

# theoretical perspectives on the family

HDFS 8820

AUTUMN 2015

MON 9:35 AM  
TO 12:15 PM

329 CAMPBELL HALL

THE OHIO STATE  
UNIVERSITY



The Kennedy Family at Hyannis Port, 1931.

**Official Course Description:** Provides an overview of theoretical perspectives used to study families and family change topics in HDFS from the perspective of psychology, sociology, economics, demography, anthropology, and others.

**Unofficial Course Description:** This course will introduce you to theoretical perspectives on the family, as well as the state of the art in family scholarship from across disciplines. Family research is inherently interdisciplinary, with scholars in psychology, sociology, economics, history, ecology, anthropology, communication, and other disciplines studying the family.

Why should scholars interested in human development, public health, education, economics, sociology, or business, care about families? What are their perspectives on the family? These are questions we will be exploring in this class. The impacts of the family are apparent across several different domains of human experience. A stressful day at work may impact a conversation with a spouse about what to do for dinner. A parents' morning argument may impact their child's day at school. Having a child who is often sick could impact his mother's career trajectory. A close relationship with a sibling may be critical when dealing with a breakup. Family relationships impact who we are, where we live, what career we chose, and our overall experience of the world. Family scholars have been interested in the interaction between family members, between the family and each member's development, and between the family and the larger social environment. We will be exploring the cutting edge of theory and research on the family in this course, using interdisciplinary research and theory to help us form cutting edge theories and questions that may move family scholarship forward, and our respective disciplinary scholarship forward, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Your professor:

**Prof. Claire Kamp Dush**

Office: 151E Campbell Hall

Phone: 247-2126


Email: [kamp-dush.1@osu.edu](mailto:kamp-dush.1@osu.edu)

Email is the preferred way to reach me.

Office hours: by appointment

## What's in this syllabus

Course goals/objectives	2
Grade breakdown	2
Readings/exam schedule	3-10
How to take this course	11
Course requirements	11-12
Policies and resources	13-14



## grade breakdown

To accomplish the goals of this course and achieve course learning objectives, you will be required to do the following.

### Class discussion

25%

Class discussion and participation in activities is required. This work cannot be made up; you must be in class.

### Weekly reaction papers

30%

2 pages, double-spaced reaction papers written in response to one of several thought questions for each week. 10 are required.

### Midterm exam

20%

Take-home exam covering the first half of the course.

### Final exam

25%

Take-home exam focused on the last half of the course, but drawing on material from the entire course.



The Kardashian Family, 2012

Week	Readings/Exam Schedule	Thought questions
<p><b>Week 1:</b>  <b>August 29<sup>th</sup></b>  <b>Introduction to the course. What is a fact? Historical changes and the American family. An introduction to theory.</b></p>	<p>Cherlin, A. (2009). <a href="#">Why it's hard to know when a fact is a fact.</a></p> <p>Cherlin, A. J., &amp; Seltzer, J. A. (2014). Family complexity, the family safety net, and public policy. <a href="#">The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 654, 231-239.</a></p> <p>Coontz, S. (1995). The way we weren't: The myth and reality of the "traditional" family. <i>Nation Forum: The Phi Beta Kappa Journal, Summer</i>, 11-14.</p> <p>Cowan, P., &amp; Cowan, C. (2009). <a href="#">When is the relationship between facts a causal one?</a></p> <p>Furstenberg, F. F. (2014). Fifty years of family change: From consensus to complexity. <a href="#">The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 654, 12-30.</a></p> <p>White, J. M. (2013). The current status of theorizing about families. In G. W. Peterson and K. R. Bush (Eds.) <i>Handbook of marriage and the family</i> (pp. 11-37). New York, NY: Springer. <i>Note: Read pages 11 – 18.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Synthesize Cherlin &amp; Seltzer (2014), Furstenberg (2014) and Coontz (1995)?</li> <li>2. Does such a thing as a "fact" exist in family research? Does a fact have to be "causal"? Do "causal" facts exist in family research? Use articles from this week to support your answer.</li> <li>3. What is the current state of the family in the US? Use articles from this week to support your answer.</li> <li>4. Should family research be more concerned with scientific description or scientific explanation? Use other articles from this week to support your answer.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Week 2:</b>  <b>September 5<sup>th</sup></b></p>	<p>NO CLASS: LABOR DAY</p>	
<p><b>Week 3:</b>  <b>September 12<sup>th</sup></b>  <b>Evolutionary Theory and Dating and Mate Selection</b></p>	<p>Asari, A., &amp; Klineberg, E. (2015). <i>Modern Romance</i>. New York, NY: Penguin Press. Chapter 1: Searching for your soul mate.</p> <p>Buss, D. M. &amp; Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. <a href="#">Psychological Review, 100, 204-232.</a></p> <p>Hamilton, N. F. (2016). Romantic relationships and online dating. In A. Attrill and C. Fullwood (Eds.) <a href="#">Applied Cyberpsychology (pp. 144-160)</a>. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Hamilton, L., &amp; Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: Double blinds and flawed options. <a href="#">Gender &amp; Society, 23, 589-616.</a></p> <p>Rupp, L. J., Taylor, V. Regev-Messalem, S., Fogarty, A. C. K., England, P. (2014). Queer women in the hookup scene: Beyond the closet? <a href="#">Gender &amp; Society, 28, 212-235.</a></p> <p>Sales, N. J. (2015, September). Tinder and the dawn of the "dating apocalypse". <i>Vanity Fair</i>. Retrieved from</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contrast Asari &amp; Klineberg (2015), Hamilton &amp; Armstrong (2009), and Rupp et al. (2014).</li> <li>2. Synthesize Buss &amp; Schmitt (1993), Hamilton &amp; Armstrong (2009) and Rupp et al. (2014).</li> <li>3. Comment on Hamilton (2016) in light of Buss &amp; Schmitt (1993).</li> <li>4. Reconcile Hamilton (2016), Asari &amp; Klineberg (2015), and Sales (2015).</li> <li>5. Critically apply evolutionary theory to your area of interest.</li> </ol>

<http://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2015/08/tinder-hook-up-culture-end-of-dating> .

**Week 4:  
September 19<sup>th</sup>  
Theory and  
Research about  
Couples**

Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 848-861.

Finkel, E. J., Hui, C. M., Carswell, K. L., & Larson, G. M. (2014). The suffocation of marriage: Climbing mount maslow without enough oxygen. *Psychological Inquiry*, 25, 1-41.

Karney, B., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, methods, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3-34.

Lauer, S., & Yodanis, C. (2010). The deinstitutionalization of marriage revisited: A new institutional approach to marriage. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 2, 58-72.

Pietromonaco, P. R., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2014). Marriage in whose America? What the suffocation model misses. *Psychological Inquiry*, 25, 108-113.

Umberson, D., Thomeer, M. B., & Lodge, A. C. (2015). Intimacy and emotional work in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77, 542-556.

1. Contrast and compare Cherlin (2004), Finkel et al. (2014), and Karney & Bradbury (1995).
2. Is marriage deinstitutionalized?
3. Do marital theories based on heterosexual couples apply to gay and lesbian couples?
4. Do you agree with Finkel et al. (2014) or Pietromonaco & Perry-Jenkins (2014)? Why?
5. Reconcile the major marriage models presented this week.

**Week 5:  
September 26<sup>th</sup>  
Economic Theory,  
Social Exchange  
Theory, and the  
Investment Model**

Becker, G. S., Landes, E. M., & Michael, R. T. (1977). An economic analysis of marital instability. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85, 1141-1187.

Sabatelli, R. M., & Shehan, C. L. (1993). Exchange and resource theories. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 385-411). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the Investment Model. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 37-57.

Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2007). Marriage and divorce: Changes and their driving forces. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21, 27-52.

Oppenheimer, V. K. (1997). Women's employment and the gain to marriage: The specialization and trading model. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 431-453.

1. Compare and contrast Becker et al. (1977) and Sabatelli & Shehan (1993).
2. Does Oppenheimer (1997) support Becker et al. (1977)? Explain.
3. Apply the investment model to Stevenson & Wolfers (2007).
4. What are the commonalities among economic theory on the family/independence hypothesis, social exchange theory, and the investment model? Where do they diverge?
5. Critically apply economic theory on the family, social exchange theory, and the investment model to your area of interest.

**Week 6:  
October 3<sup>rd</sup>  
Attachment  
Theory and  
Relationship  
Development.**

Barr, A. B., Simons, R. L., & Simons, L. G. (2015). Nonmarital relationships and changing perceptions of marriage among African American young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 77*, 1202-1216.

Hadden, B. W., Smith, C. V., & Webster, G. D. (2014). Relationship duration moderates associations between attachment and relationship quality: Meta-analytic support for the temporal adult romantic attachment model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 42-58.

Guzzo, K. B. (2014). Trends in cohabitation outcomes: Compositional changes and engagement among never-married young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 76*, 826-842.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.

Huang, P. M., Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Bergstrom-Lynch, C. A. (2011). He says, she says: Gender and cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues, 32*, 876-905.

Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2012). The impact of the transition to cohabitation on relationship functioning: Cross-sectional and longitudinal findings. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26*, 348-358.

1. Apply Hazan & Shaver (1987) to Rhoades et al. (2012).
2. Reconcile Guzzo (2014), Huang et al. (2011), and Barr et al. (2015).
3. Comment on Huang et al. (2011) from an attachment perspective.
4. Contrast Hadden et al. (2014) and Hazan and Shaver (1987).
5. Critically apply attachment theory to your research area of interest.

**Week 7:  
October 10<sup>th</sup>  
Social Learning  
Theory and  
Intergenerational  
Transmission**

Amato, P. R., & DeBoer, D. D. (2001). The transmission of marital instability across generations: Relationship skills or commitment to marriage? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 1038-1051.

Bandura, A. (1969). Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 213-262). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally & Company.

Bridgett, D. J., Burt, N. M., Edwards, E. S., Deater-Deckard, K. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of self-regulation: A multidisciplinary review and integrative conceptual framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*, 602-654.

Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 387-411.

1. Synthesize Davies & Cummings (1994), Bridgett et al. (2015), and Ludwig & Mayer (2006).
2. Evaluate Davies & Cummings (1994) and Amato & DeBoer (2001) using Bandura (1969).
3. Extend Bandura (1969) given Hammen et al. (2012) and Bridgett et al. (2015).
4. Critically apply social learning theory to your research area of interest.

	<p>Hammen, C., Hazel, N. A., Brennan, P. A., &amp; Najman, J. (2012). Intergenerational transmission and continuity of stress and depression: Depressed women and their offspring in 20 years of follow-up. <a href="#"><i>Psychological Medicine</i>, 42, 931-942.</a></p> <p>Ludwig, J., &amp; Mayer, S. (2006). "Culture" and the intergenerational transmission of poverty: The prevention paradox. <a href="#"><i>The Future of Children</i>, 16, 175-196.</a></p>	
<p><b>Week 8:</b> <b>October 17<sup>th</sup></b></p>	<p><b>MIDTERM EXAM</b> The exam will be distributed via my Campbell Hall mailbox at 9 am on October 10<sup>th</sup> and a <b>printed hard copy along with the original exam sheet</b> is due in class on October 31<sup>st</sup>. I will not accept the exam electronically nor will I accept it without the hard copy of the original exam.</p>	<p><i>Note, the exam will cover Weeks 1 through 9.</i></p>
<p><b>Week 9:</b> <b>October 24<sup>th</sup></b> <b>Family Systems Theory and Parent-Child Relationships</b></p>	<p>Berkowitz, D. (2009). Theorizing lesbian and gay parenting: Past, present, and future scholarship. <a href="#"><i>Journal of Family Theory and Review</i>, 1, 117-132.</a></p> <p>Cox, M. J., &amp; Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. <a href="#"><i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>, 48, 243-267.</a></p> <p>Edin, K., Nelson, T., &amp; Reed, J. M. (2011). Daddy, baby; Momma, maybe: Low-income urban fathers and the "Package Deal" of family life. In M. J. Carlson &amp; P. England (Eds.), <a href="#"><i>Social class and changing families in an unequal America</i> (pp. 68-84).</a> Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.</p> <p>Farr, R. H., &amp; Patterson, C. J. (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual Couples: Associations With Adopted Children's Outcomes. <a href="#"><i>Child Development</i>, 84, 1226-1240.</a></p> <p>Schermerhorn, A. C., Chow, S. M., &amp; Cummings, E. M. (2010). Developmental family processes and interparental conflict: Patterns of microlevel influences. <a href="#"><i>Developmental Psychology</i>, 46, 869-885.</a></p> <p>Kotila, L. E., &amp; Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2015). Integrating sociological and psychological perspectives on coparenting. <a href="#"><i>Sociological Compass</i>, 9, 731-744.</a></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment on Berkowitz (2009) from a Family Systems perspective, citing Cox &amp; Paley (1997). Are there commonalities? Differences?</li> <li>2. Apply Cox &amp; Paley (1997) to Edin et al. (2011).</li> <li>3. Interpret Farr &amp; Patterson (2013) in light of Schermerhorn et al. (2010).</li> <li>4. Reconcile Kotila &amp; Schoppe-Sullivan (2015) and Edin et al. (2011).</li> <li>5. Critically apply family systems theory to your research area of interest.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Week 10:</b> <b>October 31<sup>st</sup></b> <b>Gender Theory, Queer Theory, Intersectionality, and the Division of Labor in Families</b></p>	<p>Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A., &amp; Robinson, J. P. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? <a href="#"><i>Social Forces</i>, 91, 55-63.</a></p> <p>England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. <a href="#"><i>Gender &amp; Society</i>, 24, 149-166.</a></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reconcile England (2010), Goldberg (2013), and Yavorsky et al. (2015).</li> <li>2. Compare Goldberg (2013) and Fagan et al. (2014) with England (2010).</li> </ol>

**Week 11:  
November 7<sup>th</sup>  
Life-course  
Theory and  
Intergenerational  
Relationships**

Fagan, J., Day, R., Lamb, M. E., & Cabrera, N. J. (2014). Should researchers conceptualize differently the dimensions of parenting for fathers and mothers? *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *6*, 390-405.

Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the “new” critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, *6*, 169-183.

Goldberg, A. E. (2013). “Doing” and “Undoing” gender: The meaning and division of housework in same-sex couples. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *5*, 85-104.

Gamson, J., & Moon, D. (2004). The sociology of sexualities: Queer and beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 47-64.

Yavorsky, J. E., Kamp Dush, C. M., & Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2015). The production of inequality: The gender division of labor across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *77*, 662-679.

Barnett, M. A., Mills-Koonce, W. R., Gustafsson, H., & Cox, M. (2012). Mother-grandmother conflict, negative parenting, and young children's social development in multigenerational families. *Family Relations*, *61*, 864-877.

Dunifon, R. E., Ziolo-Guest, K. M., & Kopko, K. (2014). Grandparent coresidence and family well-being: Implications for research and policy *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *654*, 110-126.

Elder, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3-19). New York: Kluwer.

Fingerman, K. L., Cheng, Y., Wesselmann, E. D., Zarit, S., Furstenburg, F., & Birditt, K. S. (2012). Helicopter parents and landing pad kids: Intense parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*, 880-896.

Tsai, K. M., Telzer, E. H., & Fuligni, A. J. (2012). Continuity and discontinuity in perceptions of family relationships from adolescence to young adulthood. *Child Development*, *84*, 471-484.

3. Compare and contrast gender theory, queer theory, or intersectionality.
4. Critically apply gender theory, queer theory, or intersectionality to your research area of interest.

1. Apply life-course theory to Barnett et al. (2010) and Fingerman et al. (2012).
2. Synthesize Barnett et al. (2010), Fingerman et al. (2012), and Tsai et al. (2012). What is the state of contemporary intergenerational relationships?
3. Reconcile Fingerman et al. (2012), Tsai et al. (2012), and Dunifon et al. (2014).
4. Critically apply life course theory to your research area of interest.

**Week 12:  
November 14<sup>th</sup>  
Symbolic  
Interactionism  
and Sibling  
Relationships**

Conley, D., & Glauber, R. (2008). All in the family?: Family composition, resources, and sibling similarity in socioeconomic status. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 26, 297-306.

Campione-Barr, N., Lindell, A. K., Giron, S. E., Killoren, S. E., & Greer, K. B. (2015). Domain differentiated disclosure to mothers and siblings and associations with sibling relationship quality and youth emotional adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 51, 1278-1291.

LaRossa, R., & Reitzes, D. (1993). Symbolic interactionism and family studies. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 135-163). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Volling, B. L. (2012). Family transitions following the birth of a sibling: An empirical review of changes in the firstborn's adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 497-528.

McHale, S. M., Updegraff, K. A., & Whiteman, S. D. (2012). Sibling relationships and influences in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 913-930.

Whiteman, S. D., Zeiders, K. H., Killoren, S. E., Rodriguez, S. A., & Updegraff, K. A. (2014). Sibling influence on Mexican-origin adolescents' deviant and sexual risk behaviors: The role of sibling modeling. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 54, 587-592.

1. Apply LaRossa & Reitzes (1993) to sibling relationships Conley & Glauber (2008), Campione-Barr et al. (2015), Volling (2012), and Whiteman et al. (2014).
2. Interpret Conley & Glauber (2008), Campione-Barr et al. (2015), Volling (2012), and Whiteman et al. (2014) in light of one of the major theories identified in McHale et al. (2012).
3. Synthesize McHale et al. (2012) and LaRossa & Reitzes (1993).
4. Critically apply symbolic interactionism or the theories cited in McHale et al. (2012) to your research area of interest.
5. How would incorporating siblings into your research agenda change and expand that agenda? Cite readings from this week to support your claim.

**Week 13:  
November 21<sup>st</sup>  
Bioecological  
Theory,  
Cumulative Risk  
Theory, and  
Families in  
Context**

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child development: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793-828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Evans, G. W., & Kim, P. (2012) Childhood poverty and young adults' allostatic load: The mediating role of childhood cumulative risk exposure. *Psychological Science*, 23, 979-983.

Lareau, A. (2010). Unequal childhoods and unequal transitions to adulthood: The importance of social class in turning points. In M. J. Carlson & P. England (Eds.), *Social class and changing families in an unequal America* (pp. 134-164). Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.

1. Synthesize the following theories to determine the importance of the family for optimal human development: bioecological model, ecobiodevelopmental framework, double ABCX, and cumulative risk theory.
2. Compare Luther (2003) and Lareau (2010).
3. Interpret Luther (2003) and Lareau (2010) using Bronfenbrenner & Morris (2006) and Shonkoff et al. (2012).
4. Interpret Evans & Kim (2012) and Lareau (2010) using double ABCX model.

**Week 14:  
November 28<sup>th</sup>  
Family Violence**

Luthar, S. S. (2003). The culture of affluence: Psychological costs of material wealth. *Child Development, 74*(6), 1581-1593.

McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). The family stress process: The double ABCX model of adjustment and adaptation. *Marriage & Family Review, 6*, 7-37.

Shonkoff, J. P., Garner, A. S., The Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health, Committee On Early Childhood, Adoption and Dependent Care, Section on Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, Siegel, B. S., Dobbins, M. I., Earls, M. F., Garner, A. S., McGuinn, L., Pascoe, J., & Wood, D. L. (2012). The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress. *Pediatrics, 129*, e232-e246.

Anderson, K. L. (2010). Conflict, power, and violence in families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*, 726-742.

Bonomi, A. E., Nemeth, J. M., Altenburger, L. E., Anderson, M. L., Snyder, A., & Dotto, I. (2014). Fiction or not? Fifty Shades is associated with health risks in adolescent and young adult females. *Journal of Women's Health, 23*, 720-728.

Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., Smith Slep, A. M., Heyman, R. E., & Garrido, E. (2008). Child abuse in the context of domestic violence: Prevalence, explanations, and practice implications. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 221-235.

Lawson, J. (2012). Sociological theories of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 22*, 572-590.

Nemeth, J. M., Bonomi, A. E., Lee, M. A., & Ludwin, J. M. (2012). Sexual infidelity as a trigger: An events analysis of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Women's Health, 21*, 942-949.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women, 11*, 38-64.

5. Critically apply the bioecological model, ecobiodevelopmental framework, double ABCX model, or cumulative risk theory to your research area of interest.

1. What are the risk factors for family violence? What are the consequences? Include references to this week's articles.
2. Interpret Bonomi et al. (2014), Jouriles et al. (2008), Sokoloff & Dupont (2005), in light of Lawson (2012) and Anderson (2010).
3. What processes are at play in violent relationships? Compare perspectives from Lawson (2012) and Sokoloff & Dupont (2005). Use findings from readings for this week as evidence to support your claims.

**Week 15:  
December 5<sup>th</sup>  
Family Policy and  
Economic Theory**

Required:  
Himmelweit, S., Santos, C., Sevilla, A., & Sofer, C. (2013). Sharing of resources within the family and the economics of household decision making. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 75*, 625-639.

1. Do prevention and educational interventions for intimate relationships work? If not, what can be done? If

Read all abstracts, please choose 4 to read in depth:

Baker, R. S. (2015). The changing association among marriage, work and child poverty in the United States, 1974-2010. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77, 1166-1178.

Gassman-Pines, A., Yoshikawa, H. (2005). Five-year effects of an anti-poverty program on marriage among never-married mothers. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25, 11-30.

Bradbury, T. N., & Lavner, J. A. (2012). How can we improve preventive and education interventions for intimate relationships? *Behavior Therapy*, 43, 1, 113-122.

Metz, T. (2005). The liberal case for disestablishing marriage. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6, 196-217.

Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., & Horne, S. G. (2010). Psychological distress, well-being, and legal recognition in same-sex couple relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24, 82-86.

Sawhill, I. (2014). Family complexity: Is it a problem and if so, what should we do? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654, 240-245.

Toomey, R. B., Umana-Taylor, A. J., Williams, D. R., Harvey-Mendoza, E., Jahromi, L. B., & Updegraff, K. A. (2014). Impact of Arizona's SB 1070 immigration law on utilization of health care and public assistance among Mexican-Origin adolescent mothers and their mother figures. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(S1), S28-S34.

Wood, R. G., McConnell, S., Moore, Q., Clarkwest, A., & Hsueh, J. (2012). The effects of Building Strong Families: A healthy marriage and relationship skills education program for unmarried parents. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 31, 228-252.

so, what are the key mechanisms of change?

2. Should marriage be disestablished?
3. What are the implications of the 2015 Supreme Court ruling in favor of same-sex marriage for same-sex couple relationships and different-sex couple relationships?
4. Should the government be funding educational interventions for intimate relationships and/or be promoting marriage? If yes, give evidence to support your claim. If no, give alternatives to these interventions that would improve family life in the US.
5. Compare Toomey et al. (2014) and Baker (2015) in light of Sawhill (2014).
6. Apply at least two of the economic theories in Himmelweit et al. (2013) to your own area of interest.

**Final Exam: Due  
December 12<sup>th</sup>**

#### FINAL EXAM

The exam will be distributed in class on December 5<sup>th</sup> and a **printed hard copy along with the original exam sheet** is due in my mailbox by 4 pm on December 12<sup>th</sup>. I will not accept the exam electronically nor will I accept it without the hard copy of the original exam.

## How to take this course

There are a variety of reasons you might be taking this class. Maybe it is required, maybe you are interested in family research, maybe your advisor told you to take it.

Whatever your reason, you can do okay in this class by giving the material only cursory attention. Or, you can go deeper, and have a more meaningful experience that could shape your future research and teaching. It all depends upon your commitment. . .

## What kind of commitment do you want to make?

### hooking up

You cram before class by perusing the readings. When writing your reaction papers, you do so quickly, only skimming the parts of the papers you need to in order to get the paper done. You turn in your first draft, and do not revise. You come to class, but send the occasional text to a friend. The exam is hard for you; you have to do a lot of reading during the exam period. Overall, you are not really that into this course.

### dating

You do readings before class, giving each at least a cursory read. You spend some time on your reaction paper, reading it once out loud before turning it in. You find class discussion interesting, participating mostly with comments summarizing the readings. The exams are somewhat difficult for you; you have only given a cursory reading to the material so it is hard to synthesize. Overall, you are interested.

### married

You complete readings before class and have a study group where you go deeper into the readings and ask questions. Therefore, you have an easier time engaging in the reaction papers and exams, and you get more out of, and contribute more to, class discussion because you have already thought about the material. You can see how the material relates to your own research interests and have new ideas for scholarship that would push the literature forward. You find that you are passionate about the course material.

## Course Requirements

**Class participation (25%).** Graduate school is about developing critical thinking skills and advancing science. To do this, students must begin to understand that any scholarly discipline has multiple points of view and clashing values. Your task in this class is to analyze assumptions, challenge theories, and formulate alternative hypotheses or solutions to problems related to family scholarship. With this in mind, this class will not be taught in a lecture format, as this passive model of learning is not effective in graduate training. It will be discussion based. This means that to participate in class, you must come to class prepared, having read the assigned readings, and reflected on them. You are expected to come armed with questions, comments, challenges, and syntheses for discussion. High quality participation in this class involves not only asking questions and commenting on the readings, but also listening to, responding to, and learning from your peers. A quarter of your grade is based on your course participation and because verbal skills are so important in academia, part of your grade will be based on enthusiasm, thoughtfulness, and frequency of comments. Note that thoughtfulness is more important than frequency.

**Midterm exam (20%).** The midterm exam will consist of questions intended to assess your comprehension and integration of the course material to date. Questions will be similar to the weekly thought questions and I will ask you to respond to a subset of them. I will distribute the exam in class on October 10<sup>th</sup>. You may write your exam anywhere you like. A printed hard copy of the exam, along with the original exam sheet, is due in class on October 31<sup>st</sup>. I will not accept the exam electronically nor will I accept it without the hard copy of the original exam. I will also not accept the exam if you attempt to turn it in after the deadline. Please do not copy the hard copy of the exam.

**Final exam (25%).** The structure of the final exam will be similar to the midterm exam. It will primarily focus on material from the second half of the course, but will draw on material from the entire semester. Again, the exam will consist of questions intended to assess your comprehension and integration of the course material and questions will be similar to the weekly thought questions. I will distribute the exam in class on December



Neil Patrick Harris and David Burtka Family, 2015

5<sup>th</sup>. You may write your exam anywhere you like. A printed hard copy of the exam, along with the original exam sheet, is due in my mailbox by 4 pm on December 12<sup>th</sup>. I will not accept the exam electronically nor will I accept it without the hard copy of the original exam. I will also not accept the exam if you attempt to turn it in after the deadline. Please do not copy the hard copy of the exam.

**Weekly reaction papers (30%).** To develop your writing and critical thinking skills, both of which are essential for success in graduate school and beyond, you will be turning in weekly reaction papers. These papers will be written in response to **one** of several questions based on the readings for that week. Note you are allowed to use the question “Critically apply [theory] to your research area of interest” twice during the semester (it appears several weeks). You will turn in a hard copy of your paper at the beginning of the class in which it is due. You are required to **underline the main point or thesis (1-2 sentences)**. The thesis statement should summarize your main argument.

Papers should be about 2 pages, double-spaced. You are required to turn in 10 thought papers, but you will have opportunity to write a thought paper for 12 weeks. I will take the 10 highest grades. If you would like to revise a paper for a higher grade, you may revise two papers, once each. Revisions are due one week after you received the grade. Grading will be based on a 1 to 10 scale. Please make sure you proof read your writing for grammar and spelling errors. I often use the strategy of reading the paper out loud prior to turning a paper in, most often prior to journal submission.

Your reaction papers will be graded on the criteria show in the following rubric.

Grading Rubric for Reaction Papers										
Overall Quality of Ideas, Argument, and Effective Evidence										
Criteria	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discusses strengths of material, points out unresolved issues, considers multiple perspectives to explain behavior, critiques theory or methodology.</li> <li>• When critiquing theory or methodology, does not simply point out weaknesses, but also discusses how they can be improved.</li> <li>• Does <i>not</i> summarize the readings.</li> <li>• Develops one or two ideas in depth.</li> <li>• Demonstrates original critical thinking, depth of thinking, and synthesis of material.</li> </ul>	Meets all criteria at a high level; clear			Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear				Meets few criteria; unclear; confusing		
Organization, Development, Sentence Clarity, and Style										
Criteria	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has clear, easy-to-follow structure (reader doesn't get lost).</li> <li>• Ideas/argument sufficiently developed.</li> <li>• Has clear thesis statement.</li> <li>• Has clear, graceful, grammatically correct sentences.</li> </ul>	Meets all criteria at a high level; clear			Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear				Meets few criteria; unclear; confusing		
Editing Errors										
Criteria	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No major grammatical errors, few or no minor errors.</li> <li>• Strong professional ethos.</li> </ul>	Meets all criteria at a high level; clear			Meets some criteria; uneven; less clear				Meets few criteria; unclear; confusing		

## Policies

**Class norms** – We will discuss a variety of potentially sensitive topics in this course. In-class participation is part of your grade. But, you will not be evaluated on the degree to which you ascribe to my own beliefs. Further, my own beliefs may not be obvious. That said, you will most likely have different opinions, different experiences, and different emotional reactions to class material. Given this, I have a variety of expectations for the behaviors of students in this class. I have articulated these as “class norms”.

- Students should respect confidentiality. Specifically, another student’s personal information, experiences, or comments should not be shared outside the classroom.
- Students should listen respectfully to one another; different perspectives should be respected. Specifically, let other students finish their thought before you respond.
- Students should respond to the content of what is said in class. Specifically, you should comment on what the person said, not on the person saying it; your response to another student’s comments should not be personalized.
- Students should use "I statements" (such as "I believe that . . .) rather than generalizing their comments to a group to which they belong (e.g. Christians think. . .) or society or societal groups as a whole (All children of divorce. . .).
- Students should avoid playing the devil's advocate (but don't you think that. . .?) because the other student may not be comfortable having an argument in front of the class.
- All students have the right to be silent in any group discussion.

**Disabilities Statement: ODS Statement** – Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss specific needs. The Office of Disability Services is relied upon for assistance in verifying the need for accommodations and developing accommodation strategies. Please contact the Office for Disability Services at 614-292-3307 (V) or 614-292-0901 (TDD) in room 150 Pomerene Hall to coordinate reasonable accommodations; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/> . Students are expected to follow Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines for access to technology.

**Academic Misconduct** – The Ohio State University Code of Student Conduct (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as “Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process.” Example of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), and copying the work of another student. Ignorance of the University’s Code of Student Conduct is never considered an “excuse” for academic misconduct.



If I suspect that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course. I am obligated by University rules to report my suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If COAM determines that you have violated the University’s Code of Student Conduct (i.e., committed academic misconduct), the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University. For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct).

[http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource\\_cas.asp](http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_cas.asp)

**Statement on Diversity** – The College of Education and Human Ecology affirms the importance and value of diversity in the student body. Our programs and curricula reflect our multicultural society and global economy and seek to provide opportunities for students to learn more about persons who are different from them. Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender identity or expression, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited.

# Help & Resources

## If you are feeling lost or overwhelmed. . .

### 1. Make an appointment with me

I am more than happy to meet with you. You are welcome to email me, and we can find a time for us to meet. Many problems in any family can be resolved through open lines of communication!

### 2. Try forming a study group!

Study groups can help you by allowing you to: share notes and study tips, grapple with class material and bounce around ideas, learn class material faster and easier, and, make new friends! Consider forming a study group to help you manage the reading load for this course.

### 3. Visit the Writing Center often

You may visit the [Writing Center](#) at any point in time over the course of the semester. The Writing Center offers help at any stage of the writing process, and can give you substantive feedback on your writing. You can [schedule online](#) or call 614-688-4291.

### 4. Visit one of the OSU Health and Wellness Resources for Students

Ohio State has a rich set of resources for students who need a little help with a range of issues. There is the [Student Wellness Center](#), the [Wilce Student Health Center](#), and the [Counseling and Consultation Service](#), which provides students with up to 10 free sessions per academic year. If you are struggling this semester, come talk to me sooner rather than later. Do not wait until the end of the semester, when it will be too late.