that social security and retirement pensions are making it possible for nuclear families to each have their own homes.

It would also be interesting to ascertain how the United States compares with other countries in this type of family household and also whether other countries modify household living patterns as the economy improves.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldous, John. "The Consequences of Intergenerational Continuity." Marriage and Family Living, 27 (November, 1965), 462-469.
- Burgess, Ernest W., Harvey J. Locke. The Family, 3rd. ed. American Book Company, New York, N.Y., 1963.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." Marriage and Family Living, 27 (May, 1965). 243-255.
- Cabot, Natalie Harris. You Can't Count on Dying. Riverside Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961.
- Glick, Paul C. "The Life Cycle of the Family," Marriage and Family Living, 17 (February, 1955), 3-10.
- Herrmann, Robert D. "Expectations and Attitudes as a Source of Financial Problems in Teen-Age Marriages." Marriage and Family Living, 27 (February, 1965), 89-91.
- Kephart, William M. The Family, Society, and the Individual. 2nd. ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1966.
- Koller, Marvin R. "Studies of Three-Generation Households." Marriage and Family Living, 16 (August, 1954), 205-207.
- Kosa, John, Leo D. Rachiele, Cyril O. Schommer. "Sharing the Home with Relatives." Marriage and Family Living, 22 (May, 1960), 129-132.
- Mogey, John. Family and Neighborhood. Oxford Press, London, 1956.
- Monahan, Thomas P. "The Number of Children in American Families and the Sharing of Households." Marriage and Family Living, 18 (August, 1956), 201-204.
- Palisi, Bartolomeo J. "Patterns of Social Participation in a Two-Generation Sample of Italian-Americans." The Sociological Quarterly, 8 (Spring, 1966), 16-19.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States." American Sociological Review, 7 (October, 1942), 604-618.

- Rabinovitz, Patricia. "Living Arrangements for Older People." Living Through the Older Years. Ed. Ewan Clague. University Press of Michigan (1942), 131-147.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistic for the Behavioral Sciences. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1956.
- Smith, William M. Jr. "Family Plans for Later Years." Marriage and Family Living, 16 (February, 1954), 36-41.
- Stehouwer, Jan. "Relations Between Generations and the Three-Generation Household in Denmark." Social Structure and the Family. Ed. Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, (1965), 142-162.
- Stone, Carol L. "Three Generation Influences on Teen-Agers' Conceptions of Family Culture Patterns and Parent-Child Relationships." Marriage and Family Living, 24 (August, 1962), 287-289.
- Streib, Gordon F. "Intergenerational Relations; Perspective on the Two Generations on the Older Parents." Marriage and Family Living, 27 (November, 1965), 469-477.
- Sussman, Marvin B. "Activity Patterns of Post-Parental Couples and Their Relationship to Family Continuity." Marriage and Family Living, 17 (November, 1955), 338-342.
- Sussman, Marvin B., Lee Burchinal. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." Marriage and Family Living, 24 (August, 1962), 231-241.
- Wattenberg, Ben J. This U.S.A. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1963.

VITA

Constance Lizotte Spreadbury

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PATTERNS OF GENERATIONALITY, LINEALITY, AND MARITAL STATUS
IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN MULTIGENERATIONAL FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Madawaska, Maine, November 20, 1938,
daughter of Zélee and Raoul Lizotte.

Education: Attended Fort Kent State Teachers College, Fort
Kent, Maine and Rivier College, Nashua, New Hampshire;
received the Bachelor of Science degree from the Sam
Houston State Teacher College, Huntsville, Texas, with
a major in History, in May, 1965; completed requirements
for the Master of Science degree from the Oklahoma State
University, with a major in Sociology, in May, 1967.