

Model-Building in Family Sociological Textbooks: in Socialist and Post-Socialist Hungary

Zsombor Rajkai

An analysis of family models in two family sociological textbooks forms the subject-matter of the present study. The reason for the choice of this subject lies in the fact that current debates on family issues seem to lack a certain general conceptual compass that could serve as a base for a common interpretation and understanding on family. The general concern about family issues are reflected in both the media, political life, academic world and the everyday life of common people. The lack for a general orientational compass, accompanied by a severe confusion of values concerning family issues, can be studied in each of these fields. The reason for why I choose family sociological textbooks as the subject of analysis in the present paper derives from the fact that I have been studying family sociology in the past several years, and consequently my major interest lies in the question of how the lack of a general conceptual compass is reflected in family sociological studies. It goes without saying that textbooks are not the only possible subjects for such an analysis. Short studies published in leading family sociological journals or edited books can also be used for analysis. Textbooks as “master narratives” or privileged forms of discourse (Haraway, 1991), however, provide a more complex discussion of the family than monographs and articles do, while textbooks as school materials also address a (much) broader audience. In the present paper, I select two family sociological textbooks published in post-war Hungary, a country which has experienced an enormous confusion of values during the socialist (1949-89) and post-socialist times (1989-), and which fact consequently left its mark on textbook-writing in the Hungarian family sociology.

1. Model-building and competitive conceptual sources

Before discussing the Hungarian family sociology, it must be made clear what is regarded as a model, and what is meant by competitive conceptual sources in the present paper. The concept of a model generally pertains to the description of a phenomenon existing in reality (or sometimes to a certain ideal model), by choosing more or less arbitrary characteristic features. Though models are never perfect reflections of reality, they can help one get a better understanding about certain aspects of the subject of the model. It goes without saying that models in family sociology refer to that of the family. In family sociology, those (arbitrary) features generally pertain to such aspects as the structure and size of the family, the relations among family members (including gender issues), the relations between the family as a group and the outer world, functions of the family etc. In (introductory) family sociological textbooks, all of these aspects are (usually) discussed, which discussion(s) form the base of model-building in the respective textbooks. It depends on the author's skill, knowledge and understanding of the family what sort of model is being represented in the text after all. Nonetheless, what might be the most significant building stone in model-building is the paradigm in a Kuhnian sense on which the model is standing.

At present times, the major debate in family sociology refers to a possible paradigm shift from the (American-born) Parsonian structural-functionalist paradigm of the modern family to a potential post-modern one. Whether such a shift is possible became a major issue in both the American and Japanese family sociology in the 1990s. In the late 1990s, S. A. Mann, M. D. Grimes, A. A. Kemp and P. J. Jenkins decided to investigate in a common article the question of whether a post-modern paradigm in the American family sociological textbooks had become dominant, driving the previously prevailing Parsonian paradigm out of the textbook world in the American family sociology. Their article in fact is a reflection of two opposite standpoints in the early 1990s concerning this potential paradigm-shift issue. One standpoint refers to that of David Cheal, who believes that "the field of family theory is now a tremendously diverse terrain ... (and) Parsons no longer dominates the field intellectually" (Cheal, 1991, p. 153). The other one pertains to that of Dorothy Smith, Kyoto Journal of Sociology XV / December 2007

who calls the Standard North American Family (SNAF) an ideological code, which she describes as “a constant generator of *procedures for selecting syntax, categories, and vocabulary in the writing of texts and the production of talk and for interpreting sentences*, written or spoken, order by it” (Smith, 1993, p. 52). D. Smith reckons that Parsons’ interpretation of the modern family is still dominant in American text(books) due to the existence of the SNAF as an ideological code. S. A. Mann et al. investigated seven multiple-edition family sociological textbooks published since the 1970s up to the 1990s, covering a range of three decades. Their method was based on a sort of topic-analysis by which they investigated six different topics: the presentation of theory, social class, race and ethnicity, gender, family violence, and sexual orientation. As a result, in responding to the (so-called) Deal-Smith debate, they argue that “Actual shifts in their underlying theoretical assumptions were rare, especially for the topics of social class, family violence, and sexual orientation. For these reasons, the burden of evidence in this study favors Smith’s view that structural functionalism still governs major assumptions and debates in family sociology” (Mann et al., 1997, p. 340). Nonetheless, S. A. Mann et al. also argue that authors’ treatments of African American families and gender are “notable exceptions”.⁽¹⁾

A similar debate could be seen in the Japanese family sociology from the late 1980s too, concerning the question of what is the basic unit of society: family or the individual. The former one refers to the standpoint in the Japanese family sociology that had been prevailing until the late 1980s, while the latter one pertains to a rather post-modern interpretation of the relationship of the individual, family and society. Nonetheless, theoretical wars about the family were not limited to the 1990s. Japanese family sociology, which could enjoy a desirable freedom of research after World War Two (unlike [former] socialist countries), has produced an enormous amount of theoretical debates on family issues in Japanese context during the past six decades. Two periods can be distinguished over these years. The first one refers to the democratization issue of the former *ie* family system under American pressure during

⁽¹⁾ It must also be mentioned that in 2003 in a conference paper (unpublished manuscript), S. A. Mann and J. Dickinson claimed that American family sociological textbooks appeared to be slow to take a post-modern turn. They pointed to the fact that the texts that were criticized most harshly by the American Council of Families’ report gave more descriptions about the post-modern social conditions than other texts.

the occupational era (1945-52). The debates on the (modern) nuclear family for about two decades of post-war times were embodied in two major debates: the Aruga-Kitano debate ⁽²⁾, and the Morioka-Yamamuro debate. The main question at those times was whether a (Western [American] modern) nuclear family could serve as a model in post-war Japan. These debates actually ended in a more or less general agreement in accepting the Parsonian modern nuclear family model with a strong gender-based family role division in the 1970s, which proved to be a strong paradigm in Japanese family sociology up to the late 1980s. However, the so-called pluralization of the family starting in the 1980s called the attention of more and more family researchers to the problematic issue of the prevailing paradigm at that time. Among others, Emiko Ochiai called the paradigm of “the basic unit of society is family” into question as early as 1989, and put stress on the necessity of a rather interpretative approach instead of the then prevailing group-theory approach. E. Ochiai chose three textbooks ⁽³⁾ for analysis and extracted eight major background assumptions as remarkable characteristic features of the group-theory approach, and then discussed the problematic issue of each assumption. She found that the then prevailing paradigm could not keep up the pace with the changing family issue. The theoretical war continued in the 1990s with the result that by present times most of the family researchers in Japan have accepted the standpoint saying that “the basic unit of society is the individual”. Researchers of family pathology such as Takashi Mochizuki (2002), however, keep arguing against such a shift saying that the problematic issue of the changing family at present times can be explained well by making use of the former paradigm, therefore there is no need for a paradigmatic shift in family research.

From the theoretical debates in the American family sociology discussed above, one can extract two competing conceptual sources. One refers to the (American) modern family, while the other one to a potential post-modern one. The former one puts a heavy stress on a fixed (ideological) family form, that is, the gender-based

⁽²⁾ See Aoyama Michio's article on the Aruga-Kitano debate on the nuclear family for details (1976).

⁽³⁾ *The Family: a dynamic interpretation* of Waller and Hill (1951), *A Modern Introduction to the Family* of Bell and Vogel (1960), and *New Family Sociology* of Morioka and Mochizuki (1983).

modern nuclear family form, while the other one gives an obvious preference to individual freedom. These two conceptual sources are competing with each other in how to interpret family issues.

In the case of the family sociology in Japan, the matter of competing conceptual sources is a little more complicated than in America. Though in the major debates in the 1990s also refer to these two conceptual sources in interpreting family issues, Japan as a non-Western capitalist country needed to adapt the Western nuclear family model to its traditional cultural context right after World War Two, which caused the aforementioned debates in the 1950-60s. It is quite remarkable to see that though the traditional cultural source did not take an active part in the theoretical debates in the Japanese family sociology in the 1990s, it must be kept in mind that Japan was forced to break up with its traditional (ideological) family form under American pressure after World War Two, which in fact resulted in two major research fields: the traditional family and the modern family. One can suppose that such a sharp division in family research fields does not necessarily exist in other non-Western countries, such as Taiwan where there was no (foreign) pressure to break up with the traditional family form. Thus in non-Western capitalist countries, one can in fact suppose the existence of three competitive conceptual sources at present times in interpreting family issues: a traditional cultural one, a(n imported) Western modern one, and a potential post-modern one.

In (former) socialist countries like Hungary, however, one can distinguish not two or three, but four competing conceptual sources. The fourth one refers to the dialectical materialism based on Marxist sociology. During the Cold War, the question in these countries was whether the Marxist sociology could create a competitive model in the name of socialist industrialization that could stand against the family model of the capitalist industrialization, or it would fail to live up to this expectation. Nonetheless, since many of the countries that belonged to the socialist camp during the Cold War changed to a capitalist economic system between 1989 and 1991, the question concerning the competitive conceptual sources in the family sociology of these countries must be re-formulated - due to the sudden break with the Marxist sociology. The question now is how the traditional cultural, the Western modern and the potential post-modern orientational sources are reflected when

teaching about family. In the present study, I will attempt to answer these questions above by analyzing two family sociological textbooks from socialist and post-socialist Hungary.

2. Hungary: an East European society in transition

East European societies, having experienced a totally chaotic period of values since the end of World War Two, may provide an excellent research case in examining the problematic issue of potential competitive conceptual sources for model-building. The sudden change to the socialist system compelled by the Soviet-Union, and the sudden end of it forty years later, stirred up the former values without giving any stable ones instead. This can also be seen in the underdevelopment of civic culture after the political change in 1989, which was predicted by Ralph Dahrendorf as early as 1990, stating that the East-European societies would need at least sixty years to develop their civic cultures.

Hungary was one of the most promising countries to overcome this instability in values after the political change by showing a strong intention to break with the socialist past. Hungary was also the very first country in the East European block to declare war against the socialist system as early as 1956, and it was the first country to initiate an official turn-away from the one-party system in 1989 too. Moreover, Hungary was the only country in socialist East Europe that introduced the second economic system ⁽⁴⁾ having capitalist features as early as 1979. Therefore it is not accidental that Hungary was called the most modest socialist country in East Europe. These promising conditions may have made possible to soften value problems created by the forty-year-long socialist interlude. However unfortunately, the past seventeen years could not meet these expectations, failing to produce the stability in values, which split the country into two (leftist and rightist) parts instead, creating severe disputes and clashes over the socialist past. This has left the whole Hungarian society

⁽⁴⁾ The second economic system in socialist Hungary referred to the economic activities in the private sector. Originally, the communist party did not tolerate any form of private economy, however due to the gradually enlarging difficulties of the socialist state-economy, the government decided to permit a sort of private economy in the late 1970s, which was officially named the second economic system.

with an unfinished value transition - as a heritage of the socialist past.⁽⁵⁾

The instability of values affected family issues in both the socialist and post-socialist periods that can also be traced in the sociological research of family. Though Hungary was one of the most modest socialist countries in East Europe, the main issue during the socialist times was to create the socialist type of family based on Marxist concepts, while also facing an unfinished transition of former family values among the common people. The emphasis in the discourses of the family at those times was put on the *democratization of family relations* in a socialist interpretation of gender-equality. After the political change in 1989, while gender-equality has remained as a hotly-debated issue, there was a change in orientation from discussing what the Hungarian socialist family model might be towards debates on whether family is in crisis due to the pluralization of the nuclear family.

3. Family sociological research in Hungary

Though the Hungarian sociological research started at the beginning of the twentieth century, the sociological research of family began as late as the middle of the 1960s. This coincided with the revival of sociological research after a ten-some-year break in the early period of socialist Hungary. Though the Hungarian communist government throughout its history was highly suspicious about sociological research, the sociology of family appeared to be an exceptional field, and could enjoy a relative freedom in being critical to certain family issues. Yet despite this relative freedom, the number of family sociologists has been less than twenty people up to now. The political change in 1989 failed to bring about significant changes in the family sociological research in Hungary. The development of theoretical research could not proceed as much as it could have been expected, while no academic journal or academic association of family sociology has been founded either. What has changed is the

⁽⁵⁾ The concept of “empty individualization” created by Elemér Hankiss in the early 1980s expresses well the chaotic state of values in socialist Hungary. According to him, while western capitalist modernization could produce an ethos of its kind, socialist modernization failed to do so, resulting in independent individual values that cannot be combined into communitarian ones. As a heritage of the socialist past, post-socialist Hungary is still lacking communitarian values that could promote social integrity (See Rajkai, 2007).

increase of research subjects such as domestic violence, poverty, gipsy families etc.

The family sociological research in Hungary can be characterized by the prevalence of empirical surveys, especially with a special emphasis on values, which fact is in strong relationship with the opposition of the Hungarian family researchers against governmental idealistic slogans concerning family issues - both in the socialist and post-socialist times ⁽⁶⁾. The empirical fact-revealing research attitude of the Hungarian family researchers may be one of the main reasons for why theoretical research has never obtained as much attention as empirical surveys. Yet it does not mean that no family sociological textbook teaching about theoretical family issues has emerged. The list below provides a brief summary of these textbooks.

3-1. Textbooks in the socialist period

1. *The sociology of family* by E. Kósa (1969). This is a very short text ⁽⁷⁾, containing no reference literature (except for the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin), which approaches family issues from a Marxist sociological point of view.

2. *Family and marriage in today's Hungary* edited by P. Lőcsei (1971). This is a collection of studies including not only sociological, but also demographical and psychological ones. This collection attempts to reveal the problematic issues of the changing family and marriage in socialist Hungary.

3. *The changing family* edited by L. Cseh-Szombathy (1978). This edition can be regarded as the continuation of the work mentioned in the second point, stressing the fact that the Marxist Hungarian family sociology had not been able to make a remarkable progress yet.

4. *Family sociological issues and methodology* written by L. Cseh-Szombathy (1979). This is the first organic and systemized text to teach about the sociology of family in socialist Hungary.

5. *About the problematic issues of family life today* edited by V. Szilágyi (1980). This text is a collection of numerous conference papers, addressing issues such as

⁽⁶⁾ As for the post-socialist times, the academic scepticism concerning idealistic governmental family images is well-expressed in the paper of Neményi and Tóth (2003).

⁽⁷⁾ Twenty-six pages.

mate-selection, marriage life, child raising etc.

6. *Hungarian family today* written by L. Cseh-Szombathy (1983). This is not an organic introductory text into family sociology, but rather an attempt to summarize the results of several empirical research studies concerning the Hungarian family, by making use of the family developmental approach.

7. *The sociology of conflicts between spouses* written by L. Cseh-Szombathy (1985). This is a sociological analysis of marital conflicts, in which Cseh-Szombathy disproves the communist government's negative attitude to marital conflicts, by asserting that conflicts are not necessarily harmful in marital life.

8. *Conflict and understanding* written by P. Somlai (1986). This work basically strengthens the standpoint of Cseh-Szombathy about conflicts, by providing three case studies.

9. *Family: pro and contra* edited by M. Neményi (1988). This is a collection of numerous studies, which attempts to disprove the (mainly Christian) fear of the Hungarian family being in crisis due to the pluralization of family. Neményi stresses that it is a natural phenomenon that family is *changing*, which does not necessarily leads to the disappearance of the family.

3-2. Textbooks in the post-socialist period

1. *Family in today's Hungary* edited by J. Csernák (1994). This text contains several studies on subjects such as marriage and divorce, family economy, gipsy families, value change, gender studies, the care-taking of the elderly people etc., from sociological, psychological and demographical points of view.

2. *The sociology of family* edited by M. Schadt (1996). This work is not an organic introductory textbook into family sociology, but rather a collection of extracts from the studies of several Hungarian researchers such as the afore-mentioned Cseh-Szombathy, Somlai, Neményi etc.

3. *Handbook of the family* by B. Teleky (2000). Though this book aims at giving an insight into the sociology of family, its scope is not limited to the sociological approach alone, but also discusses family issues from psychological, philosophical, theological and educational approaches, from the base of Christian virtue.

4. *The sociology of family* written by P. Bánlaky (2001). This text also has an inclination to Christian virtues like the text of Teleky, however it remains within the boundaries of family sociology, by giving an organic introduction into it.

5. *Globalization and family - new challenges of the sociology of family* edited by Gy. Szretykó (2002). This text basically states that the pluralization of family is a natural phenomenon which does not justify the fear of the family in crisis, however this edition does not aim at giving an organic and systemized analysis of the pluralization of the family, but rather giving a brief insight into this problem.

As it can be seen from the list above, several textbooks were published concerning the family both in the socialist and post-socialist periods. Among them, textbooks that are collections of studies written by different authors are prevailing, while there are only four works written by single authors: E. Kósa (1969) and L. Cseh-Szombathy (1979) in the socialist times, as well as B. Teleky (2000) and P. Bánlaky (2001) in the post-socialist times. The first two address the Marxist sociology, while the latter two have inclinations to Christian background. This kind of change in orientation reflects the change in the political turnover.

4. Analysis of the selected textbooks

Two textbooks from the list above were chosen for analysis in this study - one from the socialist times, and another one from the post-socialist period. Two criteria were formulated for the textbook-selection. Firstly, the text must be an introductory material into the sociology of family which discusses family issues in an organic and systemized way, and secondly, the text must be written by a single author in order to keep the integrity of the contents for analysis.⁽⁸⁾ In the case of the socialist times, the works of the afore-mentioned Kósa and Cseh-Szombathy appear to meet these criteria. However, since Kósa's work is just a brief manuscript which cannot be compared to the systematic structure of Cseh-Szombathy's work, the former one will not be addressed

⁽⁸⁾ Though textbook-editions including several studies written by different authors might also be significant for valuable debate-analyses, such textbooks would not be usable for the present study due to the lack of an integral family model in them.

in this study. In the case of the post-socialist times, it is the works of Teleky and Bánlaky that could be selected for an analysis in the present study, however since Teleky's textbook is not limited to a pure sociological approach, but is a rather interdisciplinary textbook including psychological, philosophical, theological and educational approaches too, it will not be addressed in this study.

The basic data, such as the publishing year and place, the length of the text, the number of published volumes, as well as the structure of the contents, will be provided in the case of both textbooks.

The method of analysis is based on the following three analytical view-points:

1. theoretical orientation
2. methodology
3. model analysis.

Each of these view-points pertains to a different aspect of model-building.

The first one refers to the theoretical orientation of the textbook, which plays a highly significant role in establishing the base for the model presented in the text. The quest for the theoretical orientation will be made in two steps: providing a quantitative description of the structure of the bibliography (1), and making clear the principal orientation of the textbook on the base of a qualitative description (2).

The second one pertains to the methodological sophistication, which infuses life into the model by choosing a certain approach - such as structural-functionalism, symbolic interactionism, family developmental approach, conflict model etc. - to address family issues. Thus it will be made clear in both textbooks how these approaches are made use of, and what approach becomes prevailing in the given textbook.

The third one refers to the model manifesting itself in the textbook, which will be considered from the following three view-points: the definition of the family, which provides the basic framework of the model (1), the functions of the family, which throw light upon the relations of the individual, family and society (2), as well as gender roles, which has been one of the most hotly-debated issues in the sociology of family (3).

The first two points (theoretical orientation and methodological sophistication) pertain to the conceptual sources of model-building, while the third point refers to the

result of the model-building. Thus the first two view-points can be contrasted with the third one in search for (in)consistency between the conceptual sources and the model itself.

4-1. The selected textbook from the socialist times

name of author	:	Cseh-Szombathy László
title of text	:	Family Sociological Issues and Methodology
publishing year	:	1979
publishing place	:	Gondolat Kiadó
published volumes	:	7000
number of pages	:	403

contents:

Foreword		5
Chapter One	The definition of the family	10
Chapter Two	The significance of children's socialization in preparing for marital and parental roles	34
Chapter Three	Preparing for family life in pre-marital relations	56
Chapter Four	Mate-selection - marriage.....	110
Chapter Five	Family management - family decisions	151
Chapter Six	Parents and children	200
Chapter Seven	Family as an intimate community.....	231
Chapter Eight	The significance of marriage in the lives of the spouses	265
Chapter Nine	The stability - instability of marriages. Divorce	307

(1) Theoretical orientation

The bibliography includes works of Western (North American and West European), local (Hungarian), East European scholars, as well as that of Marx and Engels in the following proportion:

Table-1	pieces of works	number of references in the text
Western	338	435
Hungarian	20	36
East-European	6 ⁽⁹⁾	6
Marx, Engels	3 ⁽¹⁰⁾	5 ⁽¹¹⁾

As it can be seen from the structure of the bibliography as well as the number of references in the text, the works of Western scholars are prevalent, while there are only a few works of the researchers from the Soviet-Union or other (ex-)socialist countries, along with that of Marx and Engels. Though there are some works of Hungarian (local) researchers, their number is also dwarfed by that of the Western scholars. The gap in number between the Western (capitalist) and Eastern (socialist) works is remarkable.

The question here is why Cseh-Szombathy decides to make use of the capitalist Western literature rather than the socialist Eastern one. Three facts can be considered to be the reason for this remarkable imbalance. First of all, Marx and Engels did not provide an organic and systemized theoretical orientation in search for the socialist model. Marx appears to be satisfied with pointing out the exploitation of women in the nineteenth-century laborers' families, while Engels condemning the monogamous marital relationship asserts that in the future - after the arrival of communism - *family* will disappear. In the lack of a precise instruction from the orthodox Marxist sociology, socialist countries were left alone to find the answer to what the socialist family model was supposed to mean. Secondly, the fifteen-year-long sociological research of family from the middle of the 1960s to the end of the 1970s, when Cseh-Szombathy decided to write his introductory text, did not prove to be long enough to produce a stable Marxist family sociology. ⁽¹²⁾ Thirdly, the same goes for the Soviet and

⁽⁹⁾ Russian: 4, Polish: 1, and Yugoslavian: 1.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Marx: 1, Engels: 1, Marx and Engels: 1.

⁽¹¹⁾ Marx: 2, Engels: 3.

⁽¹²⁾ Cseh-Szombathy writes about this problem very clearly in the foreword of his textbook, asserting that though numerous significant works had been born as a part of the renewing sociological research in the previous fifteen years, unfortunately even researchers of wide reading cannot say that they have a satisfactory knowledge about the sociological research of family.

other socialist East European research achievements too, resulting in that post-war East-European Marxist sociology could not produce a useful theoretical orientation in search for the socialist family model.

Not being capable of making reference to the Marxist sociology as a potential usable source, Cseh-Szombathy was compelled to make use of the abundant Western literature instead. However in doing so, he remained very cautious about the capitalist family research achievements, warning that one must make use of them critically and adapt them carefully into the socialist Hungarian context.⁽¹³⁾ This sheds light upon a remarkable gap between the purpose of producing the socialist family model and the conceptual source for doing so, which also makes highly difficult to find out the principal theoretical orientation in Cseh-Szombathy's textbook. Though this is supposed to be the Marxist sociology, Cseh-Szombathy is compelled to look for help from the Western (capitalist) family research.

Nonetheless, while it is difficult to make clear the principal theoretical orientation in Cseh-Szombathy's text, it is slightly easier to grasp what Cseh-Szombathy is mostly critical to: Parsons' interpretation about the gender-role division within the family. Cseh-Szombathy does not accept - to be more precise, he is not in the position to accept - Parsons' standpoint about the necessity of marital role-division⁽¹⁴⁾, since the figure of the working woman was a basic state-principal in socialist Hungary, which provides the base for a *competitive* socialist family model against the modern capitalist family.

(2) Methodology

Cseh-Szombathy basically arranges the structure of his textbook according to the family developmental approach. His preference to this approach lies in its dynamic feature, since Cseh-Szombathy asserts that family as a *living* thing goes through

⁽¹³⁾ As Cseh-Szombathy asserts at the end of his textbook, "due to the special historical development of the Hungarian society, ... the results of foreign research studies can only provide assumptions for considering the conditions of the Hungarian families, which can be especially useful in giving help to develop domestic (Hungarian) hypotheses ... In order to make clear the main problematic issues concerning family, there is a need for developing the Hungarian family research by adapting international research studies selectively." (1979, p. 340).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Saying that the husband is the breadwinner working outside the family, while the wife stays at home, taking care of household issues and child-raising.

different life stages from its birth (wedding) to its end (divorce or death of the spouses). In the 1970s, when Cseh-Szombathy wrote his textbook, the marriage rate ⁽¹⁵⁾ was apparently high enough to make him believe that family equals to marriage ⁽¹⁶⁾, which can be studied well by making use of the developmental approach.

However, Cseh-Szombathy does not use the developmental approach alone, but also discusses the Marxist conflict approach together with the structural-functionalism and symbolic interactionism, and stresses the necessity of creating a modified Marxist conflict model of the family in order to describe the socialist family model in an appropriate way. ⁽¹⁷⁾ The reason for why he stresses the necessity of creating a modified conflict model lies in the fact that gender-equality between the spouses concerning the housework and child raising had not been realized in the actual Hungarian family life by the 1970s yet. Though - as he asserts - conflicts do (should) not characterize the socialist family due to the socialist ideology about gender-equality, in reality Hungarian young couples are not taught about how to get prepared for conflict-free marital and parental roles. According to Cseh-Szombathy, though emotional relations become more important in the socialist family than in previous family types, because external economic pressures cease to exist, the family members facing various everyday problems cannot fulfill the emotional function of the family appropriately - especially for lack of a proper education. ⁽¹⁸⁾ Instead, he points to the fact that previous family values which did not let men take a significant part in the housework and child raising were still prevailing in the 1970s, which also hindered the spread of socialist gender-equal values.

Though Cseh-Szombathy himself does not attempt to create this modified conflict model, there are hints in his text what this model should be like. First of all, Cseh-Szombathy puts emphasis on the dynamism ⁽¹⁹⁾ of the family and conflicts among

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cseh-Szombathy provides the crude marriage rates of eight socialist and eight capitalist European countries, according to which the marriage rate in Hungary (9.8) was the second highest one in 1975 - right after the Soviet Union (10.1). As Cseh-Szombathy asserts, "The high marriage rates in the socialist countries indicate that marriage is still a widely accepted form for cohabitating couples." (Ibid., p. 143.).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cseh-Szombathy believes that the main reason for a slight decrease of the marriage rate in Hungary compared to previous times can be explained by the increasing number of long-term premarital couples, who however probably will get married in the future (Ibid., p. 318.).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 30.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 30.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Through family life stages.

family members, and he appears to suggest that the family developmental approach and the Marxist dialectical approach are compatible to each other.⁽²⁰⁾ Secondly, though he admits the usefulness of both the structural-functionalism and symbolic interactionism in general, he criticizes the static and ahistorical feature of Parsons' structural-functionalist model,⁽²¹⁾ while he also criticizes the proponents of symbolic interactionism for putting too much emphasis on the interactions among the family members and neglecting the interactions between the family and the outer world. Therefore Cseh-Szombathy suggests that there is a need for a modified Marxist conflict model that is based on a historical-functionalist approach, and which can also express the dynamic development of family life stages along with the interactions of the family members.

Thus Cseh-Szombathy attempts to merge these various approaches into one approach, though he himself does not elaborate this approach precisely. As he asserts, the sociology of family lags behind other fields of sociology in the socialist countries, therefore the family concept that would be highly necessary to investigate family issues in the socialist countries had not been worked out in details yet.⁽²²⁾

(3) Model-analysis

Though Cseh-Szombathy in the first chapter discusses various kinds of definitions of the family⁽²³⁾, he does not give any precise definition of what family is after all. Consequently, he does not provide the definition of the socialist family model either, which is quite not surprising at all, since - as he asserts - the sociology of family lags behind other fields of sociology in the socialist countries. He appears to be content with pointing out the fact that it is hardly possible to give a general definition of the family, and therefore several family definitions may co-exist. In fact Cseh-Szombathy admits the theoretical pluralization concerning the definition of the family.⁽²⁴⁾

⁽²⁰⁾ As he asserts, "the developmental approach contributed to the spread of the dialectical (conflict) approach in the research of the family (in the socialist countries)" (Ibid, p. 23.).

⁽²¹⁾ Stressing that functionalism should focus both on the dynamic feature of the family and on the historical development of the functions of the family.

⁽²²⁾ Ibid., p. 31.

⁽²³⁾ Such as W. Burgess, T. Parsons, R. Hill etc.

⁽²⁴⁾ As Cseh-Szombathy asserts, "in order to avoid the disturbing effects of the emotional reaction on hearing the everyday usage and concept (of family), there is a high need to define its concept.

Similarly for the same reason, Cseh-Szombathy also avoids to elaborate the functions of the family - along with that of the socialist family.

Yet it is possible to reconstruct to some degree what Cseh-Szombathy meant by the (ideal) socialist family. Cseh-Szombathy stresses that the ideal family type is the nuclear family, because it is the nuclear family that can provide young married couples with the necessary independent environment to learn about marital relationship. As he asserts, young couples cannot learn about marital relations properly if they are compelled to live with their parents together - since the parents (may) intervene directly into their relationship. ⁽²⁵⁾

Secondly, in Cseh-Szombathy's interpretation, family is equal to marriage, since - as he asserts - "new families come into existence by getting married, thus all the features of the mechanism of the family is strongly related with marriage" ⁽²⁶⁾. Nonetheless, Cseh-Szombathy does not refute the necessity of divorce when the relationship of the spouses goes wrong. He is of the opinion that a marital relationship which is not bringing happiness for the spouses should not be continued just on behalf of the child(ren) ⁽²⁷⁾. Thus Cseh-Szombathy appears to put the significance of marital relations over parental ones, though it does not mean that he would agree with a subordinate parent-child relationship in which violence against children as a method of discipline could be allowed. ⁽²⁸⁾ As for the conflicts between family members, Cseh-

However, this proves to be an extremely difficult task, therefore it is not accidental that numerous handbooks on the family have been written without giving a precise definition of the family. The reason for this lies in that this apparently self-evident phenomenon (family) in everyday life proves to be very complex in fact when one attempts to define it ... Consequently, not only one definition, but several definitions are possible ... There is no absolute measure according to which the various definitions having been provided so far could be ranked, and thus it is only the question of 'what definition appears to be advantageous for clarifying a certain aspect of the family' that can be taken into consideration." (Ibid, pp. 10-11.).

⁽²⁵⁾ "The first step for the (newly) married couple to establish 'home' must be the acquiring of an independent apartment, which is self-evident all over Europe today ... (However) in today's Hungary, the majority of young married couples do not possess an independent apartment, thus they (have to) live with the parents of either of the spouses ... state-run apartments are not available for (newly married) couples, since couples with children have advantages over those having no children ... Therefore the majority of young couples are compelled to spend this critical period of time together with other people to learn about marital relationship ... This hinders the free development of a harmonious marital relationship." (Ibid., pp. 154-155).

⁽²⁶⁾ Ibid., p. 110.

⁽²⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 339.

⁽²⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 230.

Szombathy strongly argues that the results of conflicts are not necessarily negative, but they can be positive too, strengthening both marital and parent-child relationships.⁽²⁹⁾ Nonetheless, Cseh-Szombathy urges that there is a high need to develop a complex typology of the Hungarian families in order to understand about what the society can expect from marital relationships, and also in order to outline the methods that would provide help to the various problems of the respective families.⁽³⁰⁾ Moreover, Cseh-Szombathy argues that from the (statistical) (in) stability of marriages⁽³¹⁾ it is not possible to make any conclusion concerning either the intimacy⁽³²⁾ or the success⁽³³⁾ of the marital relationship in general. Cseh-Szombathy puts stress on the change in the general marriage-image, which he calls the rationalization of the institution of marriage and the search for individual interests in the marital relationship.⁽³⁴⁾ In doing so, Cseh-Szombathy also contrasts the rationalization of marriage with the negative attitude to divorce of the Catholic Church.⁽³⁵⁾

Thirdly, as it was aforementioned, Cseh-Szombathy highly criticizes Parsons' standpoint about the gender-role division among the spouses, which is against the socialist ideological interpretation of gender equality. First of all, Cseh Szombathy denies the universality of the division of the instrumental and expressive roles between husband and wife in the nuclear family in all societies.⁽³⁶⁾ According to him, if one accepts Parsons' static model of the marital relationship in the modern nuclear family, it would mean that no change could be expected in the future either.⁽³⁷⁾ Secondly, Cseh-Szombathy also denies that the socialization of children would necessarily be decisive for acquiring their (future) marital and parental roles - as Parsons' model suggests.⁽³⁸⁾ Nonetheless, Cseh-Szombathy points to the fact that in

⁽²⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 230 and p.271. Cseh-Szombathy developed his standpoint very detailed in 1985 in his work entitled *The sociology of conflicts between spouses*.

⁽³⁰⁾ Ibid., pp. 305-306.

⁽³¹⁾ That is the divorce rate.

⁽³²⁾ Ibid., p. 240.

⁽³³⁾ Ibid., p. 307.

⁽³⁴⁾ Ibid., p. 314.

⁽³⁵⁾ Ibid., p. 316.

⁽³⁶⁾ Ibid., p. 46. As Cseh-Szombathy asserts, the marital relationship is not independent of local demographical conditions, (the forms of) care-taking customs and institutions, the working rates of men and women, as well as the general political and social views. He points to that Parsons' model can only refer to the North American marital relationship in the 1950s.

⁽³⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 178.

socialist Hungary the previous (traditional) views emphasizing gender-role division were still existing in the 1970s ⁽³⁹⁾, and though the education rate of women became extremely high compared to previous times, many women in socialist Hungary regarded their jobs as a supplementary support to their husbands' salaries ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Finally, Cseh-Szombathy regards pre-marital relationship as highly advantageous for the (future) marital relationship, but only in the case when a pre-marital relationship is based on mutual emotional commitments. ⁽⁴¹⁾ As for extra-marital relationships, Cseh-Szombathy reckons that it rather pertains to a moral question of whether extra-marital relationship is acceptable or not, and he points to the Scandinavian countries where extra-marital relationships did not cause such moral problems as in Italy. ⁽⁴²⁾ Nonetheless, Cseh-Szombathy is also skeptical about the idea of open marriages, because it would require such a total intimacy between the spouses that can hardly be long-lasting in reality. ⁽⁴³⁾

4-2. The selected textbook from the post-socialist times

name of author	:	Bánlaky Pál
title of text	:	The Sociology of Family
publishing year	:	2001
publishing place	:	Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola (John Wesley Theological College)
published volumes	:	not indicated
number of pages	:	148

contents:

Chapter One	What is the sociology of family about?	7
Chapter Two	What is family?	9

⁽³⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 54.

⁽³⁹⁾ Ibid., p.89, p. 209 and p. 294.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Ibid., p. 168.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Ibid., p. 109.

⁽⁴²⁾ Ibid., p. 244 and p. 259.

⁽⁴³⁾ Ibid., p. 260.

Chapter Three	Family in the society: historical outline.....	15
Chapter Four	The internal mechanism of the family (I.): functions.....	37
Chapter Five	The internal mechanism of the family (II.): the dynamism of internal family relations	59
Chapter Six	The internal mechanism of the family (III.): conflicts in the family	95
Chapter Seven	Family types in today's Hungary.....	141

(1) Theoretical orientation

The bibliography includes the works of both Western and local (Hungarian) scholars, while there is no reference to the Marxist sociology or any of the works in other East European countries:

Table-2	pieces of works	number of references in the text
Western	2	3(+7) ⁽⁴⁴⁾
Hungarian	12	45

As it can be seen from the structure of the bibliography and the number of references in the text, Bánlaky makes use of the research achievements of local (Hungarian) researchers rather than that of Western scholars. The reason for this may lie in the fact that Bánlaky seems to be more interested in discussing the family within Hungarian contexts rather than providing a general discussion about the family - though he gives a brief social history of the family in the third chapter. Among the Hungarian researchers, it is Cseh-Szombathy's two works ⁽⁴⁵⁾ that Bánlaky makes reference to for the most part, therefore it can be concluded that Cseh-Szombathy's works stand as a sort of reference point in Bánlaky's textbook. However it does not mean that Bánlaky accepts Cseh-Szombathy's standpoints. Instead, Bánlaky is rather critical to his assertions, stressing that certain places in Cseh-Szombathy's works need

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The number in brackets (+7) refers to the number of researchers whose works are not listed in the bibliography (notes), but whose names are briefly mentioned in the text without indicating their works: such as Maslow, Weber, Hill (and Rodgers), Comte, Parsons, Hegel and Simmel.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Family sociological issues and methodology* (1979) and *The sociology of conflicts between spouses* (1985).

corrections.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Moreover, the fact that there is a lack of reference to the Marxist sociology is not surprising at all. Though the political change in 1989 would not necessarily refute the use of Marxist terminology in family research, Bánlaky's textbook has an inclination to Christian background⁽⁴⁷⁾, which probably would not find it compatible to make reference to the Marxist sociology. Nonetheless, in spite of the fact that there is only one place in Bánlaky's textbook that obviously makes reference to Christian conception⁽⁴⁸⁾, his orientation pertains to the traditional conception of family rather than the modern family.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Thereby, the conceptual source of his textbook excludes both the Marxist sociology and the search for a potential post-modern family, while Bánlaky also remains skeptical towards the modern (bourgeois) family. Nonetheless, it is surprising to see why he leaves Parsons' family model undiscussed.

(2) Methodology

In its methodology, Bánlaky's textbook shows similarity with that of Cseh-Szombathy on the surface, since both make use of the structural-functionalism, symbolic interactionism, developmental approach and conflict approach, and also because both put stress on the dynamic feature of the social history of family as well as the family life through family stages. Nonetheless, the textbooks of Cseh-Szombathy and Bánlaky also show some similarity concerning conflicts, since Bánlaky admits that conflicts cannot be avoided, and that the results of conflicts are not necessarily negative. In doing so, Bánlaky denies harmony-theories.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Bánlaky's interest in exploring the nature of conflicts can also be seen in the length of the sixth chapter⁽⁵¹⁾, which is the longest one, suggesting as if Bánlaky were most interested in conflicts rather than other subjects. Bánlaky often makes reference to Cseh-Szombathy's work⁽⁵²⁾ in discussing conflict-issues, though he also points to some places in Cseh-Szombathy's

⁽⁴⁶⁾ These places will be mentioned when addressing the model in Bánlaky's textbook below.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Bánlaky's textbook was published by a theological college.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Bánlaky makes reference to the commandment of "Honor thy Father and Mother!" in the (Judeo-)Christian Ten Commandments, when discussing the significant role of grandparents in family life. (2001, p. 44.).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ This will be made clear from (the inconsistency of) Bánlaky's family model below.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Ibid. p. 98.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Pp. 95-139.

⁽⁵²⁾ *The sociology of conflicts between spouses* (1985).

arguments about conflicts that need to be corrected.⁽⁵³⁾

However despite these similarities, Bánlaky does not aim at clarifying what the socialist family is, nor does he emphasize the necessity of developing a modified Marxist conflict model of the family. Moreover, while it is the developmental approach that stands in the center of Cseh-Szombathy's textbook in arranging the structure of the text, Bánlaky puts emphasis on the system-feature of the family in the first chapter, and discusses functionalism, interactionism, the developmental as well as the conflict approach in separate chapters⁽⁵⁴⁾. Furthermore, though Bánlaky discusses these approaches much more detailed⁽⁵⁵⁾ than Cseh-Szombathy does, Bánlaky does not attempt to converge these approaches into one, but rather leaves them discussed separately. Thus, though both textbooks touch upon the same approaches⁽⁵⁶⁾, the emphases are put on different places.

(3) Model-analysis

As for the definition of the family, Bánlaky does not introduce family definitions by other family researchers, nor does he discuss in detail the problematic issue of how to define the family. Instead, he points to the fact that Cseh-Szombathy does not provide the definition of the family, therefore he is compelled to fill in this gap by himself.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Nonetheless, Bánlaky does not provide the general definition of family, but a concept instead which he calls the definition of the modern (bourgeois) European family. According to Bánlaky,

The family is a micro-structural subsystem in the society which

a) can function as a complete system in itself,

b) has tight multi-directional connections with other subsystems of the society,

⁽⁵³⁾ Ibid., p. 97, p. 99, p. 104, p. 106, p. 123, p. 132 and p. 135.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Functionalism is discussed in the fourth chapter, interactionism and the developmental approach in the fifth chapter, while the conflict approach in the sixth chapter.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Bánlaky distinguishes seven kinds of functions of the family that will be mentioned in point (3). He discusses interactionism from four view-points: emotional relationship, competence relations, power relations, and coalitions between the family members. As for the developmental approach, he distinguishes eight life stages, arguing that transition from one life stage to the next one is always accompanied by conflicts among the family members. Finally, he discusses conflict issues from two view-points: sources and fields of conflicts as well as conflict-treating techniques and those outputs.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ With the exception of the Marxist conflict approach in Cseh-Szombathy's textbook.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 10.

- c) its members are in regular interactions that are decisive for their life styles.
- d) Moreover, the base of the relations between the family members is
 - d.1) legally or socially accepted (through marriage or cohabitation) and/or
 - d.2) connected through blood relation, and (in some exceptions)
 - d.3) connected through adoption.
- e) the family members are connected emotionally in psycho-social ways, as well as through existential and intellectual-cultural values and interests;
- f) family relations are also multifunctional care-taking systems due to the interdependence of the family members. ⁽⁵⁸⁾

Bánlaky adds the following note to the definition above:

“The definition above does not address the structure of the family on purpose. The reason for this is that the definition above is not limited to one single structure, but can be applied to any kinds of structure such as nuclear families, one-parent families, unmarried couples etc., which all have to be accepted as families.” ⁽⁵⁹⁾

From Bánlaky’s family definition and his note concerning his definition, it could be concluded that Bánlaky admits the pluralization of the (nuclear) family, and therefore his definition appears to possess a post-modern feature.

However in the third chapter of his textbook, in which he discusses the (idealistic) functions of the family ⁽⁶⁰⁾, there are two places that reveal a contradiction between the post-modern feature of his definition of the family and what Bánlaky actually believes to be the ideal family type. One refers to the ideal family form which should consist of three generations. As Bánlaky argues, the ideal place for nursing a patient or an elderly must be at home with the family, since it can be fitted naturally into the everyday activity-structure of the family. In pre-modern (feudal) families,

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 12.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 13.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Bánlaky in the fourth chapter distinguishes seven kinds of functions of the family: the psycho-social function, socialization (educational) function, spiritual-cultural function, care-taking function, producing-consuming function, reproducing function, and the public life-political function. At the end of the chapter, he concludes that “due to disintegrative processes in the last 170 years, all the functions of the family have become limited, thus the family cannot fulfill its functions sufficiently. However, all these functions are very much alive, consequently, this analysis on its functions does not support the opinions saying that the family is in crisis and vanishing.” (Ibid., p. 57.)

taking care of patients and elderly people was a natural everyday activity, but capitalism brought about serious changes. The growing number of working women caused change in the time-structure of the family and in the housing conditions (apartments in which three generations cannot live together) are destroying the care-taking function of the family. This process is harmful, because they weaken the development of a good psycho-social micro-environment.⁽⁶¹⁾ Another reason for why Bánlaky prefers the three-generational families lies in his interpretation about the educational role of grand-parents in promoting children's understanding about generational gaps - referring to the socialization function of the family.⁽⁶²⁾ This family type however refers to neither the modern nor the post-modern family, but - as Bánlaky often makes reference to - rather to the feudal family instead.

In accordance with this, the other place in the fourth chapter that reveals inconsistency with Bánlaky's family definition refers to women's work. Though Bánlaky asserts that he does not intend to discuss whether women's work outside the family is a good or bad phenomenon⁽⁶³⁾, he actually regards it as a negative one when discussing the decreasing care-taking function of the family.⁽⁶⁴⁾ In doing so, Bánlaky distinguishes two family types: the pre-modern (feudal family) and the modern (capitalist) family, asserting that while women did not work in the feudal family, they started to work in the modern (capitalist) family, which made a negative influence on the daily schedule of family life. However the problem with Bánlaky's statement is that women in the modern family did not use to work outside of the family, but they became housewives⁽⁶⁵⁾ instead. In fact, women's work started to spread along with the emergence of the post-modern attitude from the 1970s in the capitalist countries.⁽⁶⁶⁾ The reason for why Bánlaky contrasts the modern family with the pre-modern (feudal) one, and not with the post-modern one, may lie in that he does not distinguish the concepts of

⁽⁶¹⁾ Ibid., p. 47. The fact that Bánlaky regards the growing rate of working women as a result of the capitalist conditions can also be seen in his assertion on page 29.

⁽⁶²⁾ As Bánlaky asserts, "by now, the family has lost much of its value-transmitting function too. For example, since children do not live with their grandparents together anymore, one can see a growing gap between generations." (Ibid., p. 44.)

⁽⁶³⁾ Ibid., p. 29.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Ibid., p. 48.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Housewifization - according to the theory of the (capitalist) modernization of the family.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ This also has led to the weakening of the nuclear family norms, which is well-expressed in the theory of the second demographic transition.

modernity and post-modernity in his textbook at all. ⁽⁶⁷⁾ Women's work outside the family appears to be a modern phenomenon for him, and not a post-modern one. ⁽⁶⁸⁾

Moreover, Bánlaky refuses living styles such as open marriages ⁽⁶⁹⁾ or homosexual couples ⁽⁷⁰⁾, which also deepens the gap between the post-modern feature of his family definition and what he believes to be the ideal family. A further similar contradiction can be seen in that while he regards the family as a changing-living thing ⁽⁷¹⁾, his ideal family type refers to a rather static one ⁽⁷²⁾. In this sense, the dynamic feature of the family stressed in his textbook pertains to the different life stages of the family rather than to the change of the family as a historical phenomenon.

5. Summary and conclusion

The two selected textbooks from different historical periods of post-war Hungary reveal different difficulties in model-building in (introductory) family sociological texts. Table 3 shows how the various conceptual sources (traditional-cultural, Marxist, the Parsonian, as well as a potential post-modern one) are (or are not) referred to in the two textbooks, while it also reveals how these sources are related to each other - along with the confusion in their relations.

Since the term "post-modern" started to spread in the 1980s, the fact that there is no reference to a potential post-modern family model in Cseh-Szombathy's textbook

⁽⁶⁷⁾ There is no mention of the word *post-modernity* in the whole textbook.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Bánlaky contrasts the modern family with the pre-modern one in the following way: "... the bourgeois family is less stable and easy to dissolve than the previous family type was. The former social and economic structure that made possible for the majority of the social members to satisfy their primary needs (the bare existence) in a single organizational form pertained to an essential joint of interests which did not allow the dissolution of the family ... (However) the decreasing producing-function of the family (which ensures the subsistence of the family members), ... the realization of women's work (outside the family), ... individualization ..., and regional mobility ... (all) lead to the weakening of the communitarian control ... The anonymous urban environment does not provide an external uniting force. These all result in a (new) attitude and value by which families do not need to sustain for ever." Ibid., pp. 34-35.).

⁽⁶⁹⁾ As Bánlaky asserts, "extra-marital relationships without causing conflicts between the spouses cannot exist" (Ibid., 104.). Bánlaky here sets oneself against Cseh-Szombathy, who reckons that the issue of the extra-marital relationship is rather a moral question in fact.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ "The marriage-like cohabitation of homosexual couples cannot be regarded as families according to the definition of the family (given in this textbook)." (Ibid., p. 144.).

⁽⁷¹⁾ In the first and third chapters.

⁽⁷²⁾ Concerning the ideal functions in the fourth chapter.

is not surprising at all. Nonetheless, it must be mentioned that Cseh-Szombathy contrasts the declining marriage rate in West-European countries with the apparently high marriage rate in the socialist East-European societies in the 1970s. By doing so, he actually points forward to a (future) hotly-debated topic (from the 1980s on) concerning post-modernity. Moreover, it must also be mentioned that at the end of the 1970s, when Cseh-Szombathy decided to write his textbook, the official standpoint of the communist government had already accepted the notion of that (the socialist) family should be the base of the (socialist) society. It meant an official turn-away from the 1950s when the communist leadership was attempting to weaken the family relations.⁽⁷³⁾ After this change in orientation, the communist government did not tolerate individual interests in ways of living different from the (nuclear) family.

Table-3	trad.-cultural	Marxist	Parsonian	post-modern
Cseh-Szombathy's textbook	the previous (pre-socialist) Hungarian family is referred to in a negative tone	there are only a few references made to the Marxist sociology for lack of a precise instruction about the socialist family model in the orthodox Marxist sociology	while the Western (capitalist) literature is used abundantly, there are strong critical references to Parsons' family model, concerning gender issues	no reference (the term "post-modern" started to spread from the 1980s)
Bánlaky's textbook	the functions of the family, along with gender-role issues, pertain to a pre-modern (feudal) family model	no reference	no serious discussion on Parsons' family model, although Bánlaky contrasts the modern (capitalist) family model with the pre-modern (feudal) family	the definition of the family shows post modern features in attempting to include several types of the family

⁽⁷³⁾ As Cseh-Szombathy asserts, "the aim of the political leadership in the 1950s was to make people spend most of their free time in their working-place communities, school groups, political or social organizations. These efforts attempted to weaken the family as a community on purpose, since family was regarded as the keeper of conservative traditions. Today however, the purpose is to strengthen the family, since it became obvious that even socialist societies need family communities." (Cseh-Szombathy, 1983, p. 41.).

Moreover, the fact that Cseh-Szombathy makes reference to the previous (pre-socialist) Hungarian family relations in a negative tone can be considered understandable, since the discourse of family in socialist Hungary pertained to the democratization of pre-war family relations - to create a new (socialist) family. However the imbalance in using the Marxist sociology and Western (capitalist) literature throws light upon the problematic feature of model-building in creating the potential socialist family. There is an obvious contradiction between the purpose of constructing the socialist family model and the literary source that was used for this model-building in Cseh-Szombathy's textbook. Nonetheless, it must be noted that while Cseh-Szombathy makes use of the Western literature abundantly, he also remains highly critical to it. However, even this critical attitude was not enough to be able to construct the definition and functions of the socialist family model.

As for Bánlaky's textbook, the fact that there is no reference made to the Marxist sociology is not surprising at all due to the political turn-away from socialism in 1989 - though this official turn-away in the political system alone should not necessarily hinder the usage of Marxist terminology in the sociology of family. The lack of reference to the Marxist sociology in Bánlaky's textbook is rather the result of Bánlaky's interest in discussing the modern (capitalist) and pre-modern (feudal) family, while - surprisingly - he does not address Parsons' family model directly in this discussion. Instead, he provides a family definition with a certain post-modern feature that he - surprisingly again - calls the definition of the modern (bourgeois European) family. Yet there is an obvious contradiction between the definition given in the second chapter and the (ideal) functions of the family (together with his arguments on gender issues) in the fourth chapter which reveals Bánlaky's preference for the pre-modern (feudal) family model in fact. This contradiction may derive from that while Bánlaky extends the concept of family in admitting the varieties of various family types (in order to be able to handle the challenges of present [post-modern] times), his real orientation (preference) lies in the intimacy of family life which was most well-realized in pre-modern (feudal) families - as it can be seen from Bánlaky's arguments about the feudal families in the third chapter.

The textbooks of Cseh-Szombathy and Bánlaky in fact reveal two different kinds of difficulties in model-building. In Cseh-Szombathy's textbook, the contradiction lies

in the inconsistency between the purpose of constructing the socialist family model and the literary source used for this model-building. In Bánlaky's textbook, however, the inconsistency pertains to that between the present (post-modern) varieties of family types and his conservative preference for the pre-modern (feudal) family model. The two textbooks also differ from each other in that while Cseh-Szombathy's text refers to the model-building of a (newly coming) family type, Bánlaky's text pertains to a family model that was prevailing in the past. Thus it can be concluded that Cseh-Szombathy's textbook is *prospective*, while Bánlaky's textbook is *retrospective*. Nonetheless, both textbooks serve as excellent examples for illustrating the difficult issue of model-building in non-Western - especially in (former-)socialist - countries, and also for throwing light upon the confusion of competitive conceptual sources *within* one textbook.

Bibliography

- Aoyama Michio, 1976, "Nihon no [Ie] no honshitsu ni tsuite: Aruga · Kitano ronsou o chuushin to shite" (About the essence of the Japanese [Ie]: focusing on the Aruga-Kitano debate) in Fukushima Masao (ed.) *Kindai nihon no kazokukan* (Family views in modern Japan), Tokyo, pp. 9-51.
- Bánlaky Pál, 2001, *Családszociológia* (The sociology of family), Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola.
- Bell, Norman W. and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), 1960, *A modern introduction to the family*, Glencoe, Ill. : Free Press.
- Cheal, David, 1991, *Family and the state of theory*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cseh-Szombathy László (ed.), 1978, *A változó család* (The changing family), Kossuth Könyvkiadó.
- _____, 1979, *Családszociológiai problémák és módszerek* (Family sociological issues and methodology), Budapest: Gondolat.
- _____, 1983, *A mai magyar család* (The Hungarian family today), Magyar Nők Országos Tanácsa.
- _____, 1985, *A házastársi konfliktusok szociológiája* (The sociology of conflicts between spouses), Budapest, Gondolat.
- Csernák Józsefné, 1994, *Család a mai magyar társadalomban* (Family in today's Hungary).
- Dahrendorf, Ralph, 1990, *Reflections on the revolution in Europe*, London: Chatto and Windus.
- Engels, F., 1891, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats*.
- Greenwood, N. A. and M. L. Cassidy, 1990, "A critical review of family sociology textbooks" in *Teaching Sociology* Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 541-549.
- Hankiss Elemér, 1983, *Társadalmi csapdák ; Diagnózisok* (Social traps; Diagnoses), Magvető Kiadó.
- Haraway, D., 1991, *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Kósa Erzsébet, 1969, *Családszociológia* (The sociology of family), Budapest (Magyar Szocialista Munkáspárt [The Hungarian Socialist Labourers' Party] KB Politikai Főiskola Szociológia Tanszék).
- Kuhn, Thomas S., 1962, *The structure of scientific revolutions*, Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Lőcsei Pál ed., 1971, *Család és házasság a mai magyar társadalomban* (Family and marriage in today's Hungary), Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

- Mann, Susan A. et al., 1997, "Paradigm shifts in family sociology? Evidence from three decades of family textbooks" in *Journal of Family Issues* Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 315-349.
- Mann, Susan A. and James Dickinson, 2003, "Family sociology: slowly taking the postmodern turn? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels, 1845-1846, *Die deutsche Ideologie*.
- Marx, K., 1867-1894, *Das Kapital*.
- Mochizuki Takashi, 2001, "Kazoku byourigakuteki apuro-chi" (Family pathological approach) in Nonoyama Hisaya et al. ed. *Kazokushakaigaku no bunseki shikaku* (Analytical approaches in family sociology), Kyoto, pp. 202-220.
- Morioka Kiyomi, 1964, "Kakukazoku no yuuyousei" (The usability of the nuclear family) in *Ke-su Kenkyuu* 81, Kazoku Jiken Kenkyuukai.
- Morioka Kiyomi and Takashi Mochizuki, 1983, *Atarashii kazoku shakaigaku* (New family sociology), Tokyo.
- Neményi Mária (ed.), 1988, *A család: pro és kontra* (Family: pro and contra), Budapest: Gondolat.
- Neményi Mária and Olga Tóth, 2003, "Differential modernization in Hungary: families and family values after transition", *Cross-National Research Papers 5. - Changing Family Structure in Europe*, European Research Centre, p. 60-65.
- Ochiai Emiko, 1989, "Kazoku shakaigaku no paradaimu tenkan" (Paradigm shift in family sociology) in *Kindai kazoku to feminizumu* (Modern family and feminism), Tokyo, pp. 136-165.
- Parsons, T. - Bales, R. F., 1955, *Family, socialization and interaction process*, New York: Free Press.
- Rajkai Zsombor, 2007, "Empty individualization and family solidarity – Hungary: an East-European country in transition" in *Soshioroji* No. 160, pp. 93-107.
- Rodman, Hyman, 1965, "The textbook world of family sociology" in *Social Problems* Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 445-457.
- Schadt Mária (ed.), 1996, *Családszociológia (szöveggyűjtemény)* (The sociology of family), Pécs.
- Smith, Dorothy, 1993, "The standard North American family" in *Journal of Family Issues* Vol. 14, pp. 50-65.
- Somlai Péter, 1986, *Konfliktus és megértés* (Conflict and understanding), Budapest, Gondolat.
- Szretykó György (ed.), *Globalizáció és család - a családszociológia új kihívásai* (Globalization and family - new challenges in the sociology of family), Pécs: Comenius Bt.
- Teleky Béla, 2000, *Kézikönyv a családról* (Handbook of the family), Kecskemét, Korda Kiadó.
- Szilágyi Vilmos (ed.), 1980, *A családi élet mai problémái - ahogyan hazai szakértőink látják* (About the problematic issues of family today), Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Waller, Willard, (revised by Reuben Hill), 1951, *The family : a dynamic interpretation*, New York : Dryden Press.
- Yamamuro Shuuhei, 1963, "Kakukazokuron to nihon no kazoku" (The nuclear family theory and the Japanese family) in *Ke-su Kenkyuu* 77-78, Kazoku Jiken Kenkyuukai.

(Zsombor Rajkai · 博士後期課程)

Model-Building in Family Sociological Textbooks: in Socialist and Post-Socialist Hungary

Zsombor RAJKAI

An analysis of family models in two family sociological textbooks forms the subject-matter of the present study. The reason for the choice of this subject lies in the fact that current debates on family issues seem to lack a certain general conceptual compass that could serve as a base for a common interpretation and understanding on family. Instead of one, one can distinguish several conceptual sources competing for hegemony in interpreting family issues. These conceptual sources are however not equally distributed in the world. For instance, in America, there are two conceptual sources competing with each other: the so-called Parsonian structural-functionalism, and a potential post-modern one. In non-Western capitalist societies like Japan, one can distinguish three conceptual sources: a traditional-cultural one, a Western modern (mainly the American-based Parsonian) one, and a potential post-modern one. In (former) socialist countries like Hungary, however, one can distinguish not two or three, but four competing conceptual sources. The fourth one refers to the dialectical materialism based on Marxist sociology. In the present paper, I select two family sociological textbooks published in post-war Hungary, a country which has experienced an enormous confusion of values during the socialist (1949-89) and post-socialist times (1989~), and which fact consequently left its mark on textbook-writing in the Hungarian family sociology. The two selected textbooks from different historical periods of post-war Hungary reveal different difficulties in model-building in (introductory) family sociological texts. Table 3 in the present paper shows how the various conceptual sources (traditional-cultural, Marxist, the Parsonian, as well as a potential post-modern one) are (or are not) referred to in the two selected textbooks, while it also reveals how these sources are related to each other - along with the confusion in their relations. In the textbook selected from the socialist times, the contradiction lies in the inconsistency between the purpose of constructing the socialist family model and the literary source used for this model-building. In the textbook from post-socialist times, however, the inconsistency pertains to that between the present

(post-modern) varieties of family types and the author's conservative preference for the pre-modern (feudal) family model. The two textbooks also differ from each other in that while the former text refers to the model-building of a (newly coming) family type, the latter text pertains to a family model that was prevailing in the past.