Introduction

This book attempts to answer two questions: What is family policy? Why does it exist, or put another way, why is it important and what function does it serve? The answers given here differ from answers given in the past.

What is family policy? The lay public as well as academic experts think of family policy as fairly specialized public programs that include maternal and child health, child welfare, assistance to poor families, and work and family integration such as found in the Family and Medical Leave Act. The thesis of this book, however, is that family policy is all around us and is hiding in plain sight. Family policy, in fact, includes a very wide range of policies called by other names. Important elements of family policy are embedded in health and disability programs, Social Security, housing subsidies, and immigration policy. I define family policy as any publicly authorized set of supports or restrictions that affects the functioning of family life and the life chances of individual family members.

Why does family policy exist? One familiar explanation is historical: that family policy grew out of a charitable impulse toward widows, orphans, and paupers that eventually was expanded to include more people and was eventually largely taken over by government (Axinn and Levin 1975; Dobelstein 2009). Another important perspective explains the emergence of family-related policies as the result of efforts by reform movements and other interest groups to win mothers' pensions and other forms of social protection (Gordon 1994; Skocpol 1992). While both historical and political explanations are valid, they give relatively little attention to society's need for family policy in order to cope with changing economic and demographic conditions. Economists and sociologists focus instead on the uses of family policy as an adaptive response to economic and social change. Family policy emerged not only in the United States but also in other advanced industrial societies to meet the challenges of economic modernization and the changes in longevity, fertility, and family structure that ensued.

It has taken nearly half a century to recognize the need for an American family policy, or what Theda Skocpol (1995) envisioned as a program of "Family Security" to serve not just retirees or poor children, but also everyone "in the middle"—the middle generation of adults, and the middle class in the income distribution. This book represents a stepping-stone on the journey toward that larger vision of social protection for everyone. Almost all social policy is a form of social protection for families, even if the recipient of a particular benefit is an individual, because everyone has a family of some sort that is the first line of defense and a natural safety net in times of sickness, economic need, homelessness, and questions about citizenship. Families must fare well if the society is to prosper. Thus, family policy is a necessary counterpart to economic policy. Economic growth cannot occur without investment in the family infrastructure that reproduces workers with adequate human and social capital to keep the economy competitive. Parents and families must be able to educate and support the children who will make up the future labor force and the civil society. This book is intended to help students as well as the lay public to realize how important and valuable these family-related programs are and how they function both as the foundation for children's education and as social protection for individuals and families.

I have called on my own family history and professional experience for insights into why the various strands of family policy have been developed. From my parents and my childhood I learned the nature of the momentous change from a rural to an urban way of life and the profound impact this has had on the roles of women and men. My first interest in family policy was focused on equal opportunities for women and the need for childcare and more flexible work and family schedules. My professional experience as a faculty member at the Heller School for Social Policy and Management broadened my reach. I was introduced to the many other realms of social policy that affect family life—child welfare; disability policy; employment and training; income maintenance; housing and family wealth; measures to stop racial discrimination; immigrant parents' interaction with the schools; and health, substance abuse, and mental health policies.

Reflecting on my own experience in this way is similar to what Shulalmit Reinharz (2009) terms "experiential analysis" in her book *On Becoming a Social Scientist: From Survey Research and Participant Observation to Experiential Analysis*. While doing research, she found herself as an observer drawing on her own feelings and reactions to understand better the small groups, the survey respondents, and the Israeli kibbutz under attack that were the subjects of her investigations. Because she herself felt puzzlement and fear, she could sympathize with the people she was studying and in the

process ask questions and develop hypotheses that would have otherwise been ignored. So too, in telling about my family background and the era through which I have lived, my purpose is to convey an inside view of the momentous changes that have occurred in family life and women's roles over the past 75 years as well as the great range of family programs and policies that I have discovered in doing this research. In hearing my story, I hope that readers of this book will recall their own history and query that of their parents and elders in order to construct a personal inside view of family change and the family-related policies and programs that affect their lives. Such exercises make everyone better able to take responsibility as citizens for shaping the family-related policies and programs of the future.

A Transitional Generation

My personal history spans the mid-1930s to the present. During that time I made the journey from a rural economy to a commuter suburb outside Boston, from a family where the parents had little education to my own where both partners had postgraduate degrees, and from a husband-breadwinner family to a dual-career family. Change in the family structure brought on by the modern economy was something I lived through.

My father grew up in rural Ohio and my mother in the mining country of western Pennsylvania. All four of my grandparents were poor immigrants from Europe who entered the United States in the 1870s and 1880s. Each of my parents came from large families of eight or more children. Neither had a high school education. My father (born in 1894) had to leave his rural one-room school in the sixth grade to help support the family; my mother (born in 1903) grew up in a small mining company town where there was no high school. Her father died when she was 9 and her mother when she was 16. Yet she eventually put herself through business college by doing housework and then living with her sister, brothers, and brother-in-law to work as a secretary and bookkeeper in Akron, Ohio, at a salvage company until she was married. My father had his own business, first in hay baling and threshing for local farmers and later as owner and operator of dragline machines used for digging and cleaning drainage ditches that bordered roads and farms near Wooster, the county seat of Wayne County, an area about 50 miles south of Cleveland. He was very inventive and developed a couple of patents for the design of the booms for his big machines. But he was the ruler of the household because he conceived of the business which he ran as the main support of the family. He therefore believed that he was the family member responsible for making major consumer decisions. At one point he

took away my mother's checkbook because she had bought two twin beds from Sears Roebuck that he thought cost too much and were not really needed. But he had no such scruples when it came to buying machine parts and another machine or two that he could take apart for needed repairs. Later, as I taught courses on the family and learned how the patriarchal peasant family had evolved into a more egalitarian modern one, I understood this behavior as consistent with the structure of the pre-industrial family that combined economic production and consumption in one unit. Given this structure, the family must not consume the seed corn or it will forfeit next year's crop. Thus the wife's reproductive labor and consumer decisions are subjected to the husband's authority as head of the production side of family life.

Born in 1934, I was the oldest of four daughters, one of whom died as a young child. In 1942 we moved from Seville, Ohio, to take three rooms in a large farmhouse in Wooster Township while my father built a house on a neighboring property on the road south of Wooster opposite the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station. Before we moved (when I was 8 years old), I still remember driving by the College of Wooster and my father saying, "Maybe you girls will go there someday." It was especially important to him that we be able to go to the new Township school just across the fields from where we lived. But when it came time for me to go to Earlham College and my parents had to sign the scholarship form, my father balked at signing, I think because he did not realize that getting an education offered the only viable option for the daughter of a self-employed rural entrepreneur. If I had been a son, he probably would have prevailed because there would have been a pathway to carrying on the business. So at last, my mother stood up to my father and signed the scholarship form on her own. Many years later I realized how significant that was in light of her own education and work history.

Something else I learned from my family was what it felt like to be an outsider. My father had many lessons to teach about his own experience growing up, having spoken German at home until he went to school, being made fun of and being jeered at as "Girl's Coat" because of his homemade coat. Many times he also reflected on how important it was to get a "good start in life," by which he meant to have parents who had land and resources, spoke English like natives, and were not poor. My sisters and I to some extent relived this feeling of being out of step with other people. We lived in an unconventional house that Daddy built with cast-off materials during the war. We used the rainwater that flowed from the roof into the cistern for bathing and laundry. Mother cooked on a wood stove that required a steady supply of fuel and taking out of ashes. There was a privy out back to conserve water during dry weather. Although we had electricity, we used the

neighbors' phone. Daddy had a machine shop at the back of the house that held lathe, drill press, and a welder with accompanying acetylene and oxygen tanks that he used to construct booms and modify his dragline dippers. His healthy supply of extra machines in the back yard was always a bit of an embarrassment to the rest of the family.

There was a lot of household production that my sisters and I helped our mother to do—canning, making soap, doing laundry with the Maytag gyrator and wringer and rinsing the soap out in two adjoining washtubs, carrying out pails of waste water, and then drying clothes on the line outside. Although my father wasn't a farmer, many friends and neighbors were, and everyone was familiar with the seasonal routines of butchering, canning, preserving, raising one's own chickens for meat and eggs, and growing vegetables in the garden.

Yet we also had a life in the city of Wooster, a vibrant prosperous county seat of about 15,000 that was the headquarters of Rubbermaid, the Bauer Ladder Company, and Gerstenslager Company (which built bodies for mail trucks and other vehicles). We went to town for groceries, church, and shopping and my parents knew many people and their families through Daddy's business and through the church and my sisters' and my schoolmates. I attended Wooster High School and often walked home after some extracurricular activity (about two miles). My teachers were excellent and I excelled in school, which was a source of pride to me and to my parents.

I spent three years at Earlham College and my junior year in France with a special scholarship. After graduating from Earlham in 1956, I entered the PhD program in Sociology at Harvard University. This began a very different life in a sophisticated metropolitan setting that was a great contrast (except for the year in Paris) with my experience up to that point. Besides course work, the immediate challenge was to resolve the conflict I felt between finishing my doctorate to pursue a career as a college teacher (for which I had received a Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship) and getting married and quitting my graduate studies. Fortunately, I had the amazingly good and unusual fortune for that era of finding a life partner who gave up his place in the family printing business in Dayton, Ohio, to come to Boston to seek his fortune in the publishing industry and thereby see to it that I would finish my degree. My husband and I were married in 1957; I received my degree in 1961, and we moved a few months later to Wellesley, a suburb of Boston where our two children were born, and I was able to teach full time at Wellesley College. From that point on, I found myself a member of an urban world in which a new kind of family life had to be invented as we went along.

Like other young women professors who were having children in the 1960s, I was able to continue teaching because I found good help at home

and later in the excellent nursery school located at the college. Once the children were in public school, and I had left the college and won a fellowship to the Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study, our family developed a routine of sharing in the work to be done—the children helping with setting the table and doing the dishes, my husband helping with yard work, childcare, and the meals. The challenges of parenting and household management became easier in relation to the work I was doing as a sociologist. But all these experiences and the challenges of going against the typical pattern of the stay-at-home mother had already led me to think about how institutions could be changed to ease the conflicting demands of work and family. By the early 1970s I had begun to focus on questions of family policy. The changing roles of women in general, and my own experience in particular, were such a contrast with that of my mother's generation that it became clear that American society needed new social norms, organizations, and policies to meet these new challenges.

Policies for Women's Equality and Family Well-Being

It was the combination of my training as a sociologist and the challenges of being a young mother with a career that set me on a path to discover new policies to ease the strain between women's two roles. My time as a graduate student in sociology in the Harvard Department of Social Relations was at a golden moment in its history. I had the benefit of distinguished teachers and theorists who taught the four core courses in clinical psychology, social psychology, social anthropology, and sociology.

However, that was also the era prior to the great flowering of Women's Studies and prior to the civil rights and women's movements that would erupt in the following decade. Instead of providing a rationale for social reform, the reigning sociological theories were thought by many to be conservative apologia for the status quo. There was little effort to find connections between sociological knowledge and the solution of social problems. The mood of the 1950s was instead a time of political stability and growing prosperity. In this climate it was a struggle for me to find a thesis topic that would use sociology to understand the connections between the changing roles of women and efforts for social change. In the end I made a comparison of the leadership and ideology of the nineteenth century woman's suffrage movement and the more popular Women's Christian Temperance Union. I discovered that the two movements complemented each other. Suffragists focused on women's rights in the public sphere, whereas temperance advocates emphasized women's rights in the family (Giele 1995). Although

I didn't realize it at the time, this work would eventually launch me into the study of the contemporary connections between change in women's roles and in the family and between the women's movement and changes in laws and social policies to assure women's equality and family welfare.

By the late 1960s, sociologists' interest in social change had begun to expand to include the new social movements of that decade. A few experiments by families in communal living had cropped up around the country (Kanter 1972). Students in my family course at Wellesley College read about the new communes that were being set up among several cooperating families in Cambridge and which showed new possibilities for sharing the many tasks that traditionally fall on women such as cooking, laundry, and childcare. But over time it became clear that communes would never really gain a foothold. Instead of creating new family forms, the general public was more interested in creating new kinds of helping services and support programs *outside* the home—a strategy that produced much of what we consider today to be the subject of family policy.

The concept of family policy moved to the center of my attention in 1972 when I was named a principal consultant to the Ford Foundation's Task Force on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women. My assignment was to meet with the Task Force and prepare papers for its consideration on a variety of topics ranging from the changing role of women in the family to women's education and the economic position of women. Wherever I discovered educational or job discrimination against women, it turned out that more than laws for educational equality or pay equity was needed. The key was to find relief for women's overwhelming responsibility to be the main caretakers of children and other family members. The most frequent suggestion was to create flexibility in working hours and the schedules of working parents. This solution did not fit neatly under employment policy, educational policy, or equal rights policy. Rather, the issue was ultimately one of family policy.

My written report to the Foundation singled out four areas of social policy related to the family that were "now due for critical review in light of changing sex roles and family forms" (Giele 1978:194). The four areas were care of children, economic support to the family, community supports, and changing legal rights. During this period, while still at the Radcliffe Institute, I was also invited by a program officer of the National Science Foundation's RANN program (Research Applied to National Needs) to do a brief overview of family policy development in the United States. Rather than try to name all of the relevant policies, the main effort was to identify academic centers doing relevant research; advocacy groups representing various clients such as children, the elderly, and women; and key reference works (Giele and

Lambert 1975). Partly as a result of the Ford and NSF projects, I was invited by Matilda White Riley, a fellow member of the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Work and Personality in the Middle Years, to cover the topic for the 1979 *Annual Review of Sociology* (Giele 1979). The main categories of family policy (nurturance, economic activity, residence, and legal and cultural identity) that I identified in that article are basically the same as in the present book, which is to me a reassuring correspondence that suggests that my conceptual structure has stood the test of time.

Concurrent with the new scholarly developments in family policy, there was an emerging interest in teaching about existing policies as well as the process of policy making. It was this new interest on the part of policy-oriented professors at the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University that resulted in my being recruited to join its faculty in 1976. In 1977, the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH) funded three multiyear academic training programs in family policy: at the University of Minnesota, headed by Reuben Hill; at Duke University, headed by Carol Stack; and at the Heller School of Brandeis University, headed by my colleagues Robert Perlman and Roland Warren, who asked me to teach the basic required courses in the training program.

My experience on the faculty of the Heller School since 1976 has been a boon to my understanding of family policy. Later renamed the Heller School for Social Policy and Management, its faculty taught me how to connect social science to social policy. Its students exposed me to a great variety of programs for women, children, and families that I would otherwise never have known about. Charles Schottland, the founding dean, had been the U.S. Commissioner for Social Security in the Eisenhower Administration. The Center on Economics and Politics of Aging counted three past presidents of the American Gerontological Society—social worker Robert Morris, political scientist Robert Binstock, and economist James H. Schulz. The Institute on Health Policy headed by economists Stuart Altman and Stan Wallack as early as the late 1970s called attention to rising health care costs and eventually took a key role in shaping universal health coverage in Massachusetts. Gunnar and Rosemary Dybwad were leading visionaries and advocates for treating persons with mental retardation in the least restrictive setting. Lorraine Klerman was a distinguished researcher and advocate in the field of maternal and child health and prevention of teenage pregnancy.

My particular mission at Heller throughout the 1980s and 1990s was to bring a sociological perspective to women's changing roles as well as to press for special attention to policies for families, rather than child welfare alone which had always had a place at the school and had been especially championed by David Gil (1970) in his path-breaking study of *Violence against*

Children: Physical Child Abuse in the United States. Beginning with the NIMH Family Policy Training Grant, a course on children, youth, and families was offered annually with special attention to changing family structure and needed policies and programs to compensate for the new realities of parents' work, single-parenting, and ethnic and racial discrimination. In 1990, the School established the Family and Children's Policy Center, of which I was the founding director. The Center served as a meeting ground for affiliated faculty and numerous students in the master's and doctoral programs. In 2005 it became the Institute for Child, Youth, and Family Policy (2011).

In addition to all that I learned from my faculty colleagues about application of social science knowledge to social policy and practical programs, I perhaps learned even more from my doctoral students, many of whose dissertations I have cited in this book. Many came to me because they were doing dissertations on women's work and changing gender roles. But the majority were outside my specialty, and I found myself learning from them about whole new worlds—grandmothers caring for their grandchildren, kinship adoption, formal adoption, open adoption, school choice, childcare programs, women in prison, child sexual abuse, and families in the military—over 50 doctoral committees in all.

Nothing in graduate school or in my sociological training had prepared me for applying social science knowledge to contemporary policymaking. Yet in exposure to the Heller School mission of "Knowledge advancing social justice," I saw how sociological knowledge is necessary to the construction of good social policy. In order for the physician to treat a patient appropriately, she must understand the anatomy, physiology, and many complex systems in the body and how they work in order to recommend an effective treatment. So too, the policy makers who devise social protection systems for families and children must have basic knowledge of how families live and the factors that contribute both to distress and long-term well-being.

Introducing a Theory of Family Policy

This book differs from other books on family policy by including such topics as disability, health care, retirement pensions, housing, and immigration that are usually treated as topics unto themselves. This broad approach is in contrast to the much narrower range that is ordinarily thought of as family policy, namely, child welfare, laws on marriage and divorce, work–family balance, and welfare reform. I have not only extended the boundaries of the way family policy should be defined. I have also grouped family-related

policies into four main categories that address universal functions of family life: caregiving, economic provision, residence, and access to cultural heritage and legal and social citizenship. As shown in Chapter 8 of this book, previous works on social policy, family policy, and social protection have generally listed a congeries of relevant programs and government initiatives, but they have provided no rationale for what they enumerate, other than historical or current public attention to the issues at hand. There is universal agreement that caregiving for children and elderly and disabled persons is at the heart of family policy. Consensus on the importance of economic provision is nearly as strong, although opinion is divided over the desirability of universal eligibility versus supports limited to the needy. When it comes to the matter of shelter, which includes housing, neighborhood, and schools, the link to family policy is often unrecognized. Even less common is any awareness that matters of cultural, racial, ethnic, and religious citizenship have implications for the family, especially the current debates over immigration policy. Yet I include all these issues as of serious importance for the nation's family policy, by which I mean social policy, social protection, and the domestic safety net.

In making such claims, I am suggesting that the national focus on economic growth should be balanced by commensurate attention to how the fruits of growth are distributed so that they maximize well-being of the population. In preindustrial societies the household is a system for both production and consumption (and reproduction). These two functions are dependent on each other. People have to have enough to live on in order to produce the food and goods that will sustain them. At the same time they must continue to work in order to have the means to consume and reproduce. The economist Carolyn Shaw Bell (1972) summed up the role of the family in modern society as one of "consumer maintenance." The family maintains the worker's capacity to produce; the family is also the endpoint for consumption.

In our modern society, production has moved out of the home, but it is still necessary for the consumption or reproductive side of the household to be well enough nourished, housed, and integrated into the larger community to work and manage itself effectively. In other words, a feedback loop still exists between production and consumption, but now on a national plane. Economic production and continued growth cannot be sustained without due attention to the well-being of the people who are working in the fields, factories, schools, and offices of the nation.

The theory of social systems and social action has guided this conceptualization of family policy. Social systems are dynamic entities that include small groups (such as the family), social institutions (such as education or the legal

system), and whole societies (such as the United States). The members are connected to each other in such a way that events that occur in one part of the system have an eventual effect on other parts. The most common metaphor of a system is the body in which the organs are both interdependent and life sustaining. If key organs such as the heart or the brain experience a trauma, the whole body suffers. In a similar way, the family unit is a system in which its caregiving capacity, economic level, residential location, and cultural status all have an impact on its capacity for sustaining the well-being of its members. If one major function is impaired, the whole family suffers.

Just as the family is a social system, so also is the nation. The strength and capacity of the nation's families to bring up healthy and educated children, and to promote the general health of its population, has long-term effects on productivity in the workplace, the safety and livability of local neighborhoods, and the vitality of participation in civil society. Similarly, the way the nation allocates its resources—whether to national defense, foreign aid, protection of the environment, or to care of its people—affects well-being of children, families, and the population as a whole. When society is thus viewed as a system of interrelated parts, family policy becomes just as important as defense, foreign policy, and economic growth. The safety net and social protection are the society's internal defense against the enemies of sickness, hunger, privation, and despair.

The image of the social system as an entity with visible outlines and visible members is what sociologists refer to when they speak of *social structure*. Within the system are processes or *functions* such as the circulation of money; enforcement of laws; the flow of traffic; or birth, sickness, and death. The *theory of action* treats the connections between the system's structure and its capacity to function as critical to its survival in the face of challenges from within and without.

In his detailed study of the industrial revolution in the English cotton industry, Smelser (1959) demonstrates how structural change in the economy and the family spawned new social institutions such as the public school and the workingmen's cooperatives that helped to fulfill functions that were once performed by the family.

One of the postulates of the theory of action is that to adapt to new challenges in the environment, social systems tend to become more specialized or differentiated in order to meet the challenges effectively. This is what happened in the case of the Industrial Revolution. The family became more specialized in caregiving and spalled off the economic function as it was taken up by the new industrial system. As shown by the great classical theorists of modern social science like Max Weber (1968), Emile Durkheim ([1893] 1964), and Talcott Parsons (1966b), there is along with greater

specialization a universalizing trend in which greater capacity is developed to unify and standardize expectations and thereby create broader consensus on basic norms and values.

By using the theory of action to understand current developments in social and family policy, new insights become possible. Changes in family structure can no longer be explained as simply family decline or liberation from patriarchy. What is really going on is a massive process of social differentiation in which the functions of the family are becoming ever more specialized so that family life becomes the main locus for intimacy and satisfaction of the most basic psychological and physical needs. Many, but not all, functions that families used to perform have moved elsewhere: childcare to the daycare center and nursery school, food production to purchases at the grocery store, food preparation to the restaurant, and elder care to assisted living or the nursing home. Yet at the same time that all this splitting off of former family functions is occurring, new social policies and laws are being created to standardize and regulate the many family-related activities that occur outside the family on which many families depend in order to fulfill their purpose.

The social policies and programs that help the family fulfill its purpose are what constitute the corpus of family policy. A key purpose of the family in every society is to bring children into the world and socialize them to become effective adults. In addition, every member of the population who survives infancy has some connection to a family, fictive kin, or a combination of family-substitute groups (such as the homeless shelter, or assisted living) that helps to fulfill basic family functions of caregiving, economic support, shelter, and cultural identity. Grouping policies by major family functions provides some leverage for a critical appraisal of where policies are skewed toward one interest group or another or are missing. For example, data in Chapter 6 on rent subsidies and the mortgage tax credit reveal a huge inequity in the large subsidies being provided to homeowners as compared with renters. Viewed through a family policy lens, a major question is how this disparity affects the many families and children who are involved and whether the policy should be changed.

Still very new to my thinking (and not suggested until the final chapter) is the radical idea that family policy is as important to the nation's well-being as national defense, economic growth, and foreign policy. What is our nation defending, what good is its economic growth, how can it be a leader of nations if in 2006 it ranked 27th among 30 industrialized countries in prevention of infant mortality, has 15 percent of its families living in poverty, and is the highest among advanced industrial nations in the proportion of its population who are in prison? The capacity to reverse these trends is embedded

in American values as stated in the founding documents: to enjoy the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and to promote the general welfare. The well-being of families is critical to the realization of these ideals.

Organization of the Book

My purpose in this book is to show that family policy is a well-tested and necessary adaptation by society to the fundamental change that occurred in family structure with economic modernization. The account is both descriptive and theoretical. It provides a map to the field of social policies that helps to organize and highlight the major themes. Rather than focus deeply on one strand such as child welfare and follow it from its origins to its elaboration, application, and evaluation, this book provides an overview of the broader landscape of family policy—why it came into being, where it is well developed, and where it is patchy and weak. The tables at the end of the core chapters summarize the major programs and laws related to caregiving, economic provision, residence, and cultural identity and citizenship.

The organization of the chapters reflects the underlying theory that I use to organize the material and explain its significance. The first three chapters describe the changes in family structure that have driven the search for policies and programs to support family functions. The middle four chapters focus on four major functions of the family that I derive from the theory of action and which also correspond to the major themes of writers and leaders in the family policy field. The theory of action posits four functional requirements that every social system has to meet if it is to survive: ***A***daptation, ***G***oal-attainment, ***I***ntegration, and ***L***egitimation. In the case of the family unit as a social system, I identify the four capacities necessary to family viability as caregiving (***G***), economic security (***A***), residential location (***I***), and transmission of citizenship and cultural heritage (***L***). Each of the four chapters on these major functions describes the major policies and programs that have been devised to support that particular capacity. The final chapter returns to a structural analysis by viewing American family policy as a development that is consistent with modern welfare-capitalism in other countries of the world.

Chapter 1, "The Emergence of Family Policy in America," lays out the central thesis of the book that the new field of family policy has come about in order to support the functions that most families can no longer adequately provide entirely on their own, such as a livelihood, education of the next generation, and caregiving for frail and dependent family members. Family structure changed as a result of modernization. Production moved from

farm and small business to the workplace; and the reproductive functions of childbearing and caregiving then took center stage. Thus exposed to new risks, various interest groups have continued to advocate for programs and policies that address these changed conditions.

Chapter 2, "Defining the Family," reviews the main changes that have taken place in the structure of the family during the twentieth century. There has been a dramatic decline in family size and a rise in cohabitation, single-parent families, and divorce. These shifts have produced greater diversity in family structure as well as turmoil and innovation in family law and family policy. The positive and negative effects of these changes have fueled a debate over "family values" in which conservatives emphasize the value of two-parent families, liberals focus on the increased employment opportunities for women that also brought demise of the patriarchal family, and feminists seek ways that women's important caregiving roles can continue without penalty to their incomes or long-term career opportunities.

Chapter 3, "The Gender Factor," connects the changing division of household labor to the resurgent women's movement and rising labor force participation of women. Men's roles have also changed because of the dramatic shift in occupations from agriculture to manufacturing and service industries. Among younger families, husbands' and wives' duties are being reshuffled to bring about a more symmetrical marriage relationship both inside and outside the home. These changes challenge the old family system and spawn new family forms while also creating the conditions that can support greater equality between husbands and wives in their work and family responsibilities.

Chapter 4, "Re-invention of Caregiving," reviews the changes in care for children, older persons, and those who are sick or disabled and the social policies and programs that support them. With more wives and mothers in the paid labor force, care in many cases has been transferred to nursing homes for the elderly, childcare centers, and half-way accommodations for persons with disabilities. The disability rights movement has been a leader in advocating universal access to accommodations and to treatment in the least restrictive setting. De-institutionalization and caregiving in an informal setting promises clients more personalized treatment and more control over their lives. If bureaucratized caregiving can become more family-like, the low-paid caregiving work force may also benefit by being allowed to treat persons more flexibly and humanely in ways that redound to their own benefit.

Chapter 5, "Family Income and Economic Security," describes the income distribution of American families, the extent of poverty, and evidence of increasing inequality. Among the strategies to provide adequate family

income, advocates for women's equality have given particular attention to part-time and flexible schedules, employment training, and availability of childcare. Other American policies to protect family income and economic security include assistance for the poor, social insurance, private pensions and benefits, improvement of skills and wages, and work and family integration. Programs such as Social Security are administered by the government, but many job-based benefits such as health insurance and pension contributions are provided by employers subject to government regulations and responsive to government incentives.

Chapter 6, "Housing, Neighborhoods, and Life Chances," begins with a profile of renters and homeowners and then describes the evolution of U.S. housing policy that stimulated the growth of suburbia but never made an equal investment in housing for non-homeowners or those in need of low-cost or subsidized housing. Of particular interest to sociologists of the family are the connections between housing, social class, and neighborhood schools. Poor communities that are characterized by concentrated disadvantage are places of high and chronic stress that interfere with the cognitive, emotional, and physical well-being of the residents whereas prosperous communities are able to insist on high standards, intervene in deviant behavior, and promote school quality and institutional resources that enable their children to succeed.

Chapter 7, "Family Heritage, Identity, and Citizenship," examines the connections between a family's ethnic, racial, cultural, and immigrant status and rights of citizenship. The Immigration Reform Act of 1965 brought a massive influx of immigrants from non-European countries, many of whom have since experienced downward mobility. Language barriers, racial and religious differences, and a lack of technical skills in many cases pushed the new arrivals into menial work and marginal occupations, and their children suffer from discrimination and poorly managed schools. The most successful immigrants maintain parental authority and religious and ethnic ties that enable them to resist the negative aspects of American culture while supporting their children's education. The most immediate policy issue is how to create a path to citizenship for a growing number of undocumented immigrant families and their children.

Chapter 8, "Family, Government, and the Safety Net," places family protection and family policy in the larger context of the modern capitalist welfare state. Family policies are needed to address the structural changes in the economy and family life that accompany modernization. When families can no longer serve as the ultimate safety net, it is government-sponsored programs that must fill the void. In the debate over family values and the purpose of family policy, the goal of supporting family functions prevailed over

efforts to influence family structure. Current debate on curbing government deficits points to the need to cut social spending. Some leading economists, however, argue that the best way to fuel economic growth and cut the deficit is to invest in human capital, strengthen families, and improve the health and education of the next generation.

Acknowledgments

I owe personal and intellectual debts to many people, some of whom I have already named in the foregoing account of my own family history and professional experience. Here I especially want to acknowledge the various readers who reviewed my chapters and gave me many helpful suggestions. In the nature of such a broad and synthetic undertaking, I could not possibly know what was most germane in fields such as employment and income security, housing, or immigration. I had to depend on expert colleagues for help, even though I was not always able to follow all of their advice. Special thanks go to Michael Doonan, Margi Erickson Warfield, Susan Ferguson, Hilda Kahne, Jane Roland Martin, Huong Nguyen, James H. Schulz, Connie Williams, and Nicole Witherbee.

In the early stages of the writing, a faculty research stipend from the Brandeis Department of Women's and Gender Studies supported two excellent graduate research assistants, Miranda Waggoner and Ramona Olverez, who helped me in tracking down references and setting up the reference list. When it came time to put the whole manuscript together, Jenna Sirkin brought her extensive bibliographic and editorial experience and impressive knowledge of Endnote to my rescue by filling in many holes and correcting various inconsistencies.

In a more general way I also want to acknowledge the wonderful support I have received from the Heller School faculty, students, and deans who have encouraged my efforts in finding the major intersections between sociology and social policy. I have had the good fortune to know and learn from five outstanding deans of the Heller School, beginning with Dean Charles Schottland. Dean Arnold Gurin let me join the faculty in 1976 and "hang out my shingle." Without the powerful endorsement of Dean Stuart Altman, the Family and Children's Policy Center would never have come into being. Dean Jack Shonkoff was especially invested in questions of family and child well-being, and most recently Dean Lisa Lynch has welcomed my continuing involvement even though I am now in the ranks of the Emeriti.

In particular, I want to express my deep appreciation to Susan Ferguson, the editor of the Contemporary Family Perspectives Series, for her confidence

and support throughout the several years it took to complete the book. She early on identified my interest in family policy, then invited me to give a teaching workshop at the 2005 Annual Meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, and not long after that invited me to write this book. As I gathered up my notes for this introduction, I found that they went back more than twenty years! I would still be writing memos to myself about a possible book some day on the topic of family policy if it hadn't been for Susan who actually made it happen.

Given its position as a leader in publishing titles in the social sciences around the world, it is a pleasure to see this book under the imprint of SAGE. I wish to thank the Sage editorial staff for their excellent handling of the manuscript. Editor David Repetto has been an enthusiastic supporter of the Contemporary Family Perspective Series. From the beginning, he also recognized the need for this book to be somewhat longer than others in the series because of its broad reach and synthetic nature. Editorial Assistant Lydia Balian invited my participation in plans for the cover. As production editor, Eric Garner oversaw the steps leading from manuscript to finished book. Copy editor Terri Lee Paulsen was amazingly efficient and meticulous in correcting errors and noticing omissions under the pressure of a tight schedule. In addition, she communicated her own enthusiasm for the contents of this book, which stemmed from her experience as a journalist, entrepreneur, and (girls') hockey mom.

Finally, as my personal history has already explained, I owe the greatest tribute to my parents, Albert and Ellen Nestor Zollinger, who gave me a good start in life, and to my husband and partner, David Giele, with whom I have enjoyed the fruits of all the care and opportunities that have come to us. Bringing up our two children, Elizabeth and Ben, has given me special insight into both the challenges and pleasures of being a parent. We are all members of families that have come before us and will continue after us.