

PRAEGER PERSPECTIVES

THE FAMILY IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

World Voices Supporting the "Natural" Clan



EDITED BY A. SCOTT LOVELESS AND THOMAS B. HOLMAN



VOLUME 3

Strengthening

The Family in the New Millennium

THE FAMILY IN THE NEW
MILLENNIUM

WORLD VOICES SUPPORTING
THE "NATURAL" CLAN

VOLUME 3

STRENGTHENING THE FAMILY

Edited by A. Scott Loveless and
Thomas B. Holman



PRAEGER PERSPECTIVES

PRAEGER

Westport, Connecticut

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Loveless, A. Scott and Holman, Thomas B.
The Family in the new millennium : world voices supporting the "natural" clan / edited
by A. Scott Loveless and Thomas B. Holman.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-275-99239-X (set : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-275-99240-3 (v. 1 : alk. paper) — ISBN
0-275-99241-1 (v. 2 : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-275-99242-X (v. 3 : alk. paper) 1. Family. 2.

Marriage. 3. Family policy. I. Loveless, A. Scott. II. Holman, Thomas. III. Title

HQ519.F37 2007

306.85—dc22 2006031055

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 2007 by Praeger Publishers

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be
reproduced, by any process or technique, without the
express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2006031055

ISBN: 0-275-99239-X (set) (alk. paper)

0-275-99240-3 (vol. 1)

0-275-99241-1 (vol. 2)

0-275-99242-X (vol. 3)

First published in 2007

Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881

An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

www.praeger.com

Printed in the United States of America



The paper used in this book complies with the
Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National
Information Standards Organization (Z39.48-1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

These volumes are not published or endorsed by the United Nations System.

Every reasonable effort has been made to trace the owners of copyrighted materials in this
book, but in some instances this has proven impossible. The authors and publisher will be
pleased to provide information leading to more complete acknowledgments in subsequent

Contents

Preface of Her Highness Shiekha Mozah Bint Nasser Al-Missned, Consort of His Highness the Emir of Qatar and President of the Supreme Council for Family Affairs of Qatar	ix
Preface of the NGO Working Committee <i>Richard G. Wilkins</i> Managing Director, The Doha International Institute for Family Studies and Development, Doha, Qatar	xiii
Acknowledgments	xv
Section 1: Family Values	1
Chapter 1: Aristotle and Aquinas on the Family and the Political Community <i>Montague Brown</i> (USA) Professor of Philosophy, St. Anselm College Manchester, New Hampshire, USA	3
Chapter 2: Two Competing Value Systems: Premises and Consequences; Legal and Pragmatic <i>A. Scott Loveless</i> (USA) World Family Policy Center J. Reuben Clark Law School Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA	15
Chapter 3: Belonging: The Formation of Human Capital as Expressed in the Five Basic Institutions of Society <i>Patrick F. Fagan</i> (USA) The William H.G. FitzGerald Fellow in Family and Culture Studies The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA	36
Chapter 4: Mother Teresa, John Paul II, and Christian Personalism vs. Peter Singer and Utilitarianism: Two Radically Opposed Conceptions of the Nature and Meaning of Family <i>Peter J. Colosi</i> (Austria) Assistant Professor of Philosophy Franciscan University, Gaming, Austria	49
Chapter 5: The Family and Development: A Muslim Perspective <i>Mahathir Bin Mohamad</i> (Malaysia) The Honorable Tun Former Prime Minister, Malaysia	66

Chapter 6: The Decision to Love: A Jewish Perspective	73	Chapter 14: Family-Friendly Child-Care Services in a Welfare State: An Outline of the Swedish Christian Democrat Party's Family Policy	165
<i>Michael Gold</i> (USA)		<i>Tuve Skånberg</i> (Sweden)	
Rabbi, Tamarac, Florida, USA		Member of the Riksdagen (Parliament), Sweden	
Chapter 7: Summarizing Catholic Doctrine on the Family: A Christian Perspective	78	Chapter 15: Building Healthy Communities: The Family is the Basic Group Unit of Society—The Malaysian Experience	181
<i>William L. Saunders, Jr.</i> (USA)		<i>Fatimah Saad</i> (Malaysia)	
The Family Research Council, Washington, D.C., USA		Director General	
Chapter 8: The Aging Population Explosion: An Overview of Medical Ethics and Family Problems	88	National Population and Family Development Board, Malaysia	
<i>John Collins Harvey</i> (USA)		Chapter 16: Resiliency Factors in Refugee Families	192
Professor of Medicine Emeritus, Georgetown University		<i>Angelea Panos</i> (USA)	
Senior Research Scholar, Center for Clinical Bioethics		Director, International Center for Child and Family Resiliency, USA	
Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington, D.C., USA		<i>Patrick Panos</i> (USA)	
Chapter 9: Development of Prosocial Behavior and Empathy in the Hand that Rocks the Cradle	98	School of Social Work, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA	
<i>Mohammadreza Hojat</i> (USA)		Chapter 17: Strict Scrutiny of Prospective Adoptive Parents: What Children Really Need	204
Professor of Medicine, Center for Research in Medical Education and Health Care, Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, Jefferson Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA		<i>A. Dean Byrd</i> (USA)	
Chapter 10: Intergenerational Relationships: Towards Promoting a Culture of Dialogue	107	Professor, University of Utah School of Medicine	
<i>Michael Schluter</i> (UK)		Salt Lake City, Utah, USA	
Founder and President		<i>Shirley E. Cox</i> (USA)	
The Relationships Foundation, UK	115	School of Social Work, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA	
Chapter 11: The Impact of Globalization on the Transgenerational Transmission of Knowledge Skills, Values, and Norms in Hitherto Isolated, Remote Communities	115	Chapter 18: The Impact of Migration on Family Structure and Functioning in Java	220
<i>Laetitia van Haren</i> (The Netherlands)		<i>Ekawati S. Wahyuni</i> (Indonesia)	
Cultural Anthropologist, Research Fellow, CERES		Lecturer, Department of Social and Economic Sciences	
Freelance Researcher and Consultant, France		Faculty of Agriculture	
Section 2 Government Policy	129	Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor, Indonesia	
Chapter 12: New Zealand—The First Feminist Nation?	131	Chapter 19: The Nation-State, the Family, and the Rule of Law in New Zealand: An Indivisible Trinity	244
<i>Alexis Stuart</i> (New Zealand)		<i>Bruce Logan</i> (New Zealand)	
Journalist, Social Policy Analyst		Director, Maxim Institute	
Christchurch, New Zealand		Christchurch, New Zealand	
Chapter 13: Clearing Up Three Misunderstandings about the Convention on the Rights of the Child	145	Chapter 20: Indian Families in Transition: Implications for Family Policy	263
<i>Bruce Abramson</i> (Switzerland)		<i>Lina D. Kashyap</i> (India)	
Human Rights Attorney, Geneva, Switzerland		Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India	
		Chapter 21: The Fundamental Principles of Family Policy: Rethinking the "Rights of the Family" in a Society Undergoing Globalization	274
		<i>Pierpaolo Donati</i> (Italy)	
		Professor of Sociology, University of Bologna, Italy	

Chapter 22: No-Fault Divorce Laws and Divorce Rates in the United States and Europe: Variations and Correlations	306
<i>John Crouch</i> (USA) Attorney at Law Americans for Divorce Reform, Arlington, Virginia, USA with <i>Richard Beaulieu</i> (USA) Americans for Divorce Reform, Arlington, Virginia, USA	
Chapter 23: My Family Story	332
<i>Wade Horn</i> (USA) Assistant Secretary for Children and Families United States Department of Health and Human Services Washington, D.C., USA	
Chapter 24: Latvia—Implementing the Principles of the Doha Declaration	341
<i>Inese Slesere</i> (Latvia) Member of Saeima (Parliament), Latvia	
Chapter 25: Analysis of Islam and Muslim States' International Support for Family	348
<i>Farooq Hassan</i> (Pakistan) Barrister at Law, Lahore, Pakistan	
Chapter 26: International Law and the Family: Building on the Doha Declaration	365
<i>Richard G. Wilkins</i> (USA) Managing Director The Doha International Institute for Family Studies and Development Doha, Qatar	
Afterword	383
Appendix A: Universal Declaration of Human Rights	385
Appendix B: Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the Family	391
Appendix C: Plan of Action on the Family in Africa	395
About the Editors and Contributors	401
Index	413

Preface of Her Highness Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al-Missned

In the Name of God, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful:

We are pleased to publish this collection of international scholarship, gathered during the 2004 Doha International Conference for the Family. The Conference culminated on 29–30 November 2004 in Doha, Qatar. This gathering, held to celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the International Year of the Family, was preceded by a series of conferences and meetings held in various cities and continents around the world. Those meetings reaffirmed the importance and vitality of the family, regardless of cultural, social, and national backgrounds and interests.

There is no common denominator better able to bridge the gap between different people from around the world, despite conflicts and diversity, than a firm belief in the sacred nature of the family. All divine laws have blessed this sacred institution, which forges a strong bond between males and females, a bond which conforms to human nature in bearing and raising new generations that, in turn, contribute to building civilization.

The Doha International Conference for the Family emphasized the ongoing need to re-energize the role of the family in public life. These volumes provide a new opportunity for global society to discuss the role of the family and to participate in promoting the family as the fundamental pillar of society and repository for values and high ideals. As shown in these volumes, the family plays an important role as a safety valve to reduce social pressures on the individual—pressures that have rapidly increased in the modern world. By performing this, and other functions, the family safeguards social stability and security.

I praise the fact that these volumes address various issues of paramount importance confronting the family in the New Millennium. The modern family faces serious challenges that should be addressed, without delay, by serious thought and action. The concept of the family, as we all know, has been defined at times in a manner contrary to established social norms, religious values, and basic concepts of human consciousness. We should resist these notions, especially those that are promoted solely under the guise of modernity. Modernity cannot be accepted as a pretext to bypass social, cultural, and religious values that have long shielded and maintained the family.

The family in the New Millennium is charged with new responsibilities, including social progress and development, which must be discharged effectively. An enlightened, strong, and stable family not only provides a safety net for men, women, and children, it also safeguards society. By properly fulfilling its fundamental role of bearing, rearing, and teaching children, the family contributes to strengthening intercultural dialogue and forgiveness, as it

The Impact of Migration on Family Structure and Functioning in Java

Ekawati S. Wahyuni (Indonesia)

Lecturer, Department of Social and Economic Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture

Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor, Indonesia

The vast population mobility between regions in Indonesia in the past two decades is closely associated with the development of transportation and communication systems. These have made traveling in Indonesia easier (Hugo et al., 1987), and the economic development policies implemented by the government have played a major role in accelerating movement between regions within the country. People generally move from rural or less-developed areas to urban or developed areas.

Migration of one or more members of a family influences the way the family functions and the way it distributes its internal roles. The absence of particular family members, either on a permanent or temporary basis, affects family structure, in both destination and origin areas (Hugo, 1987). Following the changing of its structure, the family has to make adjustments, for example, in the roles of family members left behind. During the husbands' absence, the wives may take over several of his roles in order to maintain the necessary family functions, such as handling more agricultural tasks (Siegel, 1969; Colfer, 1985; Rodenburg, A.N., 1993; Rodenburg, J., 1993) or acting as a *de facto* household head (Hetler, 1986), and may represent the household in community activities, such as attending community meetings, becoming involved in community activities, and paying taxes (Hetler, 1986). In addition, there is always a chance that migration of adult children to the cities will adversely influence the well-being of their elderly parents in the rural areas (Hugo, 1987).

Although several studies have discussed the impact of migration on the family, there is a lack of information about the impact of migration on family structure and functioning in Indonesia. How does migration influence the family structure? How do families cope with the instability due to the migration of particular members of the family? What do they do to maintain the family's function in the larger society? How do they change the distribution of roles among the family members left behind? This chapter is intended to explain the impact of migration on family structure and functioning among the Javanese ethnic group.

This study is focused on internal migration in Java island, and this has been carried out in an area of out-migration, a village in Central Java, and in a destination area in West Java. Java is the most densely populated island in Indonesia and is relatively more developed than the other islands. The island comprises only seven percent of the total land area of Indonesia, but more than 100 million people, about half the population, reside there. Administratively Java is divided into six provinces, namely Banten, Jakarta Special Region, West Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta Special Region, and East Java. Two major ethnic groups are native to Java, the Javanese and Sundanese, and there are several minorities. The Javanese mostly live in Yogyakarta, Central and East Java provinces, while the Sundanese heartland is West Java and Banten. Jakarta Special Region is the Capital of Indonesia and accommodates almost all ethnic groups in Indonesia.

Two methods of data collection are used in the study, a survey in the origin village and a qualitative approach in both areas. The survey data are used to obtain the magnitude of out-migration, while the data from qualitative interview are used to explain the reasons for migration and the impact of migration on family structure and functioning. This report presents only the qualitative.

Migration as a Family Strategy: Cross-National Findings

Household's Socioeconomic Condition as a Migration Factor

Migration for economic survival is more likely to occur among the lower strata families, whereas the better off tend to use migration as a wealth accumulation strategy (Arizpe, 1981; Cornel et al., 1976; Findley, 1987). If the purpose of migration is to gain greater wealth, families will send their children of both sexes out to get a better education or to find more lucrative employment (Connell et al., 1976; Arizpe, 1981; Trager, 1984b; Radcliffe, 1986). However, in North Tapanuli, Indonesia, both rich and poor families send their children, preferably their sons, to migrate to get a better education, perceiving that education is the only way to get a white-collar or nonagricultural job (Rodenburg, A.N., 1993). Migration of sons in North Tapanuli, Indonesia, cannot be associated directly with a household strategy, but is mainly motivated by individual job expectations and the reciprocity relation between parents and their children as a basic moral consideration. However, once the son has secured a salaried job the "counter obligation" definitely occurs, by sending remittances to the village to support elderly parents or to pay for younger siblings' school fees or to provide accommodation and other help for his siblings in the city. In fact, wealthier families have a greater chance to control their sons' income than poorer ones, because wealthier families tend to invest more in their sons' success, having the ability to pay for their education or to arrange that employment, whereas the children's success from poorer families mostly depends on their own efforts.

Beyond the ability to take risk or to finance migration costs, the availability of family labor is also an important consideration in a family's decision to

send its members out to migrate. The family is able to send out its members to migrate if the family labor situation includes the following factors (Guest, 1993): (a) the amount of family labor is above the minimum requirement to produce goods and services to meet the household's subsistence needs (Guest, 1989; Pessar, 1982); (b) hired labor can be afforded to replace family labor that has migrated (Connell et al., 1976; Roberts, 1982); and (c) the family is able to maximize the use of the remaining family labor (Deere, 1982). Larger landholder families are not dependent on family because they already use hired labor (Connell et al., 1976; Roberts, 1982). The small landholder family, by contrast, does not need a large amount of labor for agricultural work. Therefore, migration is more likely to occur in both low and high income families. For middle size landholder families, however, the decision to send their members to migrate must be made in a more careful way. If the family chooses to send its members to migrate, it faces a problem of losing labor for agricultural work or other reproduction tasks, because the family cannot afford hired labor to replace the loss. Consequently, the family will not be able to maximize production from its land and therefore will be more dependent on migrant income. However, if the family does not send any of its members to migrate, its income source depends solely on agricultural products, which are usually relatively small (Arizpe, 1981).

Family Structure as a Migration Factor

Family labor availability is determined by the structure of the family, and the structure of the family, in turn, is a function of the number of family members, its composition, and the stage of the family life cycle (Guest, 1989, 1993; Radcliffe, 1986; Hugo, 1987; Arizpe, 1981). The more family labor available, the more likely the family will send a family member out for migration (Connell et al., 1976; Findley, 1987; Lauby & Stark, 1988; Guest, 1989; Root & De Jong, 1991).

Besides size of family, the composition and the stage of the family life cycle will influence the choice of which family members are sent out for migration (Guest, 1989; Arizpe, 1981; Radcliffe, 1990). Migration usually involves the working age population; therefore the more working age members are available in the family, the more likely migration is to occur. The sex of the family member is also an important factor. Three factors influence the family in deciding whether to send male or female members to migrate: the culture of the society of origin, the socioeconomic condition of the family, and the type of labor force demand at the destination.

Among poor families, which use migration as a means of economic survival, a family with children of working age often sends its most dependent members to migrate so as to assert control over their income, which often therefore involves young female members (Trager, 1984a; Lauby & Stark, 1988; Radcliffe, 1990). Individual cultures vary on this point, however. Daughters are expected to contribute to parents more than sons in the Philippines (Trager, 1984b) and in Sri Lanka (Rosa, 1989), for example, but in North

Tapanuli, Indonesia, families expect greater remittances from their migrant sons than from their daughters (Rodenburg, A.N., 1993).

Taiwan presents another variation. Here parents insist that their daughters work and give their earnings to the family, a cultural norm of repaying a daughter's parents for raising her (Wolf, 1972; Kung, 1978). Parents will refuse to send a daughter to the city if she is the only available daughter at home because the family depends on her to perform household domestic tasks or to give help in agricultural activities (Kung, 1978). What is more, parents also play a major role in deciding where their daughters should go for work. They will only give permission to their daughters to work in nearby places so they do not have to live separated from the family. The parents often explain such living arrangements as protecting the daughters from bad influences, from their new friends, and from city life. However, this original reason described by Wolf (1972) has been criticized by Kung (1978), who asserted that the reason parents keep their daughters at home is purely economic; by keeping daughters at home, parents will have more control over their income. If the daughter must pay to live in a dormitory, the family will receive a much smaller share of her income. Kung noted that daughters' needs in Taiwan rarely become a priority in the families' spending patterns, and that when the family needs a larger share of her income, a daughter will often sacrifice her own education for the family's well-being.

However, women's migration is not always related to a household strategy. In some cases the woman's mobility is decided independently, without any familial considerations. In poor Javanese families, daughters have more freedom to decide where to work without parent's direction (Wolf, 1990). By working in the city the girls have more chance to meet a nonfarmer future husband and buy cosmetics and fancy dresses (Wolf, 1986b). However, the money they earn is used to sustain the family household in difficult times, such as crop failure, drought, or others impacts of natural disasters.

In the case of young families, where the only available working age persons are the parents, the father will often migrate, and the mother will stay at home to manage the household and take care of the children (Arizpe, 1981; Radcliffe, 1986) and/or to undertake the agricultural tasks (Rodenburg, A.N., 1993; Rodenburg, J., 1993). They believe that once a woman is married, her place is at home to take care of the children and family, and she should no longer participate in independent mobility (Radcliffe, 1986; Rodenburg, A.N., 1993; Rodenburg, J., 1993). However, for poor families, the privilege of a married woman to stay at home sometimes does not work. If a husband's income is insufficient to meet the family's subsistence needs, the wives are forced to enter the labor market. Married women usually migrate for shorter periods than single women and often are accompanied by their husbands or children (Radcliffe, 1986, 1990). In Central Java, Indonesia, in addition to migrating together with their husbands and leaving their children to the extended family members, some poor women also migrate independently and leave their husbands in the village (Hetler, 1986, 1990). This kind of migration

arrangement is usually undertaken when a better income is available for women in the city, whereas the men still have the opportunity to generate income in the village. Therefore, some families adopt a strategy that lets the husbands stay in the village to undertake agricultural work, while the wives work in the city to earn cash (Hetler, 1990).

The Family in Javanese Society

The Javanese Kinship System

According to Geertz (1961) the Javanese kinship system has two important characteristics, namely nuclear and bilateral. First, the nuclear family is structurally an autonomous unit separated from extended kin groups. Kinsmen in such families are only considered as people to ask for help or to share a joy. The influence of the wife's kinswomen network is also apparent as a secondary structure, forming a kinship organization called matrifocal. Second, the Javanese kinship system is bilateral. In this sense,

Kinship terminology is absolutely symmetrical in regard to maternal and paternal kinsmen. Descent is reckoned equally through the father and the mother. Inherited property is divided equally among siblings of both sexes, and each child has claimed to inherit property from both his mother and his father and their respected relatives. Residence at marriage is bilocal in the first year, or so, neolocal after that, with no specific customary preference for proximity to one set of parents. (Geertz, 1961, p. 76).

One implication of this bilateral system is that there is no sex preference for children among Javanese parents. Both sexes are important, because they have different roles (Darroch et al., 1981; Berninghausen & Kerstan, 1992). Girls play an emotional role, and they will help with household tasks and take care of elderly parents, while boys have a protective role and will support the family in financial terms. Studies in the 1970s showed that 62 percent and 51 percent of Javanese women and men, respectively, do not have preferences for their children's sex (Darroch et al., 1981), while Berninghausen and Kerstan (1992, p. 126) in the 1980s showed that 49 percent of their respondents equally wanted both sexes.

Another implication of the bilateral kinship system is the rule of domicile of a newly married couple. According to Koentjaraningrat (1967, p. 257), "there is no fixed rule of residence determining where a married couple should live." They can live close to the husband's family or near the wife's family or set up their new household in a different location altogether. In her study Geertz (1961) found that new couples usually lived close to the wife's family rather than the husband's, although if the husband's parents were better off, the new couple would live nearer to them (Koentjaraningrat, 1967). The recent study by Berninghausen and Kerstan (1992, p. 69) showed that 80 percent of married couples lived in the husband's village. On this basis they concluded that the rule of domicile in their study area was patrifocal,

and that a matrifocal domicile was an exception. They also mentioned, however, women who stayed in their village of origin after marriage were those who had a high economic position, who "received the most respect in the family and made most of the important decisions" (Berninghausen & Kerstan, 1992, p. 70).

The Definition of Family and Household

The basic unit in Javanese society is the *somah* or household (Koentjaraningrat, 1967, p. 260), which does not always mean a separate dwelling but is rather characterized by a separate kitchen used by a Javanese family to cook the common meal. To describe the meaning of *somah*, Jay (1969, p. 53) called it a "hearthhold." He stated that the hearthhold is "identified with the conception of the nuclear family as an independent economic unit" (Jay, 1969, p. 54). A newlywed couple can be considered a mature nuclear family when they can support themselves economically by providing their own food, even if they do not occupy a separate dwelling. The nuclear family (*batih* in Indonesian) is a "tight unit," augmented by one or two relatives, usually a widowed parent of one spouse, single younger siblings, nephews, nieces, or other close relatives (Geertz, 1961; Jay, 1969; Evans, 1984). Among larger households, which usually encompass well-to-do families, the nuclear family may also include at least one preadolescent relative to serve the house (Koentjaraningrat, 1967, p. 260). In this arrangement the children are being taken care of by the family, but they are not adopted into the family. The relation between the children and the natural parents therefore remains intact, and they do not acquire inheritance rights from their foster parents' home. This arrangement occurs because the well-to-do families have the capability to help their less fortunate relatives by taking care of their children and sending them to school. The children then provide household help in return. However, as economic conditions have improved, this type of living arrangement has become very rare. Most villagers today are able at least to send their children to primary school.

Family Functions

According to Geertz (1961), the "bilateral and nucleating" Javanese kinship system has reduced the effective contribution of the family to the stability and continuity of Javanese society. Because the nuclear family at present comprises the only important kinship unit and it does not consider other kinsmen in the family decision-making process, it does not play a central role in structuring economic, political, and religious behavior in Javanese society. The most important remaining functions of the Javanese family are as an economic provider and as a socialization agent.

As mentioned elsewhere, the importance of family in society is central, because it bridges individuals to their society. Individual members of society

are born within a family, which then provides their primary child care. One major responsibility of child care is to socialize the new family members with the type of social behavior expected of a mature Javanese (Geertz, 1961). She explained that young children are expected to learn the "fundamental rules and attitudes for proper adults relationships with their neighbors, superiors and inferiors." One of the first lessons is how to use the proper expressions relating to differential status that is learned from parents and siblings and then from other kinsfolk who allow them to practice appropriate variations. In this way, Geertz concluded, families cultivate and preserve primary Javanese ethical norms within its individual members. And this is a major contribution of the family to the functioning of Javanese society.

The family is also a place of economic cooperation between husband and wife. In this cooperation the family becomes the basic group for both consumption and production (Geertz, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1967; Jay, 1969). This means that all of the family members pool what they earn into one household account and then receive their share according to individual need. A division of labor between husband and wife concretizes this economic cooperation within a nuclear family; husband and wife work together to maintain the family, and in these relationships, both husband and wife have equal status, although the husband is the nominal head of the household. Koentjaraningrat (1967) articulated this sort of cooperation in agricultural activities:

Preparation of the soil for tillage, plowing, harrowing, and the repair of irrigation works fall primarily within the masculine sphere of activities, whereas women do most of the planting, weeding, harvesting, and threshing, as well as the further processing, preservation, and preparing of food. Both sexes transport crops from the field to the home, and products from home to the market, but in many market centers one notices a predominance of female buyers and sellers (p. 260).

However, women do not play an important role in public and political affairs, which caused some feminist scholars (Bernighausen & Kerstan, 1992; Wolf, 1992) to reject Geertz's (1961) conclusion that women occupy a strong position in Javanese society. Geertz's statement was premised on the observations that there is no limitation on occupation for Javanese women, that they have the right to own farms and supervise its cultivation, and that they therefore have no difficulty in supporting themselves. But the observations of the feminist scholars interpret women's activities in managing the household as simply obeying men's will. They perceived the less important role of women in the public sphere as indicating their powerlessness.

Family Structure

Household Composition

Having a separate house or dwelling is not an important characteristic of a single nuclear family. Therefore, one household is not always composed of a

single nuclear family, although it is the most common living arrangement in Javanese society. A single dwelling can be occupied by "a single person, widowed or divorced, by an elderly couple whose children have moved away, by a widow or divorcee with her children, by a married couple and their children or by any combination of these" (Jay, 1969, p. 51). Various studies of Javanese society have shown that more than 50 percent of households are composed of a single nuclear family. In his study in Tjelapar, a village in southern Central Java, Koentjaraningrat (1967, p. 250) said that "369 nuclear families...live in 351 houses," indicating that the majority of nuclear families live in separate houses. In her study of "Modjokuto," a pseudo name of a small town in East Java, Geertz (1961) found that 58 percent of her city sample households were nuclear families compared to 75 percent in the village (Jay, 1969). More recent studies undertaken in the 1980s, still showed the dominance of nuclear families. Evans's study in urban Java (1984) reported that 58 percent of his sample households consisted of nuclear families, while in her research in rural Java, Wolf (1992) ascertained the figure at 60 percent. A similar result was also suggested by Hetler (1986), who found that 78 percent of the village population had status as spouse and children related to their household's head, while only 17 percent had status as parents, sons- or daughters-in-law, or grandchildren.

The other types of households are composed of augmented nuclear families, multiple nuclear families (stem and joint families), and single adults. These extended family households are most likely to exist in urban areas rather than in rural areas (Geertz, 1961; Evans, 1984) due to the housing shortages in urban areas and the arrival of single villagers, either to find a job or to attend a school, to stay with their town relatives. The other reasons for family extension are the arrival of a new son- or daughter-in-law, the union of nuclear families with their aging parents, the union of widowed elderly parents, the return of one divorced daughter with her children, or a joint family with two or more siblings living together.

The single most common reason for a multiple family household is a newlywed couple living with the bride's parents for a few years (Geertz, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1967; Jay, 1969). Because they often marry at a very young age, about thirteen to eighteen for girls and fifteen to twenty for boys, the new couple are usually not able to afford their living cost (Koentjaraningrat, 1967, p. 257) and they need their parents' help. But after usually five years, when they are considered self-sufficient, they live in a separate house. The second and third most common reasons for multiple households are children taking care of their elderly parents. The fourth most common situation is that of a divorced woman rejoining her parents' family and returning to her role as a daughter. Another reason for family extension is the migration activity of family members. Hetler (1986) reported that due to the circulation or migration activities of wives or husbands or both, married couples often choose to live in an extended family form, because they need other able-bodied relatives to take care of their households and children while they are

away. Therefore, instead of moving out from their parents' house, married children choose to stay with them permanently. In this category 60 percent were daughters and 40 percent were sons.

Household Size

According to Koentjaraningrat (1967, 250) most Javanese tend to have a large family, due to their belief that "children are a blessing" and they will take care of their aging parents (Geertz, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1967). Therefore one family usually bears many children, but due to a high infant mortality rate, household size remained small. In his study area in Tjelapar, Koentjaraningrat found that the average size of a nuclear family (*batih*) was 5.1 (1967, p. 250). An almost identical figure, 5.3, was reported by Geertz (1961, p. 32) as the average household size in her study area. Jay found the average size of the hearthholds to be 4.7 and for the households 5.2 (1969). These studies were conducted in the 1950s, when the demographic condition in Indonesia still showed high fertility rates and a decreasing mortality rate (Nitisastro, 1970) and the Indonesian government still had a pro-natalist view (Hatmadji & Anwar, 1993). However, more recent studies carried out in the 1980s, after the birth control program had become a major focus in Indonesia's development strategy, do not demonstrate a decreasing family size. Evans (1984) reports that the average urban Javanese household in Surakarta was 5.1, and the nuclear family size was 4.7. Hetler's figures in 1986 were actually higher.

Family Formation

In Javanese society marriage and the birth of a child mark the beginning of a new family, creating rights and obligations between the spouses (Jay, 1969). In the past, although the youth were allowed to choose their own spouses, most marriages were arranged by the parents (Geertz, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1967; Jay, 1969). As a result, it was quite common for a couple to not know each other until the wedding day, or at least until they began to court with both parents' consent. Arranged marriages usually affect girls rather than boys. In this sense, boys tend to have greater freedom to make a choice for a future wife. Therefore, they could make a choice, or refuse their parents' recommendation. According to Berninghausen and Kerstan (1992, p. 113), arranged marriage for girls means that "they do not have control over themselves and their needs; rather, they're traded by their families." Although recent studies report a decrease in arranged marriages, they still do occur, but in a different way, through reducing the number of arranged marriages made by parents without consulting the children or by providing more allowance for girls to refuse their parents' will (Hull & Hull, 1987; Berninghausen & Kerstan, 1992; Wolf, 1992). Arranged marriages substantially decreased among middle-class women (Hull, 1975) in the urban population (Hull & Hull, 1987) and among daughters of factory workers (Wolf, 1992).

This change has taken place slowly as a consequence of increasing female education, industrialization, and urban life, and it is closely related with the "increasing age at marriage, declining divorce rates and decreasing fertility" (Wolf, 1992, p. 213). Age at marriage has been steadily rising. Formerly, people were married at a very young age, sometimes even before the bride began menstruating (Hull, 1975; Singarimbun & Manning, 1974). But today the practice of such early marriage has become very rare. Berninghausen and Kerstan (1992, p. 111) reported that 75 percent of women who married between the ages of thirteen and sixteen had either never gone to school or did not finish school, whereas 50 percent of women who married at nineteen or later had completed school. They also noted that parents who had made the investment to educate their daughters supported the delayed marriage until they finished school in the hope that their educated daughters would eventually find better (more educated and well-off) husbands. Another reason for parents to support their daughters' delay in marriage is the girls' significant contribution to the household economy, the potential of which is increased if the education is completed (Wolf, 1992).

One effect of self-selected mates and delayed marriage is a reduction in the divorce rate. Because young couples do not know each other when they first marry and they are too young to take the expected responsibilities of married people, conflicts between them easily emerge within their married life. These conflicts often end up in divorce, and because of the high incidence of arranged marriages and early marriages, in addition to the lack of a conception that divorce is morally wrong, the divorce rate among Javanese people is quite high (Geertz, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1967; Jay, 1969; Singarimbun & Manning, 1974). According to Berninghausen and Kerstan (1992, pp. 135-6), the belief has increased among the young girls that "love and partnership in marital relationship" will guarantee a stable marriage, although most of their mothers did not have such beliefs. These authors also noted that more people had accepted the idea that divorce is "something undesirable." Nevertheless, about 33 percent of all women and 22 percent of all men still have the opinion that divorce is a normal situation. The incidence of frequent divorce and one person remarrying creates a difficulty in studying the family life cycle, because of the complexity it introduces into the family history (Wolf, 1992). Wolf argued that the changes in family structure cannot be seen as a simple movement of passing, for example, from an extended structure to a nuclear one, but rather as a fluctuation from one structure to the other. We can say, based on various facts about Javanese families mentioned earlier, that the Javanese family system is nuclear in structure but extended in function.

Migrations and the Structure of the Javanese Family

The definition of household structure used in this study is that of household members living with the head of a household, with or without any family or kin relation. A family is defined as a group of people who are related to

each other by blood, marriage, or adoption. Consequently, the *household* structure does not always reflect family structure because a household, by definition, does not necessarily consist of people who have blood, marriage, or adoptive relations.¹ That said, most households do consist of a family, either nuclear or extended. However, the tendency toward nonfamilial households is increasing, especially in urban areas.

Although there is a high rate of family migration, most people migrate as individuals. The direct impact to the family structure of the migration of one or more family or household members is the splitting of a family into two or more households geographically dispersed between the village of origin and the destination area (Wahyuni 2000). When children of a rural household migrate to an urban area, it reduces the original household size. If the individual rural migrant joins a household in an urban area, it increases the urban household size, or, if the migrant lives alone forming a single person or nonfamilial household, it increases the number of nonfamilial urban households. The addition of rural relatives changes the urban family structure. The migration of children to the city may not affect the family structure in the village, but when the head of a rural household or his spouse migrates to an urban area, it both reduces the household size and changes the family structure. The rural family becomes a *de facto* single-parent family, which can last for decades. Most interviewed migrants had experienced living in a divided family for many years. The divided home, caused by the migration of the household head or spouse, often did not end until the rest of the family members also eventually migrated to join the household head in the urban area, or the household head returned to the village permanently. The divided home also affects the ability of the family to function as a socialization agent and/or as an economic unit. The family must adjust the role of each family member in order to fulfill these functions in society.

As greater economic opportunities have become available for women in urban areas, the tendency for rural women to migrate to the city has also increased. These migrant women usually form nonfamilial households in the city by sharing a house or rented room with other migrants from the same village. The local government generally records this kind of household as an independent household, increasing the statistical tendency for women to appear as heading an urban, migrant household (Wahyuni, 2000). These migrant women are usually still single, although if they are married, their husbands usually do not accompany them to the city, and they are therefore still counted as single women. In Indonesian society, a husband automatically will be acknowledged as the household head in the *de jure* sense, while a married woman is considered a spouse. A married woman normally could not head a household, but a single woman can, whether she has never married or been widowed or divorced. A migrant married woman in an urban area, however, is considered a single woman and is counted as a household head. A nonfamilial household in a destination area for migration is important only for purposes of population administration. It is easier for a local government

to track its population by registering the people in a household unit and choosing one household member as the household head who will represent all household members in the community (Wahyuni, 2000). A nonfamilial household does not have the same obligations or roles as a familial household. They may or may not make provision for food or other essentials for living. The house practically functions as a place for sleeping and taking rest after working. Some household members never even meet with the other occupants of the house, as some of them work a night shift and the others work in the daytime. For nonpermanent migrants, their home and families remain in the village.

Migration and the Functioning of the Javanese Family

As explained previously, migration affects family functioning. The following analysis uses the nuclear family as the basic unit to identify family functions and to explain the effects of including the roles of extended families in the functioning of migrant nuclear families.² This analysis emphasizes the economic and reproduction functions, especially focusing on child care and the socialization of young children. The socialization of young children, including both physical care and education, follows as a consequence of the earlier reproduction function of the nuclear family. Reproduction must occur primarily within the nuclear family, while to be able to survive a family must also form a solid economic unit. In other words, the nuclear family produces both people and the economy that supports the people.

The Economic Function

Economic cooperation within the nuclear family refers to the pooling of income earned by individual family members or from family businesses into one purse and then distributing it among the household members according to individual needs. Economic cooperation can be identified from the practices of labor division between husband and wife. Koentjaraningrat (1967) has described economic cooperation in agricultural activities, while Jay (1969) has provided the following explanation of one of his informants, relating to the independence of the nuclear family economy:

Any money coming in that I earned went to my wife. She kept it and used it for our own household expenses; it was not given to her parents. Also the rice stores were kept separate, and the rice was cooked separately... If the rice was all gone, she might borrow from her parents and repay from the next harvest, or she might sell things later to repay or buy more rice (Jay, 1969, p. 54).

This quotation is from the 1950s, when the economy of Indonesia was less industrial than today. In the present study, which was conducted in the mid-1990s, after industrialization had become an important aspect of the Indonesian economy and many Indonesians engaged in economic activities outside

the household, the function of the nuclear family as an independent economic unit is still maintained, especially by married couples.

The lack of control over economic resources among villagers in the village of origin has forced less well-off families to allow their young children to search for work in the city (Wahyuni 2000). Based on information on remittances provided by these families, the children's earnings are often not pooled into a single household purse; the migrants' children keep and manage their own income for their own needs. Although the children were not obligated to send regular remittances to support their families in the village, it was common for them to comply with requests for money from the family in the village for certain purposes, such as to pay for their younger siblings' school expenses, medical treatments, or house renovation. Parents rarely ask for financial assistance to pay for their everyday meals; the main intention of the families in allowing their young children to migrate is to relieve some of the economic burdens on the poor parents. The parents are always grateful when their children are able to support themselves, and even more grateful if their children are willing to pay for their younger siblings' school expenses. Although some female factory workers might put their savings into goats to be reared in the village, most spend their earnings freely on themselves (Wolf, 1986b, 1992). These female workers frequently buy luxury items such as cosmetics, soap bars, or long pants to show off their success to the villagers (Wolf, 1986b).

The involvement of migrant family members in the household economy, however, is different when a migrant is the head of a household (Wahyuni 2000). In this situation the migrant tends to serve as the main provider in the village household, even when not living or residing there. The main objective of this type of migration is to seek better job opportunities in the city at the cost of separation from his family for most of the year. This situation is adopted as a family strategy. Most migrant husbands in this situation are not only away for a distinct period of time, they may be gone for decades. One man has been living separately from his family for about thirteen years, and at present there is no indication of him giving up his job in Bandung, West Java, and joining his family in the village. Although the family owns a piece of agricultural land, it is only enough to meet the household's consumption needs, but they need much more than that. He explained his intention to stay in Bandung longer as follows:

My children are growing up and we need more money to send them to high school. I may not be able to send them to college, but they have to finish at least high school so they will be able to find a job in the future. Nowadays, no factory will accept workers with low education (Wahyuni, 2000, p. 363).

In this case his wife does not have any option other than to agree. She used to work in Bandung too, but she gave it up because the children needed someone to care for them. When they worked together in Bandung, they pooled their income and saved to buy agricultural land and build a permanent house in the village. On her return to the village she was strictly a housewife and did

not take up a paid job because there was no job suitable for her. Her main job is taking care of the children and managing the family economy while learning farming from her father-in-law. The main sources of household income are the cash remittances from her husband and the sale of rice from their agricultural land. She said that she does not know her husband's total income in the city. Although she knows his salary as a factory worker, she does not know how much he earns from his side jobs.

A similar situation was described by a wife whose husband works in Jakarta selling factory-made traditional herbal medicines (*jamu* in Indonesian). She said that her husband works for his brother-in-law, one of the Jakarta representatives of the *jamu* factory. This family has three sources of income, namely remittances from the husband, the wife's salary as a primary schoolteacher, and additional income from selling cold drinks and ice cubes at home. She admits that she was the one who urged her husband to continue working in the city because they needed the money to send their two children to high school and, if possible, to college. Although her husband wants to return home and work in the village, she persuaded him to remain in Jakarta. She argued that there is no job for him in the village that can give him a salary higher than Rp. 5,000 per day. Since the children are still in primary school, she spent the husband's remittances to renovate their house in the village and to buy a refrigerator. With that refrigerator she produces cold drinks and ice cubes for sale. She manages the allocation of income pooled in her purse but does not include her husband's entire income—only the amount sent by her husband. She does not control her husband's entire income in the city. She explained that her husband is free to spend part of his income to support his living expenses in Jakarta. She does not know how much he earns each month.

Other families interviewed also run two separate, geographically dispersed households. The wives at home manage only the portion of their husbands' income after it has been reduced by their husbands' living expenses in the city, which is out of their control. Village wives who do not have a personal income in the village face problems when remittances from their husbands are too small or arrive very late. This forces them to borrow food or money from shop owners, sometimes at high interest rates. Some circular migrant families also own agricultural land to produce staple food for household consumption and use their remittances for other expenses.

The pooling of income was also common among migrant households in the city. When both husband and wife had migrated and both worked in the city, the husband typically gave his salary to his wife, and she managed the money to supply the family needs. She usually returned some pocket money to her husband for his needs, such as to buy cigarettes and transportation. One migrant woman explained that her husband trusts his income in her hands. Therefore, every month he always gives his full income to her, and she gives him some pocket money to buy cigarettes. She said that she has to make sure that her husband has some money in his pocket because it would be very

embarrassing for him to ask her for money when he wanted to treat his friends to a cigarette (Wahyuni, 2000). This wife allocates the money to buy agricultural land in her village and to rent agricultural land in her husband's village of origin, in order to support her elderly mother and mother-in-law. The agricultural land, or *sawah* (Indonesian for rice field), provides enough food for their mothers, and they therefore do not have to send money regularly to the village. This woman married a man from a different village in Central Java province. Like most nonpermanent migrants in the city, this couple does not intend to stay in Bandung, West Java, forever. They plan to retire in the wife's village, where they already had built a house and had bought pieces of agricultural land. The wife's mother and the couple's daughter manage their house in the village. In the city they live in a room provided by the husband's company. They have lived in this arrangement for about twenty years.

Not all husbands trust their income to their wives, even if they live in the same household. One factory worker lives with her husband and two of her three children in Bandung. Her eldest son lives with her parents in the village because he does not like living in crowded Bandung and prefers to go to school in the village. She said that her husband gives her only a portion of his salary while spending the rest on his own needs. She uses her husband's money to pay the rent, to pay school fees and transportation costs for her second child who goes to school in Bandung, and to pay for her eldest son's school fees and meals in the village. She uses her own salary to pay for meals and other household needs. Therefore, although she has been working for more than fifteen years, she was able to buy only a piece of dry land but she has neither a house nor a piece of rice field in her village or in her husband's. She explained that they plan to settle in Bandung and already have made a down payment on a house there. She said that her husband made the decision to buy the house. She has never been asked by her husband to become involved in buying the house. Her husband told her that he had borrowed the money from the factory and will pay it back in monthly installments deducted from his salary over several years.

Such economic cooperation among family members represents the family function of providing the basic needs of the family. When the family still owned enough resources or when other economic opportunities were still available in the village, the family was able to produce goods and services to meet the family's needs. However, the process of development has changed the needs and nature of the community at large, making it impossible for the economic opportunities available in the village to meet the needs of the villagers and forcing them to seek employment elsewhere. According to Deere and de Janvry (1979) and Wood (1981), families in the village have released their family members to seek wage jobs in the city to maximise the utilisation of the labor power owned by the family. Families have adopted this strategy as a response to structural changes that occurred outside the household unit (Wood, 1981).

The Socialization Function

A second important family function is the socialization of new members to prevent the culture from becoming extinct (Murdock, 1949). Although institutions such as schools play an important role in educating children, families are the primary agent for transferring the values and culture of the society to future generations. The birth of children is an expected consequence of a marriage. To survive, newborn babies need full-time care from older people "to nurse, tend and rear them physically and socially" (Murdock, 1949). These tasks take place primarily in nuclear families and demand the cooperation of all family members. In fact, the burdens of physical and social care of children must be distributed among the nuclear family, the extended family members, and the community. When the newborn arrives, the primary caregiver is expected to be the mother. However, as the mother is often also engaged in income-generating activities, there is a need for substitute child care, especially for preschool children. It has been argued that women's employment is incompatible with the child-rearing activity and consequently that the increasing rate of female employment will result in a lower fertility rate (Blake, 1965). This argument may hold for women who work in industrialized countries, where a woman's work usually dictates that she leave the house for a certain amount of time, but it is often not the case for women in less developed countries who mostly engage in agriculture or self-employment at home (Ware, 1981; Richter et al., 1992).

A rather different pattern of child care was found among commuting migrant mothers in Central Java, Indonesia. Hetler (1986) reported that leaving the children in the villages to go to school was the most common solution for child care problems, although other options were available. If the mothers migrated alone, leaving their husbands and children at home, the fathers took care of the household and child minding with the help of their older children and elderly mother. Commuting mothers were considered "improper" by upper class women (Hetler, 1986) because they abandoned their husbands and children. However, these migrant women were able to commute without neglecting their young children. These women often took their preschool children with them to the city, especially when they were still breast-feeding them, but they preferred to leave school-age children at home. This means that it was unlikely for children to be left at a very young age. Hetler (1986) reported that 54 percent of women who migrate with their husbands and 20 percent of women who migrate alone take their young children to the city. The latter decision is usually the result of not having any other option. Helter found that about 42 percent of ever-married migrant women had had to take their young children with them to the city at some time. In the city, migrant mothers have several child care options, such as having teenage or preadolescent girls mind the children while they are working, making arrangements with their husband, older children, or other kin to distribute the child care responsibilities around the mothers' working hours, taking the children to work, and leaving the children to play alone.

and physically maintaining the children in the city. Economic cooperation between husband and wife is carried out in two different forms. In the village, wives work on their agricultural land or in nonagricultural work to produce food for family consumption, while the husband works in the city to get cash to pay for other goods and services. Migration of mothers has consequences for child care arrangements. The migrant women have to involve the extended family in child care. Because their extended families live in the village, these mothers have to endure a life separated from their children, often for a long time, resulting in migrant families choosing from among at least five child-rearing strategies, as discussed earlier.

Although this study has covered only one village, it is felt that its findings on the impact of migration upon household structure and functioning are common in Central Java and in other migrant villages of origin in Java (see Hetler, 1986; Mantra, 1988). Because of the developed communication and transportation system in Java, contact between migrants in the city and their families left behind is readily maintained. Villagers prefer to migrate on a nonpermanent basis by commuting before deciding to migrate permanently or to return to the village permanently. In many cases migrants decide that commuting between the city as a place of work and the village as the family home is the most acceptable option for family well-being.

This study also found that Javanese migrants in Bandung prefer to share a rented room with one or two friends to save on living costs. Because the house size is smaller than in villages, migration usually does not create horizontal extended families through the inclusion of relatives or friends. More migrant households are headed by single females as a consequence of the higher number of migrant females in the destination area. Migration also splits nuclear families into two households: one in the origin area and one in the destination area. As a consequence of splitting households, there is also a substantial percentage of temporary female-headed households in the village of origin.

*Presented at the Asia-Pacific Dialogue
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, October 2004.*

Endnotes

1. In this case, public households such as dormitories, penitentiaries, or hospitals are not included in this discussion.
2. A migrant family is defined as a family in which one or more member migrates on a nonpermanent basis for economic purposes.
3. A guarantor is a person who guaranteed a new migrant a job in the factory in the city, and who also assumes a responsibility to make the new employee loyal to the factory (Wahyuni 2000). Usually guarantors are senior relatives from the home villages and are therefore respected by the younger migrants.

Bibliography

Arizpe, L. (1981). Relay migration and the survival of the peasant household. In J. Balan (Ed.), *Why people move*. New York: The Unesco Press.

- Berninghausen, J., & Kerstan, B. (1992). *Forging new paths: Feminist social methodology and rural women in Java*. London: Zed Books Limited.
- Blake, J. (1965). Demographic science and the redirection of population policy. In M. Sheps and J.C. Ridley (Eds.), *Public health and population change*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Colfer, C. (1985). On circular migration: From the distaff side. In G. Standing (Ed.), *Labour circulation and the labour process* (pp. 219–251). London: Croom Helm.
- Connell, J., Dasgupta, B., Lashley, R., & Lipton, M. (1976). *Migration from rural areas: The Evidence from village studies*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Darroch, R.K., Meyer, P.A., & Singarimbun, M. (1981). *Two are not enough: The value of children to Javanese and Sundanese parents*. Honolulu and Yogyakarta: East-West Population Institute No. 60 D.
- Deere, C.D. (1982). The division of labour by sex in agriculture: A Peruvian case study. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 30(4), 795–811.
- Deere, C.D., & De Janvry, A. (1979). A conceptual framework for the empirical analysis of peasants. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 61(4), 601–611.
- Evans, J. (1984). Definition and structure of the household in urban Java: Findings of a household census in suburban Surakarta. *Urban Anthropology*, 13(2–3), 145–196.
- Findley, S.E. (1987). *Rural development and migration*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Geertz, H. (1961). *The Javanese family*. New York: The Free Press.
- Guest, P. (1989). *Labour allocation and rural development: Migration in four Javanese villages*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Guest, P. (1993). The determinants of female migration from a multilevel perspective. In *Internal Migration of Women in Developing Countries*. Proceedings of the United Nations Expert Meeting in the Feminisation of Internal Migration, Aguascalientes, Mexico, 22–25 October.
- Hatmadji, S.H., & Anwar, E.N. (1993). Transisi Keluarga di Indonesia Suatu Tinjauan Demografis [Family Transition in Indonesia: A Demographic Perspective]. *Warta Demografi*, no. 5, 15–21.
- Hetler, C.B. (1986). *Female-headed households in a circular migration village in Central Java, Indonesia*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Demography, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Hetler, C.B. (1990). Survival strategies, migration and household headship. In L. Dube & R. Palriwal, Rajni (Eds.), *Structure and strategies: Women work and family*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Hugo, G.J. (1987). Demographic and welfare implications of urbanization: Direct and indirect effects on sending and receiving areas. In R.J. Fuchs, G.W. Jones, & E. Pernia (Eds.), *Urbanization and Urban Policies in Pacific Asia*. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Hugo, G.J., Hull, T.H., Hull, V.J., & Jones, G.W. (1987). *The Demographic dimension in Indonesian development*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Hull, T.H., & Hull, V.J. (1987). Changing marriage behaviour in Java: The role of timing of consummation. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(1), 104–19.
- Hull, V.J. (1975). Fertility, socio-economic status, and the position of women in a Javanese village. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

- Jay, R.R. (1969). *The Javanese villager*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1960). The Javanese of South Central Java. In G.P. Murdock (Ed.), *Social structure in Southeast Asia*. Chicago: Current Anthropology.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1967). Tjelapar: A village in South Central Java. In Koentjaraningrat (Ed.), *Villages in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kung, L. (1978). *Factory Women in Taiwan*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Lauby, J., & Stark, O. (1988). Individual Migration as a Family Strategy: Young Women, in the Philippines. *Population Studies*, 42(1), 473-486.
- Mantra, I.B. (1988). Population mobility and the link between migrants and the family back home in Ngawis Village, Genung Kidul Regency, Yogyakarta Special Region. *The Indonesian Journal of Geography*, 18(55), June.
- Murdock, G.P. (1949). *Social structure*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Nitisaastro, W. (1970). *Population trends in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Pessar, P.R. (1982). The role of households in international migration and the case of U.S. bound migration from the Dominican Republic. *International Migration Review*, 16(2), 342-364.
- Radcliffe, S.A. (1986). Gender relation, peasant livelihood strategies and migration: A case study from Cuzco, Peru. *Bulletin of Latin America Research*, 5(2), 29-47.
- Radcliffe, S.A. (1990). Between hearth and labour market: The recruitment of peasant women in the Andes. *International Migration Review*, XXIV(2), 229-49.
- Richter, K., Podhista, C., Soonthorndhada, K., & Chamrathirithrong, A. (1992). *Child Care in Urban Thailand*. Bangkok, Thailand: Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University.
- Roberts, K.D. (1982). Agrarian structure and labour mobility in rural Mexico. *Population and Development Review*, 8(2), 299-322.
- Rodenburg, A.N. (1993). *Staying Behind: Rural Woman and Migration in North Tapanuli Indonesia*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Rodenburg, J. (1993). Emancipation or subordination? Consequences of female migration for migrants and their families. In *Internal migration of women in developing countries*. Proceedings of the United Nations Expert Meeting in the Feminisation of Internal Migration, Aguascalientes, Mexico, 22-25 October.
- Root, B.D., & De Jong, G.F. (1991). Family migration in a developing country. *Population Studies*, 45, 221-233.
- Rosa, K. (1989). Export-oriented industries and women workers in Sri Lanka. In Haleh Afshar & Bina Agarwal (Eds.), *Women, poverty and ideology in Asia: Contradictory Pressure, uneasy resolutions*. London: McMillan.
- Siegel, J. (1969). *The rope of God*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Singarimbun, M., & Manning, C. (1974). Marriage and Divorce in Mojolama, Indonesia. *Indonesia*, No. 17, 67-82.
- Trager, L. (1984a). Migration and remittance: Urban income and rural households in the Philippines. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 18(April), 317-340.
- Trager, L. (1984b). Family strategies and the migration of women: Migration to Dagupan City, Philippines. *International Migration Review*, XVIII(4), 1265-1277.
- Wahyuni, E.S. (2000). The impact of migration upon family structure and functioning in Java. Ph.D. thesis, Adelaide University, Australia.

- Ware, H. (1981). *Women, demography and development*. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Wolf, D. (1986a). *Javanese village revisited*. Paper prepared for Session on Household Organization in Developing Countries, Annual Meeting of Population Association of America, April 1986.
- Wolf, D. (1986b). Factory daughters, their families and rural industrialization in Central Java. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- Wolf, D. (1990). Daughter, decision and domination: An empirical and conceptual critique of household strategies. *Development and Change*, 21, 43-74.
- Wolf, D. (1992). *Factory daughters: Gender, household dynamics and rural industrialisation in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wolf, M. (1972). *Women and the family in rural Taiwan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wood, C.H. (1981). Structural changes and households strategies: A conceptual framework for the study of rural migration. *Human Organization*, 40, 338-349.