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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop a model that could answer general questions about why social welfare develops in complex industrial societies, and to relate socio-economic conditions to types of family organization and the demand for types of social welfare.

Since it was not clear how the development of social welfare was related to industrial society, exploratory research was undertaken. A survey of the literature of the family, sociological models of society, writings on the different types of welfare, and relevant DBS statistics were examined. This material was studied with sensitivity to the hypotheses that may be derived from it.

The findings indicate that it is possible to develop a model based on the analytical tool of systems theory. This tool allowed the writer to sift through the data, organizing it according to the units of a social system, which is defined in terms of different levels of structure and function. Thus person, family, neighbourhood and community relationships were set out in relation to each other. Over time community relationships reflect the growing complexity of society. In early simple societies the family embraced most of the functions of the tribal society. The "social security of the family" is not sufficient in the complex industrial society. Thus the family function of social security was transferred to the state. In modern complex societies the family has come to rely on various social institutions, in addition to the market place, to meet its needs.

The two-way exchanges of the market place have been replaced by one-way transfers to the family from the larger social institutions of government, Federal, Provincial and Municipal. Three types of
unilateral transfer were highlighted, occupational, fiscal and direct assistance (in kind and money). Four types of demand for welfare result and are related to four types of family organization. These four family types, ordered according to the degree of integration in their conjugal role patterns, and the extent of connectedness in their surrounding social networks (contacts with kin, friends and neighbours), were related to the level of societal complexity. The resultant relationships are organized into a table of hypotheses. This table and its interpretation constitute the major findings of the study.

The implications of the findings for social work practice indicate that the model could provide a framework for a systems approach to "Social Diagnosis."
I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The development of social welfare appears related to the transfer of roles once handled by the family to institutions outside the family. In simple societies the family might embrace all the socio-economic functions of the tribal society. This is not so in more complex cultures. This study assumes that of all the institutions of society, the family provides the link between the individual and society's institutions. It is the purpose of this study to develop a model that suggests answers to general questions of why social welfare evolves in complex industrial societies. Since the family is an arbiter between individual and society, the second aim of the study is to relate socio-economic conditions of industrial society to types of family organization, both in terms of internal family behaviour patterns, and external social relationships to the community. The kind of family organization, internally speaking, and its related exterior social networks will be related to different types of social welfare.
II. THE PROBLEM

The Scope of Welfare Theory

Social Welfare in this study is viewed as a "product" of socio-economic conditions. This is simple enough, however it is more difficult to explain how it has developed. There is the longitudinal view of the problem, which involves studying the process over several centuries of development. Another approach is to study certain points of history in detail. Each approach has its own strengths: the former obtains perspective at the loss of detail, the latter provides detail, but such studies are difficult to relate to other periods of development in Social Welfare. The relating of two periods is difficult, because the indicators that are common to one time period

1A good example of the developmental view is the work of social historians; Maurice Bruce, The Coming of the Welfare State (revised edition), (New York: Schocken Books, 1966,) and Samuel Mencher, Poor Law to Poverty Program, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967.)


Social Welfare has long been identified with the poor and the fear that the poor would exploit the rich. See Richard Titmuss, Commitment to Welfare, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1968) for a collection of his better known essays on the issues: redistribution, freedom, free choice, democracy and the ethics of giving.
cannot be measured as they change over the next. This requires ana-
lytical tools that are highly sophisticated. Suffice it to say, as
yet there is not much welfare theory.

What welfare theory there is, is either too broad in scope to be
manageable, or too limited to be of much analytical use! Thus the
descriptive material of one period of history is limited in such a way
as to be not comparable to the next. The intention for this study is
to have a theory of the "middle range" that is applicable over time,
but not so "grand" as to be overgeneralized.  

Social Welfare as Unilateral Transfer

The problem of what is social welfare policy can be clarified if
we distinguish it from, for example, policies of defense, natural re-
source development, and economic policy. Since economic policy and
social policy are easily confused Boulding, an economist, has provided
a helpful distinction:  

If there is one common thread that unites all aspects of so-
cial policy and distinguishes them from merely economic pol-
icy, it is the thread of what has elsewhere been called the
"integrative system," This includes those aspects of social
life that are characterized not so much by exchange in which
a quid is got for a quo as by unilateral transfers that are
justified by some kind of appeal to a status or legitimacy,
identity, or community. The institutions with which social
policy is especially concerned, such as the school, family,
church, or, at the other end, the public assistance office,
court, prison, or criminal gang, all reflect degrees of in-
tegration and community. By and large it is an objective of
social policy to build the identity of a person around some
community with which he is associated.

3See Winifred Bell, "Obstacles to Shifting from the Descriptive to the
Analytic Approach in Teaching Social Service," Education for Social
Work (Spring 1969) pp. 5-13, for a discussion of this point.

Economics has to do with transfers that are bilateral, that is a two-way exchange. Social policy deals with transfers that are unilateral, or one-way, usually from the state to the individual or family. This implies, as Boulding points out,\(^5\) that social policy has to concern itself with questions of identity and alienation, because in unilateral exchanges there is no opportunity for a response of the individual receiving the transfer. Alienation can result unless there is adequate feedback built into the social welfare delivery system.

There are three\(^6\) general types of transfer: direct public provision of services in kind (education and welfare), and the direct payment of benefits in cash (retirement pensions and family allowances), fiscal and occupational transfers. Fiscal transfers have their basis in tax changes thus increasing total disposable income, for example, when a new child is born to a family, or when education is prolonged. Fiscal transfers relate only to the rather small population who pay direct taxes, and not to those who pay property taxes and social security payments. Occupational transfers include survivors' benefits, child allowances, severance pay, compensation for loss of office, and health and welfare services. Occupational welfare relates to the employed population's "fringe benefits", and favours white collar and middle class occupations. Thus Titmuss concludes that social policy centers primarily on "areas of unifying interest centered in those social institutions that foster integration and discourage alienation."\(^7\)

---

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 8.


\(^7\)Titmuss, Op. Cit., p. 22.
Others agree with this basic orientation to social policy.

**Social Welfare as Institutional and Residual**

Wilensky and Lebeaux\(^8\) outline two conceptions of social welfare that they call the residual and the institutional. The first holds that social welfare should come into play only when normal structures of supply, the family and the market break down. The second view sees welfare services as a normal "first line" function of modern industrial society.

The institutional view of social welfare is characterized by five traits: formal organization; social sponsorship and accountability; the absence of profit motive as a dominant program purpose; functional generalization; an integrative, rather than segmental view of human needs, and focus on human consumption needs.

**The Characteristics of Institutional Welfare**

**Formal Organization.** Social welfare activities are formally organized. This is in contrast to handouts or individual charity. Mutual aid extended by family, friends and the like are not included. There is a continuum stretching from these cases to the welfare services of a small union, church or fraternal society to municipal, city, provincial and national welfare services. Modern social welfare refers to help given where personal bonds are at a minimum. It assumes a degree of social distance between helped and helper.

**Social Sponsorship and Accountability.** Socially sanctioned purposes and methods exist with formal accountability to society. This

---

is crucial to distinguish social welfare from the activity of the market or the family. Typically, society acts through some city, state or federal office.

Absence of Profit Motive as Dominant Program Purpose. The chief goal is not profit as is the case of pension plans or nurseries set up by industry. If the nursery, for example, were set up more for the purpose of service to the workers then it is not a fringe benefit. It should, therefore, be classified as occupational welfare. Blue collar workers tend to be the largest group of benefactors of occupational welfare. However if this fringe benefit was part of a negotiated wage package it represents a contractual relationship—a bilateral transfer of the market place. In this case the advantages of the benefit are not social welfare, because little weight is given to social sponsorship and control. Because professional codes of ethics emphasize social service, fee-for-service professionals are included in social welfare by Wilensky and Lebeaux.

Functional Generalization: An Integrative View of Human Needs. In the face of extensive segmentation and division of labour (societal complexity) social welfare attempts to generalize itself in order that it may be applied to any situation. Thus it requires a broad view of human need and personality. Social welfare and its implementors, social workers, serve an integrative role and function in society. Wilensky and Lebeaux exclude the school system, because it tends to be segmental in its approach to its clientele. This writer would argue that social welfare alienates too, by separating out welfare recipients by category of need, although a primary purpose of social welfare is integration.
Direct Concern with Human Consumption Needs. Government provides many services all of which are socially sponsored. It is possible to put these services on a continuum from those that are functional requisites (like national defense, or law and order) for social existence and only indirectly of importance to the person and family, to those that provide a direct service to meet immediate consumption needs of individuals and families. In this latter end of the continuum are schools, recreation facilities, libraries, museums, school books and lunches, subsidized housing, medical and hospital services. The latter group contain the welfare services. Such services serve the wider aims of the society as well; for example, unemployment insurance acts as an economic stabilizer in periods of unemployment. Unemployment insurance is designed to meet social need; to withdraw the service when the economy is on the upswing of the business cycle can be good economic planning, but it is not done because it is against the principle of human need.

Thus social welfare is an organized part of the social structure of the community. One can say the trend seems to be towards a further development of the institutional type. That is, more people accept the idea that various services for people are necessary. Once a service becomes highly developed it tends to become universally accepted no matter what its origin. A good example of this would be unemployment insurance. It was first identified with the depression of the 1930's and those who were "slackers" or lazy; now unemployment insurance is seen as necessary protection against the periodic layoff of the hard working.

In conclusion the determination of social welfare development is
hampered by a lack of a set of common indicators that undergo measurable change over time. Much of the literature on Social Welfare concentrates on specific developments in the legislation or on the need for it. Usually the latter are studies of poverty. This literature is detailed and highly descriptive. The general point made thus far is that social welfare is distinctive as social policy compared to defense or resource development policy. Social policy is both residual and institutional in its scope and is best characterized as a unilateral transfer. Its social function is an integrative one, although in practice unless there is proper feedback from the receivers of social welfare it can be a segmenting or alienating force in society. A typology of social welfare will be developed later under the section on definitions in order to be more specific about what is to be analyzed.

---

9The following are examples:


III. SOURCES OF DATA AND ANALYTICAL TOOLS

Sources of Data

Because of the complexity of the problem involved in relating levels of industrialization to family type and welfare type it was the opinion of the writer that explorative research was best suited to clarifying the relationships. Library research was the method used to collect the data. Reading was pursued in the following areas and disciplines: the sociology of the family, comparative sociology, labour economics, and the literature of social welfare. Dominion Bureau of Statistics data were sought for statistics on the labour market, migration, population, labour force figures and government policies and expenditures for health, education and welfare.

Analytical Tools

Since these types of data embrace many levels of scope, systems analysis was used to relate the variety of data surveyed. Systems theory facilitates the defining of boundaries, at the same time allowing flexibility, by providing a method for relating units of theory of different scope, and ordering them in a systematic way into a hierarchy. Structural Functional theory, Societal Complexity and Time are three important related aspects of systems analysis.

Structural Functional Theory

Family, Industry, and Social Welfare are social phenomena. Therefore the structural-functional theory of society, made familiar by sociologists, was drawn on for a model. Structural-functional theory concentrates on patterns of social organization and the resultant consequences of these patterns. Thus, structure is pattern and function is the consequence of the implied pattern.

Since this study is confronted with the interpretation of history much as Smelser was when he studied the industrial revolution, then rather than analyze the facts of history as another historian he attempted to approach them as a sociologist. As he says,

The fact that distinguished my research most from that which many historians do is that I approached the Industrial Revolution as a case illustration for an explicit, formal conceptual model drawn from the general tradition of social thought...this model says that under certain conditions of social disequilibrium, the social structure will change in such a way that roles previously encompassing many different types of activities become more specialized; the social structure, that is, becomes more complex and differentiated. It was this abstract, analytic model...that generated problems for me, not the period of the Industrial Revolution as such.

Thus Smelser provides a theoretical framework that could be used to evaluate the development of social welfare through the exercise of testing.


Smelser's model is about how society differentiates its structure. The main point is that a society's structure becomes more complex through a process of increasing specialization of societal roles. This process is called structural differentiation. Structural differentiation has been used in two ways to explain social-historico phenomena. One type of analysis has noted the increasing degree of it over time. Others such as Smelser have taken a specific time period of two to four decades and showed how structural differentiation has affected the lives of certain groups of people during the time period. For the purposes of this study structural differentiation will be used in the sense that Smelser used it in order to present hypotheses about the family's place in a modern industrial society.

To give an example of structural differentiation one can refer to the work of Smelser. He established that the working class family in Britain 1790-1830 adhered to an extended pattern. The father, usually the spinner, supervised his wife, children, nephews and nieces first in his own home and later in the factories. But with technical innovation the number of people needed to supervise a spinning machine was much greater than the numbers even in an extended family. Secondly older, more experienced men were needed. Children were not capable

enough to meet the new tasks. Thus by 1830 there was a movement to cut the number of hours children would work in the factory. This meant that parental control was weakened and the internal structure of the extended family was threatened. The result was strikes and an agitation on the part of workers, not the manufacturers, to have their children in the factory for not eight but twelve hours. By 1840 a compromise of ten hours was achieved. This meant that children and other kin were out from under the supervision of the extended family system for two hours every day. The older more experienced members worked a twelve hour day.  

This illustrates how two systems of different scope, the extended family and the cotton industry, interact and how changes in technology shifted the relationship between the two systems. The boundaries are clear in terms of the functions. The extended family composed of father, mother, children married and unmarried, made up the work force of the cotton factory. However with large spinning machines the family did not have enough qualified members to man them. Thus outsiders were introduced, destroying the family's control of the spinning of cotton. It was when the internal organization of the family was threatened that the workers rebelled. What has occurred here is a transfer in the authority of parents over children. It was suggested that children work in rotating shifts of shorter duration than their parents. Thus the children spent some time away from parental supervision. This was a new departure in the English working man's life. The development of the British school system can be traced to the fact that children now had some free time away from the productive process.

\[1^4\text{Smelser, Op. Cit., pp.24-31.}\]
that could be spent in acquiring education. Thus power was transferred from the extended family to school authorities.

Societal Complexity

The development of greater structural differentiation occurred because once the extended family was no longer the sole supervisor of the children, then a new supervisory structure had to be set up. In this case the school system development can be traced to the reduced need of children in the production process. It has already been noted that division of labour is related to structural differentiation. Many economists, in particular, have noted that jobs become increasingly complex, but also that specialization becomes an increasing factor in the development of new jobs, in the production process. Specialization has been a chief way in which increased productivity has been achieved. Thus the scope of function for each job declines. In Smelser's example the extended family is relieved partly of a function as a result of technological change. It is only a matter of time, then, before the extended family's structure alters either to reassert its influence, or to allow its influence to decline. If the latter occurs the likelihood of the number of people in the extended family declining becomes a distinct possibility.

Time

In the illustration cited above from Smelser, the family is analyzed over a period of time as it relates to the production process of industry. This is known as a sequential law of interaction.\textsuperscript{15} The

\textsuperscript{15}Dubin, Op. Cit., p. 100. Sequential laws determine the change of the two units over the whole process. For this study only a few points of change in the process will be analyzed. That is, those levels of societal complexity associated with different types of family will be noted.
relationships between two units in the theory, family and production process, are examined in terms of their changes in function and structure over time. The analysis of these relationships is known as longitudinal analysis. Points in this process can be analyzed if they are related to the process. If the points, however, were not analyzed according to some system of interaction there would be no basis of comparison of two points in time. The indicators or numbers measuring each unit should change in predictable ways. Thus structural functional theory, if systematically organized and tested, provides a basis for analyzing the relationship between the family, the development of industry, here expressed as structural differentiation, or division of labour, or societal complexity, and the development of social welfare policy.

It remains still to define exactly what is to be analyzed in this study.
IV. DEFINITIONS

The preceding general discussion of the analytical tools suggests that the definitions of the family, industrialization and social welfare can be defined in terms of their structures and their functions.

**Structural-Functional Analysis of the Family**

**Family Structure as a Social System**

A number of distinctions can be made that clarify what is a family system. In the past writers have not distinguished between an ecological unit and the family, that is, the domestic household and the family; household refers to people living together in the same place, related or not; family refers to relatives whether living together or not. A family is a social system whose structure is specified by familial positions. The nuclear family consists of three familial positions: husband-father, wife-mother, and offspring-siblings. We can speak of these as dyads of connecting relationship: that is, the marital relationship of husband-wife; the parenting relationship, mother-offspring, father-offspring; and the sibling relationship, offspring-siblings. An incomplete nuclear family exists if there are less than the three above-mentioned positions, such as: mother and

---

her child(ren); a marital couple with no children, and a set of siblings.

A social system such as the family is a group with two or more differentiated positions. A location is a social structure which is associated with a set of social norms in a social position. An extended family is a social system of two or more familial positions other than mother and father—an example is a nuclear family plus a paternal uncle. Unlike the nuclear family the extended family does not have a fixed number of specifiable positions.

Family as a Kin Structure

The family is an ecological unit and a family system. The ecological unit refers to the domestic household. That is a family system may be living physically in more than one geographical area. When we are describing the family in this context we usually refer to kin network. Kinship as an organizational principle does not describe the total pattern of social relations, only the kin relations. Families have many relationships that are not kin relations. The term social network is used to denote both kin and non-kin family contacts. Studies of the family indicate a great diversity of family type. However, for the purposes of theorizing it is convenient to discuss the nuclear pattern as the basis for generalization. Kinship is a basic organizing principle for this analysis.

The marriage bond is the main structural keystone of the kinship system. This results from the structural isolation of the conjugal

---

family, and the fact that the married couple is not supported by comparatively strong kinship ties to other adults. The marriage bond is like a bridge that both holds together and holds apart. It links the two families, but in such a way as to balance off the families of orientation of husband and wife. Neither is to get too close to the new couple. The new couple hold the balance of power in order to maintain the independence of their marriage through their impartialness to the two families of orientation. Neither family of orientation, especially neither marital couple, have any priority of status that is structurally sanctioned.

It is around this "keystone", then, that the kinship system is built. The keystone sets the tone of some of the closest personal relations of the family of procreation: who visits whom, and how often. It is this that largely determines the intensity and closeness of the relationship of family members. The centre of the family is the conjugal couple, their respective mothers and fathers, and siblings with their children, and the children of the couple. Terminologically the siblings are cousins, the brothers and sisters are aunts and uncles or brothers-in-law or sisters-in-law, the parents of origin become grandparents or great-grandparents. The kin structure unfolds like the skin of an onion, layer upon layer. This implies proportionately greater distance with each circle.

The American family system is open. There is no preferential mating on a kinship basis. A person's family of orientation and his in-law family are from the point of view of his children both first ascendant families whose members are equally grandparents, aunts, and uncles. The kin system is, therefore, an open one.
The above picture of the family system reflects reality reasonably well. The symmetry is not biased in either a patrilineal or matri-lineal direction. The evidence that points to the soundness of this picture is that the isolated conjugal family is the normal household unit: it is the unit of residence and a source of common financial support, especially in the money income economy of today. The conjugal family is largely financially independent of each family of orientation. Often geographical separation is considerable. The status of the conjugal family rests with the husband's job, which is not usually tied to any kin-structured relationship. Our patterns of inheritance reflect this as well because all family members should, ideally, share equally in it. Thus there are no groupings of collaterals cutting across the conjugal family.

It is this open, onion-skin structure that is the most distinctive feature of the American kinship system and underlies most of its peculiar functional and dynamic problems. It is this feature that isolates the conjugal family so much. Of course there are many exceptions to it. For example rural areas, because of the economics of farming, can use an extended family pattern; certain upper-class elites pass on their heritage of power through a patrilineal kin structure; finally there are lower-class patterns, both urban and rural, where a mother-centred type of family structure predominates. However, these are variants of the basic American nuclear type of kinship structure. This nuclear family type has developed in the urban middle-class areas of the American continent.

The Family as Function

As with structure, functions vary with the unit of study. That is
Macro functions deal with the larger relationship of family to society. A typical list of these is as follows:

1. Replacements for dying members of the society must be provided.
2. Goods and services must be produced and distributed for the support of the members of society.
3. There must be provision for accommodating conflicts and maintaining order internally and externally.
4. Human replacements must be trained to become participating members of the society.
5. There must be procedures for dealing with emotional crises, for harmonizing the goals of individuals with the values of the society and for maintaining a sense of purpose.

The analytic subsystems of the family have correspondent societal functions: familial, economic, political, socializing-educational and religious.

In general these activities may be carried out in a number of structural contexts. The reproductive function is an exception since it is the prerogative of the family. In a subsistence economy the family could carry out all of the functions. Thus simple undifferentiated societies can be organized according to kin structure, because all the tribal community functions can be embraced by the family head who will not only be progenitor, but economic leader, political

---

18 See Jeanne McIntyre, "The Structural-Functional Approach to Family Study" in Emerging Conceptual Framework in Family Analysis, (New York: Macmillan, 1966), edited by F. L. Nye and F. Berardo. She outlines that, as noted earlier, social systems are of different scope. If one takes the family as the basic unit of analysis, it is, by convention, a micro unit. However, the scope of societal complexity or social welfare is such, that the scope of function is much greater in comparison. Therefore by convention it is referred to as a macro-system.
leader, teacher and priest.

The nuclear family has a much more restricted function. Basically there is reproduction, and two derived functions, that of providing its members with an identity, and with a position or status in the society. These functions are both system serving, in the sense that they are macro-functional and individual serving, that is, micro-functional in scope.\textsuperscript{19}

Types of Family Related to Degree of Function

It is obvious, then, that different degrees of function pertain to different families. Also, historically family functions have changed over time. The family as a system varies in the degree of autonomy it has. At some times in history it has been more autonomous in the sense that it embraced more functions. It is useful to view the extended family in this way, particularly because it has historically embraced more of the functions. At the other end of the scale it has embraced few and as such disappeared as a system. Similarly the nuclear family varies in function over the lifetime of its life cycle. One can discuss extended "familism" as a variant of the single nuclear family, using a scale of functionality. Extended familism is organized largely according to kin structure. Indeed, some approach the status of social system. At the other end of the scale, nuclear familism stresses the relative absence of the functionality of the extended kin network. We shall see later that another concept, "Social Network," is more descriptive of nuclear familism, since it refers to

\textsuperscript{19}The family is macro in scope when its functional relationship to larger units is considered. But when the family is the focus then its functions are micro-functional in scope since now the family and its members are the focus. Thus it depends on the reference point used as to whether the family serves micro or macro functions.
The family, considered according to its function and structure, embraces many forms. However, if the nuclear family is chosen as the basic analytical unit, then, by adding other functions the extended pattern can be derived from it. Often the complete nuclear family does not exist. This is one source of considerable social welfare expenditure for direct assistance. Thus, this analysis of the family is relevant in this sense. More generally, structure of the family, internally and externally, has been outlined in terms of the kinship system. In addition the family, extended or nuclear, has many non-kin contacts that are supportive of it. Since non-kin and kin contacts both sustain the family, and are equally important to the social system, then, both of these will be related together later in the term social network.

Societal Complexity

Earlier in the discussion of tools of analysis, it was noted that structural functional analysis allows one to move freely from units of theory of small scope to larger ones. Societal complexity has been called structural differentiation and division of labour in this paper. It has been described as a process and a state:20

As a state, differentiation can be defined as the number of structurally distinct and functionally specialized units in a society. The principle units under consideration are those of roles and collectivities. A society is therefore internally differentiated to the extent that it has numerous specialized roles and collectivities that perform complementary functions in the society. Differentiation in this sense must be distinguished from segmentation, in which two or more

structurally distinct roles or collectivities perform essentially the same function. . . Populous agrarian societies may be highly segmented -- for example, hundreds or thousands of peasant households, or lineages, or village communities, all performing the same function -- but they are typically much less differentiated than are modern industrial societies.

For purposes of this study, the focus is on societal complexity as a state. The focus is on counting the number of roles and collectivities in society, and their related functions. At the same time structural differentiation as process cannot be ignored. At least one has to be aware that social structures are differentiating. However, the documentation of this process is beyond the scope of this study. The number of roles and collectivities seem to be important, since there is a relationship between them, and the type of family structure.

In the field of Comparative Sociology, cultures have been compared according to a number of variables. These comparisons are in many ways crude. Much of the work done in this field is with simple societies that have been studied by anthropologists. However it is now possible to rank societies according to the extent of structural differentiation in each.

21 People are probably vaguely aware of social structure and the process of structural differentiation. A family reunion will likely cause people to reminisce, particularly older generations will tell the younger generations about the "good-old-days-when-things-were-simpler, more relaxed." Anthropologists and sociologists do not believe people are very consciously aware of social structure. Rather for them it is a way of ordering and classifying social activity. Social structure as an unconscious model is analogous to the relationship between the everyday speech of a people and the syntactic rules that underlie this speech. It is the sociologist's job to make this conscious in his analysis.

Nuclear - Extended Family Type and Societal Complexity

Figure 1

Extent of Family Function Related to Level of Societal Differentiation

Research findings thus far indicate that there is a curvilinear relationship between familial complexity and societal complexity. In simple preliterate societies the nuclear family is much more characteristic of these cultures. As the hunting-gathering culture evolves into a more stationary way of life, usually based on agriculture, the extended family predominates. Again as commerce and trade develop the nuclear family reappears as the dominant organizational pattern. Thus the nuclear family predominates in simple societies and in complex industrial societies.

23Ibid., p. 74. See also Winch and Goodman, Selected Studies, pp. 78-87 for a similar development of this relationship.
Intra-Familial Role Patterns

Structural functional analysis is used to evaluate internal family positions. Of the three nuclear positions the husband-wife and parent-offspring relationships are of importance to this analysis. Three types of pattern of family behaviour were described by Elizabeth Bott: segregated, complementary and joint role patterns.

Segregated Role Patterns

The segregation of the role pattern refers to the fact that neither the husband-wife, nor the parent-offspring roles overlap very much. Rather both husband and wife have contacts with kin, and boyhood-girlhood friendship cliques. As a result they rely little on each other for emotional sustenance. Although the family lives in a residence separate from relatives the family kin system operates like an extended system. The mother of the wife, as well as neighbour women have daily contact, and offer help to each other in the care of the children, and with housekeeping duties. Similarly the father has his own friends that he socializes with, rather than spending his evenings home with the family. Husband and wife seldom share each other's work at home, or with the children. There is a clear separation between women's work and men's. The marriage appears superimposed on the

24 The writer is indebted to Elizabeth Bott's Family and Social Network (London: Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1957) for her discussion of intra-familial behaviour patterns and the development of the concept social network. Although her study is limited to only twenty families she has made an important contribution to an understanding of the inner workings of the family as they relate to the social contacts that surround it.

25 Ibid., pp. 78-85.
former kin and friendship clique contacts of the husband and wife.

Complementary Role Patterns

Complementary refers to the fact that the amount of sharing of family roles is greater than in the segregated pattern. That is, more tasks are shared in common. The tasks form a system where some parental tasks are shared jointly. These families have moved more and have less contact with old friends and kin. It seems to be an intermediate form of pattern between segregated and joint. It is, however, essentially segregated; there are a few roles shared jointly. Complementary patterns are a result of a lesser degree of segregation with a random selection of joint behaviours.

Joint Role Patterns

The joint pattern is distinguished because the husband-wife and parent-offspring role systems are highly integrated. Thus either parent can take the other's place in most tasks related to the children. Similarly husband and wife share equal task loads in their respective positions in the areas of: finances, contacting hospitals, schools, churches, or shopping. The chief role distinction is centered on the husband's occupation. Because of the extensive overlap of roles neither mate could clearly distinguish women's from men's work. In the joint pattern, equality of the sexes is stressed and the marriage and its sexual relationship was stressed as an example of the family's "togetherness". Kin and adolescent friendship cliques have little facial contact with the members of families living in the joint role pattern. The joint pattern represents the ideal type of nuclear family as discussed earlier.
Time and Intra-familial Role Patterns

The extent of jointness and segregation varies over time. Jointness tends to be highest during courtship, and early marriage, until the arrival of the first child. When the children are young the greatest segregation occurs. At adolescence husband and wife regain some, but not all, of their former joint role functions.

Intra-familial Role Pattern and Family Type

Because of the physical presence of kin in the segregated and complementary role patterns, and because of their functions in these patterns, these families represent extended types of family organization. The mother of the wife baby sits, counsels about household and child management tasks. On the husband's side of the family financial help is offered in time of trouble. Both kin, and friendship cliques offer help with finding work, repairing around the house, and provide the husband's main social activity. Husband and wife attend weddings, christenings and funerals together. Most of the remainder of their social activity is with their own kin and friends.

In contrast the joint role pattern constitutes the nuclear pattern of organization. The family often lives long distances from relatives so that they seldom have face-to-face contact. Neither are their long-standing friendship cliques available. The joint family tends to view their neighbours with suspicion. They tend to resent friendly approaches of neighbours as an intrusion into their private lives. It is seen also as a threat to their "togetherness" as a married couple. Thus, the joint pattern of family behaviour represents the nuclear family type. As described earlier, the functions of this family type are restricted usually to three: procreation, the nurture
of children, and the establishment of status for the children according to the father's occupational level.

**Social Network Connectedness**

The concept of social network is Bott's other unique contribution to the understanding of the family. Modern suburbia today is not a community because its membership is not a group. In the modern community people do not know each other well. In one type, referred to as loosely-knit network, only two persons at a time know each other: A knows B, A knows C, but C does not know B. In the other type, a tightly-knit network, all would know each other. Tightly-knit networks, it is assumed, demand considerable amounts of informal involvement from an individual. Individuals are placed in the position of expending almost their entire fund of sociability on this network. Since the funds of "sociability" are limited, then spouses consequently will not make extensive intimate or informal demands on each other. This tendency is reversed, if the family is in contact with a loosely-knit network.²⁷


²⁷ Nelson's research set out to test the concept of a fund of sociability and the idea that tightly-knit networks demand greater amounts of informal involvement than loosely-knit networks. The findings were not statistically significant, but tended to confirm the hypotheses. Ibid., pp. 669-670. Eugene Litwak and Ivan Szelenyi hypothesize that "Neighbours can best handle immediate emergencies, kin, long-term commitment; and friends heterogeneity," in "Primary Group Structures and Their Functions: Kin, Neighbours, and Friends," *American Sociological Review*, XXXIV:4 (Aug, 1969), 465-481. Thus the family's reliance on others seems to follow a pattern, if type of dependency need is considered. See also examples of this differential use of kin, neighbours and friends in: Marvin B. Sussman and Lee Buchinal, "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning," *Marriage and Family Living*, XXIV:4 (November
It was found that families with tight knit networks looked to the network for support. They showed considerable suspicion of agencies and institutions even in the immediate locale of the neighbourhood. They did not utilize banks, schools and social welfare services efficiently. In contrast the families with loose knit networks used these services to their benefit; they were aware of a wide variety of them, even beyond their immediate vicinity— a knowledge close knit families did not have. Presumably, because close knit families are family and friendship clique oriented, and do not have energy to examine other alternatives.

Conjugal Role System and Social Network Connectedness

Conjugal role system has been discussed as either segregated, complementary or integrated, that is, joint, role patterns. Since the complementary role pattern essentially emphasizes the separation of the husband-wife, father-mother positions it can be considered a segmented pattern. In contrast, the joint pattern emphasizes the integration of these role positions to the exclusion of friendship cliques and kin. Internal family behaviour can be ordered along a continuum of segregated conjugal-role relationship to joint conjugal-role relationship. This continuum was related to that of degree of social network connectedness.

When the families in Bott's sample were examined, segregated role patterns occurred with tight knit networks, and at the opposite


end of the continuum, joint patterns occurred with loose knit networks. Figure 2 illustrates this grouping. In addition two other types of family were defined, Type II with intermediate level of segregation, associated to an intermediate degree of social network connectedness, and Type III where the family was changing from segregated to joint role patterns. This latter type was associated with intermediate level, or better, network connectedness.

Figure 2

Level of Segregated-Joint Role Pattern Associated to Degree of Social Network Connectedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SC-Rr - Close knit SN</td>
<td>Intermediate SC-Rr - Inter-mediate SN</td>
<td>Transitional SC-Rr -- JC-Rr associated to intermediate or better connectedness</td>
<td>High JC-Rr - Loose knit SN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High degree connectedness of social network (close knit social network) Low degree connectedness of social network (loose knit social network)

Note: SC-Rr - Segregated Conjugal Role Relationship
      JC-Rr - Joint Conjugal Role Relationship

Family Type I - High Segregated Conjugal-Role Relationship and Close Knit Social Network

The couple make one main geographical move in their lifetime, that is, to set up their own household at the time of marriage separate from their parents. But relatives and neighbours remain in easy reach of the couple, so that the segregated role pattern dominates the marriage

\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 107.
from the beginning. After children are born, the wife will see less of former girl friends, and more of her mother and other female relatives. The husband will be slightly drawn into his wife's kinship circle, but most of his contacts and time is spent in his own social network. His life is centred on his work, his friends and kin; his wife's life is centred on her home, her children, and her relatives. A rigid segregation of role tasks is adhered to by husband and wife, hence this conjugal relation is segregated. In view of the nature of kin contacts, it is an extended family system.

Family Type IV - High Joint Conjugal-Role Relationship and Loose Knit Social Network

Networks become loose knit when couples move from one area to another, or they make new relationships outside their networks. External relationships are relatively discontinuous. Thus husband and wife rely on each other. They share equally in most of the parenting and household tasks. There is some role confusion because of the extent of integration in their role loads within the family. They confront the world with a united front. Most of their social contacts are made together. Recreation, visiting, and shopping are primarily joint activities.

Family Type II - Intermediate Segregated Conjugal Role Relationship and Intermediate Social Network

These families moved geographically about a third as much as Type IV families. However, they are still geographically close enough to their former social network for them both to use it. Thus tasks are segregated into activities that are female tasks and male tasks. This is a fairly stable system.
Family Type III - Transitional Segregated to Joint Conjugal Relationships with Intermediate or Better Network Connectedness

These transitional families illustrate some of the factors involved in changing from a close knit to a loose knit network or vice versa. The eventual outcome depends partly on the family and partly on the extent to which their new neighbours build up relationships with one another. It seems the intermediate type of connectedness is likely to result. A couple who move from a loose to a tighter network are, at first, defensive over the threat to their privacy, but, in time, an intermediate degree of network connectedness and conjugal segregation evolves. Those families that move into loose knit networks from tight ones experience severe marital problems, because they are not familiar with the intimacy of a more joint relationship, nor are they able to socialize together as a couple as others in their loose knit network would expect.

Typology of Welfare

The four basic types of welfare are income maintenance, deviance control, social utilities and planning and power mobilizing.\(^{30}\)

Income Maintenance is subdivided into demogrants, social insurance and financial assistance. Demogrants are payments given to specific groups with a means or needs test, for example to children and the aged. Social insurance is a form of enforced saving whereby the work force deposits money in a long term annuity, that the government

pays back to the wage earner at retirement. Financial assistance is not universal in its coverage as are the first two forms of income maintenance. Rather specific groups, usually not in the labour force, the blind, the physically disabled, and the mentally retarded, if they meet the criteria of need or means, are eligible, and if they fit one of the categories of assistance.

Deviance Control involves children's aid functions, delinquency control, parole probation and after care, rehabilitation training and family counselling. Children's aids are for the protection and care of children. They offer preventive help to families who cannot manage their families. Delinquency control refers to preventive work with groups; the use of police is necessary where informal constraints of family and neighbourhood fail. With this failure, the courts are involved with individual cases, the person may be jailed, or put on special assignment to a parole or probation officer to whom the offender is directly responsible. After care refers to half way houses, and other counselling services designed for the social deviant. Rehabilitative training attempts to help the person obtain legitimate skills that can help him join the mainstream of socio-economic life.

Social Utilities are represented by educational, health, child care services and citizens' advice bureaux. The first three are universally used by almost all members of society. At one time or another these functions were carried out by the family. Citizens' advice bureaux have developed in order to coordinate social and other services, and to inform the public of their availability.

Planning and Power Mobilizing refers to the need of all classes to affect the decisions of local, regional, provincial and national
levels of government. Neighbourhood, or citizens’ groups, and settlement houses cater to the lower classes. Social Planning Councils and United Funds cater more to the middle and lower upper classes. Community Development Action groups refer usually to local alliances of various vested interests to affect social policy at various levels of government.

The definitions outlined above specify what is to be analyzed in this study. The material in this chapter has set forth, generally, definitions of family types, kinship and neighbourhood relations, societal complexity and types of social welfare. The definitions still must be related one to another.
V. COMPILATION OF THEORETICAL MATERIAL

Figure 3 represents a summary of Bott’s four types of internal family organization, as they relate to societal complexity in simple and complex societies. By suggesting that the modern family is similar to the earlier nomadic hunting family, that is, it is nuclear with joint conjugal role patterns, one can extend the analysis to modern industrial society. On the vertical axis degree of extended familism is exchanged for the more general term, extent of familial function (complexity). As a result two curves can be drawn, one representing the curvilinear extended family relationship—the segregated conjugal role relationship; the other showing the nuclear curvilinear relationship—the joint conjugal role relationship. On the horizontal axis is societal complexity, or extent of structural differentiation. A second related variable, degree of social network connectedness, is placed parallel to societal complexity. The family types are ordered from intermediate to high societal complexity, because these refer to only the more complex societies of the modern world. Societal complexity and network connectedness have a curvilinear relationship, because degree of network connectedness is related to family type directly. Data on preliterate societies, of hunting type subsistence, have a low degree of connectedness. It increases to the intermediate level of

\[31\] Data on preliterate societies show that until some form of agriculture is the means of subsistence nuclear families predominate over
Figure 3
Extent of Familial Function, Conjugal Relationship, Family Kinship Type and Social Network Connectedness

- High Societal Complexity
  - SC-Rr* Curve - extended family
  - SC-Rr* nuclear family

- Low Societal Complexity
  - Intermediate Social network connectedness
  - Transitional SC-Rr -- JC-Rr
  - High JC-Rr

- Degree of Social network connectedness
  - High S.N.
  - Intermediate S.N.
  - Low S.N.

* "SC-Rr - Segregated Conjugal-Role Relationship"
* "JC-Rr - Joint Conjugal-Role Relationship"
* "S.N. - Social Network"
societal complexity, where the social network is close knit; the network loosens again at high societal complexity. This latter position in Figure 3 refers to modern urban industrial centres of industrialized countries. Rural and underdeveloped areas of such countries may have tighter networks, depending on the type of economic livelihood pursued by the people in these areas.

The evidence indicates that those regions of the country that are less urbanized demand less welfare services. New York City spends eight times more per capita on Aid to Families with Dependent Children than Mississippi. In Canada large amounts of government funds are spent on social welfare. The underdeveloped regions are more interested in public works. Regional disparities are a source of conflict in Canada. The federal government makes large grants to these regions--unilateral transfers. This is done through the tax system, and could be discussed under the heading fiscal transfers. Thus in general, level of societal complexity seems to be related directly to extended families unless there is an abundant and stable food supply. Societies that fish for their primary source of food often have extended forms of family life, but hunting and gathering have loose knit networks and nuclear families. See Marsh, Op. Cit., pp. 72-74. For further evidence of the mix of extended and nuclear patterns see Mirra Komarovsky, Blue Collar Marriage (New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1957), pp. 140-142, "Barriers to Marital Communication," pp. 148-177, and "Separate Social Life," pp. 320-326.


the demand for social welfare. However, this study seeks to relate the style of family life, segregated - integrated, as an important intervening variable.

Social Welfare has been discussed as a unilateral transfer. At least three types of transfer are peculiar to social welfare, occupation, fiscal and direct provision of services in kind and/or payment in cash. In terms of the analytical framework, transfer has been used in a much broader sense to mean, any structural change that results in further structural differentiation. That is, a structure and function

34 If migration and immigration patterns are examined, the evidence indicates that both internal migrants, and immigrants move to areas where the demand for social welfare policy is greater. Richard E. Dawson and James A. Robinson in a chapter "The Politics of Welfare" edited by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines, Politics in the American States (Toronto: Little Brown and Co., 1966), pp. 391-410, attempt to show that "the more urbanized the state, the more industrialized the state, and the larger the proportion of its population that is foreign born or the children of foreign born, the more extensive its welfare efforts." Urbanization and industrialization are weakly correlated to the amount of state per capita welfare. The federal government's contribution tends to equalize the differences between the states, but the highest correlations are for ethnicity, foreign born and per capita welfare payments. This data was for the United States. Canada has experienced two waves of immigration, first to the West 1901-1920, and then to Ontario 1947-1957. Many of the social welfare innovations, family allowances, old age pensions and medicare were first initiated in Winnipeg and Saskatchewan. See K. McNaught, A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J. S. Woodsworth (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), and Robin F. Badgley and Samuel Wolfe, Doctors Strike (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1967). Winch and Goodman, Selected Readings, pp. 84-87, emphasize that ethnicity and immigration can rapidly increase societal complexity. For a summary of Canadian population migration and immigration statistics see M. V. George, Internal Migration in Canada (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970), pp. 153-157, and Warren E. Kalbach, The Impact of Immigration on Canada's Population (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970), p. 27. Immigration and ethnicity undoubtedly have a complex relationship to the development of the family types outlined in the model. Since this study is interested in the general relationships of family type and demand for social welfare, immigration and ethnicity were beyond the scope of it, and are not included, although important.
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of some sub part of the social system is transferred to another part of the system.\textsuperscript{35} If this transfer results in the development of a new subsystem, then structural differentiation occurs. This theme dominates the analytical tool, since no real social change occurs without a change in some system.

In the case of this study it is suggested that the family's functions have dwindled over time. These functions have been transferred to the state. The result has been the growth of social welfare as a function of government. Social policy now rivals policies of economics, defense and public works in importance.\textsuperscript{36} Thus because the family can no longer embrace the functions it once did, these functions have been transferred to other parts of the social system. The family is, thus, placed in the position of receiving unilateral transfers from these other areas of the social system. This type of transfer situation explains social utilities, those functions needed by all if families are to survive in modern industrial societies. Income maintenance serves the family at points in its life cycle when it is most

\textsuperscript{35} Samuel Mencher, in \textit{Poor Law to Poverty Program} (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967), uses a similar model that focuses on status and contract in society from the Mercantile period to the twentieth century in England and America. The underlying theme is that society has changed from informal to formal organization patterns during this period. Wilensky and Lebeaux's book, \textit{Industrial Society and Social Welfare} is organized around Sir HenryMaine's idea of status and contract, too. Implied is an increase in societal complexity over simple societies. See Neil J. Smelser, \textit{Social Change in the Industrial Revolution} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), especially pp. 158-160, for more detail on transfers.

\textsuperscript{36} For example in the financial year ending March 31, 1966, the Canadian federal government spent $1,571,551 on Defense and Mutual Aid, $1,891,283 on Social Welfare, $598,535 on Transportation and Communication, and $445,512 on National Resources and Primary Industry. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, \textit{Federal Government Finance} (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965).
vulnerable: for example, social insurance in case of premature death, demogrants, to the young and the old, and financial assistance to special categories of problem; deviance control is used in cases of more severe personal and family troubles, planning and power mobilizing represents interest groups helping each other through institutionalized cooperation.
VI. INTERPRETATION OF THE MODEL

Table 1 represents the summary of the relationships between societal complexity, the family and types of social welfare.

Primary Assumptions

The primary assumption is that the family functions are dwindling because they are transferred to social institutional functions. The Welfare State has developed as a result of this transfer, in order that people may be sustained in their respective communities. For this reason demands for type of welfare can be put on the right hand side of Table 1. They are the result of the decrease in the family's function in modern industrial society.

The work of Smelser is an illustration of this process of transfer of function from family to social institution. He describes in detail how working class families in England 1790-1840 lost some control over their children. This occurred because they were no longer needed for as many hours of labour in Britain's weaving industry. This was the result of technological change. On Page 10 of this report Smelser was quoted about how his sociological model of structural differentiation provided the questions, that is, the focus for his study of history. Similarly it can be used to study the development of welfare legislation. The horizontal axis of Table 1 is societal complexity. This is taken from Smelser's definition: societal complexity.

Smelser, Social Change, see chap. VIII, pp. 158-180.
| Type of Property by Degrees of Mobility | Social Competence | Number of geographically mobile heterosexual couples | Family as unit of labour | Social Skills | Class | Education | Occupation | Perceived Source of Security | Private Insurance | Income Maintenance | Deviance Control | Social Utilities | Planning and Power Mobilization | Demand for Type of Welfare |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Land - Farmer or other smallholders | High              | 
| Types                                  |                   |                                                   |                         |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| of Joints                              |                   |                                                   |                         |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Single                                 | Low               | 
| Married                                | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
| Married with dependent children        | Low               | Households, households with dependent children  | Low and lower middle   |              |      |         |           |                             |                |                      |                |                |                |                          |                           |                           |
complexity which means the degree of structural differentiation that exists in a society.\(^\text{38}\)

**Independent Variable**

Societal complexity is the independent variable. As it varies the overall values of the vertical columns in Table 1 vary directly, or inversely, to it.

**Dependent Variable**

The vertical axis, the dependent variable, is taken from Figure 1 and Figure 3. It is degree of familial complexity expressed according to Bott's four types of intrafamilial organization. That is, familial complexity is expressed as a joint-segregated pattern of organization: III and IV are joint, I and II are segregated. Since simple societies are not welfare states they are ignored; Table 1 level of societal complexity is at the intermediate or higher level. Thus quadrant one in the left bottom corner of the table refers to at least intermediate societal complexity, which is related to agricultural economies, where the segregated family patterns of an extended nature predominate. Thus Table 1 begins in the middle of Figure 3. The "y" axis has been moved along "x" to the right, up to the "intermediate or higher level of societal complexity. From Figure 3 it is clear that Segregated Conjugal relationships (the SC-Rr Curve of Figure 3), associated with extended families is on the decline. Also the Joint Conjugal Relationship (the JC-Rr curve of Figure 3), associated to nuclear families, increases with intermediate to high societal complexity.

---

\(^{38}\)Marsh, Op. Cit. See his appendix for a detailed ranking of various simple and complex societies according to the variable societal complexity.
These general relationships were presented in summary form in Figure 3. They represent the work of anthropologists with simple societies, and their extensions, through argument by analogy, to industrial society. They are now included in Table 1 as the dependent variable, and related to the four types of intrafamilial behaviour patterns. Thus Type I is an extended family with segregated conjugal relationships; Type II is an extended family, and operates internally like an extended one, but to a lesser degree; Type III is in transition from segregated conjugal to joint conjugal patterns; Type IV is a fully joint family pattern, completely nuclear, in the sense that, no relative from the family of origin would be present in it. This would not be the case for Type I or II where relatives visit weekly, and often daily.

The degree of familial complexity means the extensiveness of family function. Extended families in simple societies can embrace, in some cases, all the functions of the tribal community. However, as societal complexity has increased, the functional complexity of the family has dwindled along with the scope of its social jurisdiction. Societal complexity and degree of familial complexity, therefore, have an inverse relationship. Type I family has the highest level of complexity and function, at the lowest level of societal complexity. That is, an intermediate level; one that is intermediate between very simple societies and complex ones like Canada's today; type II, less than I, type III less than II, and type IV less than III. In Table 1 familial complexity is expressed in terms of Joint-Segregated patterns of family interaction as outlined previously. Figure 3 has these four
types of family pattern related to degree of social network connectedness on the horizontal axis. And in addition, these family types can be expressed as extent of family complexity, in terms of the scope of family function—the roles it plays in society. That is, complexity refers to the family structure (pattern) of organization, and function to the "consequences" of that "pattern" or structure. Each family type, then, because of its internal structure and related social network, determines each vertical column differently giving Table 1.

Intervening Variables

Type of family subsistence\textsuperscript{39} pattern in simple societies was correlated to family pattern extended to nuclear. By analogous argument societal complexity has been related to family type along the extended-nuclear pattern of family function. Researchers studied four subfactors that influenced family type in preliterate (simple) societies. These four factors were: abundance and stability of food supply, extent of demand for the family as a unit of labour, the amount of geographic mobility involved in subsistence, and the amount and type of property. By analogy one can extend this to more complex societies. For Canada, generally, one can assume an abundant and stable food supply. However, the opportunities to obtain a given standard of living are differentially distributed (i.e. class) in the population. In Table 1 the other three intervening variables are: the family utilized as a unit of labour, social network connectedness, geographical mobility, and type of property.

The family utilized as a unit of labour is a reciprocal of the

number of industries that can use extended types of families as a labour unit. Examples of this are best illustrated in construction, services (restaurants), and in retail outlets. The key variable seems to be the size of the business. Beyond certain limits the family business becomes corporate business with a management structure that is not based on family tenure. ⁴⁰

Social network connectedness and geographical mobility have a complex relationship to each other. Network connectedness is a measure of the "groupness" existent in the family's exterior social contacts with kin and non-kin. It is directly dependent on the number of geographical moves made in the lifetime of the spouses of the family. The distance that these families travel from their families of origin is also most important in determining the cohesiveness of the social network around the family. These various patterns have been described at length and constitute Bott's unique contribution to this model.

Mobility, however, as many writers first thought it to be, is not the independent variable of these four subfactors that influence subsistence. Rather it is the type of property owned; not the amount, but the type of property that is the independent variable of the four. In preliterate societies (simple societies) it was some form of subsistence activity connected with land, that was most closely linked to the extended family pattern.

However, in complex industrial society there are many other types


⁴¹ I am particularly indebted to Marsh for making this specific distinction; Marsh, Op. Cit., p. 77.
of property associated with business enterprise, that might provide the demand for the extended family as a unit of labour. It should be noted that not only does industry support this, but certain practices of trade unions as well. For example, craft unions have had hiring halls, that screened out all but relatives of the membership for new jobs. Later developing industrial unions use the principle of seniority to protect their membership from intruders.

A major point that this theoretical model makes is that internal family behaviour, linked to social network and type of property have more impact on the family members than their class position. It is the opinion of this writer that an explanation of how the family membership "makes it" in adulthood depends more on these intervening variables than class level. Because most data are collected along class lines, or according to age, sex, or some other general category, then it cannot be used, for this model's purposes, until the four types of family conjugal patterns are associated to these more general categories. The tendency thus far has been to see society somewhat like a cake that can be sliced into layers of socio-economic class. However, according to this model, the linkages up or down through the layers are determined more by the social network surrounding the family, and the intergenerational changes in the intrafamilial behaviour patterns of the family. The way children of these segregated-joint family types survive can be illustrated by an example or two of each type. There seem to be significant differences.

Case Illustrations Taken From Agency Files

In Type I two families will be discussed, both of whom have extended families and segregated conjugal relationships. Family H lives
on a farm; the original home was built in the 1840's. Additions and renovations have been made to accommodate this family over the years. At present there are three generations living in the one residence. However, because of the amount of time spent by the men in the fields, and their pattern of socializing, the marriages in these families are segregated. The men travel off to town to go drinking with neighbours. Perhaps the wives accompany the men, but they do the shopping, and then, impatiently wait for their men to come out of the hotel. They seldom drink together; also there is little joint socializing at home. Rather the wives help each other with baby sitting, or socialize with each other at the local women's organization, or go to church on Sunday. The children of the youngest generation have less education than either their fathers or their grandfathers. They tend to stick at home and the boys reluctantly leave for labouring jobs in the city upon marriage. If the farm would support their offspring, it seems they would stay on the farm. The exception is the oldest daughter, who is a nurse, and moved to California where she married.

Family M is segregated, but the parents of this couple do not live in their $150,000 home. Mr. M. is Italian and owns several cabinet making firms worth approximately one million. Social life for Mr. M. consists of contacts made through his work, and a few friends from the Italian community. He is a self-made man, who because of his lifestyle, no longer fits easily into his old Italian neighbourhood. He talks warmly of his days when he was 18 and ran a "blind pig", or when he tells about stopping by on his weekly visit to his mother—he usually leaves her money to make sure she is cared for. Mrs. M. visits only her relatives. Mr. and Mrs. M. are seldom seen out together,
except for an occasional social event connected with business. Here it is a matter of necessity that out-of-town visitors be entertained. Mr. M.'s extensive travels on business keep him away from home several weeks a year. Mr. M. wants his children to get more education than he has; they are presently too young to predict what they may do.

In Type II the C family were urban dwellers; Mr. C. worked in a local factory; Mrs. C. was a wife and mother. Husband and wife are French-Canadian with close family ties. Mrs. C. moved to the city upon her marriage from a country village on the fringe of the city. Still she has maintained close contact with her relatives. Mr. C. had his friends, and Mrs. C. her relatives and a few friends. Their seven children have achieved high school at this point. Mrs. C. left her husband because of continual beatings. She has since met another man similar in background, but who has more education and makes $15,000 a year. They plan marriage. However, since Mrs. C.'s separation, she has relied on categorical welfare assistance because her relatives had insufficient funds to support her during this period of 5 years. Upon remarriage Mrs. C. and her boyfriend expect to move to another city in order for him to obtain a better job. They have some joint patterns of social life, but this is typical of the courting period. However, if this family moves, likely a joint conjugal arrangement will evolve. In fact contacts with a local social agency have helped to effect this evolution.

Type III family can be illustrated by family D. Mr. and Mrs. D. grew up in adjacent townships in a farming community. Mrs. D. joined her husband in an extended farm family. Mr. D.'s parents helped him buy an adjacent farm. In return Mr. D. worked with his father until
he retired. At that time, because of their close relationship, Mr. D. received his father's farm for a nominal sum. Mr. D.'s brother and sister ostracized him. Similarly Mrs. D. was alienated from her family ties. Thus when the oldest of four children was seven years, Mr. and Mrs. D. were forced into more of a joint relationship, because of the family conflicts on both sides of the family. At the same time boyhood friends and neighbours of Mr. D. had moved away. Mrs. D. made some efforts to make social contacts with local women's groups. The new neighbours were strangers, many from foreign countries. Mrs. D. did not, therefore, establish many relationships outside the family. Thus, because of changes both in kin and non-kin contacts in the social network, the D family changed from a highly connected to a low connected one, without a geographical move. Children in this family as compared to family H have all moved away from the parents. They have taken on non-manual positions of nurses and teachers. The emphasis was on moving outwards to make contact with the community. Family H seems oriented to itself, and its own interfamilial relationships, and highly connected social network. As a result they have not left it.

Family S is a type IV family. They are a young couple with no children; both are professionals—psychology and social work. Their family of origin is essentially a joint system as is theirs. They have made many geographical moves. Mrs. S. comes from a well-to-do Polish family, and lived in several different countries, South America, Canada and the U.S.A., as a child. Mr. S. lived in the same city as his parents, until he pursued graduate studies in a university 300 miles distant from relatives. He is contemplating another move to within 100 miles of his family, but neither he nor his wife want to
live close to relatives. Theirs is a totally joint conjugal relationship. Both are just beginning careers. Both feel very ambivalent about having a family, although they think they will have a child or two. Their social network consists of friends from college and work contacts. It is a loose knit social network.

These families, H, M, C, D and S are illustrative of the kind of career patterns related to conjugal relationship and social network connectedness. It seems that where one starts his career in terms of class level is important, however at least equally important is the conjugal relationship of the family of origin, and the surrounding social network. It is the network of social relationships, that is either supportive or a hindrance to the social mobility of the membership of these families. Those in the lower classes seem to be much more likely to lose their independence when some crisis befalls them. Once one has moved into a loose knit social network, demands for social services and insurance against the normal pitfalls of illness, disability and accident are needed. Those families with little property are very vulnerable. Thus family H and M have more resources and also a willingness to help one another. Family D illustrates that kinship ties are not always as strong as they are sometimes thought to be. Family C had to resort to government categorical assistance. Family S likely has enough personal insurance, or can rely on relatives who are fairly well-to-do in times of financial crisis. The number of joint conjugal families like the S family with loose social networks has likely increased. The C family seems to be the most vulnerable, perhaps the S family the least. These examples illustrate the differential demands of the four types of families for supportive
services, and at times direct financial assistance. Government at all levels in the fifties and sixties has been extending more and more funds for the various types of social welfare described.\textsuperscript{42}

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This report represents explorative research. It was beyond the scope of this research report to collect data from primary sources. There is much data that already exists on the extent of welfare services. However little is known about how people come to use such services. The model addresses itself to this question, and to the question of who uses them according to a typology of family interaction. Data available are not ordered according to the typology used in this study. In fact the typology cuts across age, class, sex and labour force data. Thus research on this model should focus on the question, what is the distribution of these family types in the population; and how do these relate to the opportunities and life chances of these families. An inter-generational study should be made. The data could best be collected through surveys using the interview as the primary data collecting technique.

Such topics as the following could be considered: To determine the distribution of family types I, II, III and IV in the population, and their respective use of type of social welfare; since type of property, occupation and geographical mobility are closely related to network connectedness, then, relate these to the distribution of family type; certain categories of job, for example the service industry, offer more opportunity for demand of the family as a unit of labour. Relate job opportunities according to their potential to demand the family as a unit of labour. The work of Smelser suggests that social
change does not cause social unrest, unless family role functions and/or positions are threatened; analyse several political-economic crises in Canada since Confederation. The above projects deal more with the impact of the dependent variable, family type, and its relationship to the demand for welfare. However, the model suggests societal complexity has considerable impact. Cross-cultural studies between undeveloped regions should give a good indication of societal complexity's importance in the determination of the demand for social welfare; for example, compare the Maritimes, Quebec, the Prairies, British Columbia or Ontario at various points of time. Obtain a measure of societal complexity for the region, for the time period, and determine the level of use of social welfare. This might explain much of the federal-provincial rivalry over the collection of tax revenues and their use.

The general relationships between societal complexity, family type, and demand for welfare must be tested to verify the model. The intervening variables, type of property, social network connectedness, the family utilized as a unit of labour, class, education, occupation, perceived source of security and private insurance affect these general relationships. They introduce considerable complexity, but general implications for social work practice can be discussed if the purpose of this enquiry is first made clear.
VIII. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MODEL FOR SOCIA L WORK PRACTICE

The Purpose of Social Work and Social Science

The preceding chapter "Recommendations for Research" deals with the testing of theory for the purpose of developing theory. The purpose of social work is social control, not theory formation. Thus the previous chapter deals with the model in its most general terms. The social work practitioner uses these relationships in order to develop practice theory. The social scientist develops general models. Social workers use them for the purpose of social change. Social work is concerned with action, as such, then, it is closely related to the value system. Social science theory in general, and the model of this study in particular, maintain more value neutrality. It was for this reason that the model in Table 1 does not deal with the question of society's responsibility for social welfare.

In like manner the practice theory of social work is distinguished from social science by its different approach to values. Practice theory, like any theory, is any system of relatively abstract propositions, but it is value laden, since it deals with action for

---


44 Social responsibility is of considerable importance in the determination of Social Welfare policy. However in view of the emphasis on structure and function in the model, social values were beyond the scope of this study. The problem of the study was to determine how demand for different types of welfare occurs, not what "should" occur.
the purpose of social control. In contrast scientific knowledge is designed to understand the world. As such it tends to be value free.

Social Work Research

Table 1 provides the general relationships that form the basis of social work practice theory. Social work research has the task of taking the model in its general terms, or its statements of relationships, and connecting them to principles of practice. In this way the general model becomes useful to social workers. The conversion of the social science theory of Table 1 into practice theory should be an empirical one, not a mental one.\(^5\)

The model lends itself primarily to basic research, that is, practice theory particularly with families. The goal in practice theory is to develop a typology of treatment and diagnosis. To a lesser extent the model provides a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of social agencies: how well do they relate their service-delivery systems to the distribution of the four types of families outlined in this study. Research on community need can be organized according to the types of welfare services available, in terms of the demand for them, as represented by the distribution of family types in the community.

Case Work - Group Work Practice Theory

The model provides a practice theory based on social systems analysis, a form of "social diagnosis." Diagnostic categories are expressed in terms of internal conjugal patterns, and external social

network connectedness. The practice theory is essentially interac­tional, one system with another, one role position to another. Person, family, neighbourhood and community are related in a systematic way, so that there are theoretical connections between these four levels of analysis.

Social diagnosis is expressed in terms of people in role posi­tions, either within their family or their social network. As such they are not described only by impersonal categories such as sex, age, class, and occupation. Rather the person is seen as belonging to a type of conjugal role system. The person is more the centre of atten­tion since diagnosis consists of establishing which family type he be­longs to, and then how well he is carrying out his respective roles. Since the family is defined in terms of extent of function, inter­generational analysis of kinship contacts is possible. The emphasis is on normal interaction patterns. Once the person is categorized as to type of family, then expectations of role behaviour, parent, husband-wife, and parent-offspring can be analyzed. The focus is per­son in context, familial and social network.

Systems analysis allows the relating of different levels of con­cern, person, family, neighbourhood. This is done through specifying positions in the nuclear family, as these relate to social network—the community. This way one has specific data to use as an indicator of level of family function in terms of its structure. That is, the

---

worker does not miss an area of function because the basic roles are set out. If others, such as a grandmother, live in the home, the theory by definition recognizes an extended pattern of family organization. In this case a tight knit social network is more probable. If this family fails to use community services well, it may be more a result of the social network connectedness than a symptom of some weakness or personal pathology.

The interactional frame provides an alternative explanation to disease. Thus members of the above extended family pattern are not being "resistant" or exhibiting some defense mechanism, when they refuse to seek help from a social agency.

The family provides a pivotal point in case work, group work practice theory, because the model suggests specified interconnections between the person's behaviour in the family and his relationship to the neighbourhood. These allow the worker to move from the person to the family to the community in a systematic way. This is done according to the knowledge the worker has of the structures of each and their related function. This could provide a potential "diagnosis" of how the person will function in the case work or group work relationships.

Community Organization and Development

A survey of the level of social network connectedness of a target population should enhance the worker's prospects of making changes in that population. Contractual associations would be resisted by Type I and II families, not so Type III and IV. Thus a more informal mode of intervention is necessary for Type I and II families. Also, since joint social activity is frowned upon by couples in these family types,
a community meeting for husband and wife to attend together is likely to fail. Type IV families, in contrast, would likely want a joint meeting. Attention to these indicators of family type could pay off in improved community organization and development.

Societal Complexity is important to consider in relation to regions, at least on the provincial and national levels. The lower the complexity the more likely Type I and II families are to predominate.

Welfare Planning and Administration

The higher the level of societal complexity the more formal the organization of welfare services will need to be. Social utilities, and power mobilizing and planning become more important. Over time Canada has become more complex; similarly income maintenance, deviancy control, social utilities and planning and power mobilizing have developed in that order over time. Associated to this has been the development of Type III and IV as a more significant proportion of the population. An examination of the distribution of the family types should indicate what welfare services will be in most demand. If the welfare planner could predict the growth trends of the family types, then predictions might be made about the demand for different types of welfare.

In administration, social welfare delivery systems need to be designed to make contact with the social networks of the family types. Tight knit networks do not function well with formal delivery.

\[147\] See Mencher, Op. Cit., pp. 57-78, for the development of the notion of contractual relations in social policy as early as the 1834 Poor Law Reform Act in Britain. This act was "the beginning of the end" for informal relations set out in the Elizabethan poor laws of 1601.
systems. Also they may not need certain agencies as much as others in the community. For example the Italian community has become identified as a cliquish group of people with tight knit networks, who look after their own. They also work in the construction trades, and the services industries where extended family patterns are more functional. These industries tend to demand the family as the unit of labour. As a result an employment agency may not serve as many Italians as it does the native born. Analysis of this order has the potential of improving the delivery of social welfare services.
 IX. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to answer general questions about the Development of Welfare, and to relate societal complexity to Family Organization, and demand for welfare. Table 1 represents a summary of the findings; that is, the above relationships are presented in the form of a chart. Table 1 constitutes the summary of a model, that interprets how demand for different types of welfare occurs. The model has implications for social work practice. Indeed it has the potential of being a general practice theory, that is testable, and that could embrace the major social work methods.

The model focuses on the family as the central variable. The family is related to the social system through its contacts in the social network surrounding it. Internally the family is specified as three positions, husband-father, wife-mother, and offspring-sibling—the nuclear family. If the function of the family is increased sufficiently, then, the family could add other kin members to form an extended pattern. The model links tight knit social networks with the latter, and looseknit with the former. This defines the exterior relationships to kin, friends and neighbourhood. Internally the family conjugal relationships are described on a continuum from joint to segregated patterns of task behaviour in terms of spouse and parenting roles. A family typology is developed on the basis of degree of conjugal integration and extent of social network connectedness.

In this way, then, the family is central to the model, because it
is an institution intermediate in scope between person and community. Through the use of systems theory, the family, as defined by this analytical tool is related to larger institutions—school, church, and government. The structure of the family alters according to the exterior social network around it.

Societal complexity refers to the degree of structural differentiation in a society. Often this has been referred to as the division of labour; that is, all the functions of the society, not just those of the market place. It is likely, in terms of what is known from studies like Smelser's, that technological change is an important determinant of levels of societal complexity. How societal complexity developed is not of central importance to this study, but it appears that societal complexity has increased over time.

What is important about societal complexity for this study? It is the fact that extent of social network and type of family organization are directly related. From intermediate to high levels of societal complexity, social network connectedness decreases. This is associated with nuclear families. Nuclear families are more vulnerable to natural disasters, death, accident, and disability, than extended ones. Also nuclear families, except for simple hunting economies, tend to predominate in complex societies. It is unlikely that the rapid growth of social welfare in such societies is an accident. It seems more plausible to suggest that nuclear families in loose knit social networks, confronted with a complex society, demand a greater diversity and amount of social welfare services. In fact, many of these become institutionalized as an integral part of social life.

Thus there is a differential use of welfare services, according
to type of family, defined in terms of degree of family function. That is, the four types of family, defined in terms of internal family behaviour, related to exterior network connectedness, demand different types of social welfare. This demand is affected by a complex set of factors besides family type and societal complexity. Some of these factors are noted across the top of Table 1. They are: social network connectedness, the type of property, number of geographical moves of the spouses, social skill, class, education, occupation, the family utilized as a unit of labour, and perceived source of security. It is known that social utilities and planning and power mobilizing are more recent developments in social welfare. Income maintenance dates back to England in 1601. Time is another important variable since families are more vulnerable in the child-bearing-rearing period, and in old age.

Thus the model indicates how social welfare demands might have been altered over time as different family structures, extended to nuclear, have come to predominate. It should not be implied that extended type relationships are about to disappear; the evidence is to the contrary; there will likely always be occupations that demand the family as a unit of labour.

The model has implications for social work practice. A profession utilizes such general theory, as developed in this study, for its own purposes. The model is neutral in terms of value; it only provides an analysis of the relationships between the variables. Social Work develops practice theory for the purpose of social control. Because social work is involved with people in the context of society, values expressed as principles of action are introduced. Practice
theory, like any theory, is a set of interrelated hypotheses, but with the addition of value.

Briefly the implications for practice theory are that first relationships are established between various levels of practice, person, family and social institution in such a way that the social worker can move from one to the other according to the theory of the relationships—in short, the worker has a practice theory that is general enough to embrace most of his methods, yet applicable to specifics. Secondly, there are ranges of normative behaviour established for the four types of family, inside, in terms of conjugal role, and outside in terms of social network contacts. The degree of function determines the structure of the family, nuclear to extended. Third, since the normative is emphasized, then, the focus is on health, not disease. Health is defined in terms of interactions between the various role positions in the family and outside it in the community. That is, treatment occurs through exchanges or transfers. The thoroughly dependent receive largely unilateral transfers. As the social worker uses the context of interaction, the client takes on more of his role load, so that at termination, the client has developed an ability to engage in bilateral exchanges. Finally, since the positions and role-loads of these positions can be defined, it seems possible to test hypotheses related to the practice theory in regards to conjugal role and social network. These five attributes of the theory apply generally to the methods of social work: case work, group work, community organization and development, welfare planning and administration and teaching.

In case work or group work the social worker should focus on the
client's social network connectedness and its related family system. This will help the professional diagnose the client in terms of the kinds of social contacts he makes and the types of conjugal roles he has experienced. Such an analysis seems vital to family counselling in particular. Is the family intact as a nuclear unit, or is it some combination of nuclear and extended pattern, are the parenting roles distinguished from the spouse roles, do offspring take on inappropriate roles—perhaps associate parent status. Diagnosis can be carried out through the answering of these questions. In the treatment phase, the aspirations of the client may be blocked by his adherence to modes of behaviour inappropriate for the means of achieving it, that is through the channels of intra and extra familial relationship. The case worker helps clarify feeling around the alternative roles available, given the family-social network system of the client. Similarly the group worker encourages this insightful analysis.

Community organization must look to its community in order to determine the distribution of close knit and loose knit networks. The latter favour an informal approach to intervention, the former a more formal method. The latter group will allow wives to have more influence. In the close knit system women play restricted community roles. Type I and II families tend to be cliquish. They would not readily join a community project.

In Welfare Planning and Administration, the previous point about formal-informal organization is important for service delivery. The type of social welfare demanded varies with the family type: Type III and IV will use more social utilities. They will be more community-minded and less dependent on income maintenance and deviancy control.
The opposite holds generally for Type I and II.

Teaching in Social Work has been struggling to move from descriptive to analytical frameworks in the area of social welfare policy; the model suggests an analytical structure. Societal complexity provides an index on which to compare welfare systems between regions and countries. The general model provides many insights as to the nature of social welfare.

This research project was exploratory research. The general question of how social welfare develops, and of its relation to the family in the context of complex industrial societies, has been explored through library research. The general model has been developed, but none of the relationships in it have been tested. Empirical testing is required to verify the model and its usefulness in Social Work Practice.
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Upon graduation Mr. Disher worked in a Psychiatric Social Work position at Chatham Public General Hospital 1964-1965. At this time further courses in Anthropology and Sociology were taken at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, and the University of Windsor. Then full-time studies in Economics were begun in September 1965; some graduate work at the M.A. level was completed.

In May 1967 Mr. Disher joined the Department of Social and Family Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Branch, Windsor, and remained with this employer till September 1969. Further courses were taken in Social Work at Wayne State University and in Economics at the University of Windsor 1967-1968. In September 1969 educational leave of absence was taken, in order to begin studies for the MSW degree in Social Work at the University of Windsor. The expected date of graduation is May 1971.