Social Inequalities and Intra Household Relations

in 21st Century Mexico

Marina Ariza
Institute for Social Research
National University of Mexico

Orlandina de Oliveira
El Colegio de México

SOCIAL INEQUALITIES AND INTRA HOUSEHOLD RELATIONS IN 21ST CENTURY MEXICO [1]

Introduction

For at least two decades, socio-demographic studies conducted in Mexico have consistently highlighted the asymmetric nature of intrafamilial relations. Usually on the basis of feminist criticism of the ideologization of the family world as a sphere of consensus and well-being, it has became usual to stress that power relations govern its interaction and that its internal dynamics may lead to situations of risk or vulnerability for the least protected.

Until then, most socio-demographic studies focused on exploring the most structural and classic aspects of this field, such as the dynamics of the formation and dissolution of the family, changes in its structure and composition, its links with social reproduction and its importance as a unit of consumption and production, among other aspects. The pace set by the demographic transition served as the background to these discussions, whether explicitly or implicitly. One line of analysis that undoubtedly dominated part of scientific research from the early 1980s onwards was the study of survival strategies used by families in certain social contexts, whereby – it was understood – they could offset the effect of macro-structural processes on their internal stability.

In keeping with the growing interest in the socio-symbolic and cultural dimensions of social processes that has characterized sociology in recent years, research designed to analyze the internal dynamics of families in terms of the imbalance of power, resources and well-being among its members, domestic violence and the social significance of motherhood and fatherhood, among other

---

[1] This text is part of research for a chapter in process that will form part of a collective book coordinated by Cecilia Rabell, of the Mexican National University, Institute for Social Research.

aspects, have gradually gained ground. As analytical dimensions have become increasingly complex, a number of key concepts and problem areas have been defined, including decision-making, the sexual division of labor, power relations, and the quality of intrafamilial life, in the collective effort to determine the nature of intrafamilial life by highlighting its asymmetries (Oliveira and Ariza, 1999).

With very few exceptions, however (Casique, 2003; García and Oliveira, 2006) and partly because of the complexity of the object of study and the lack of adequate statistic data, most research has been based on qualitative research applied to case studies, which are extremely thought-provoking from an ethnographic point of view, but unable to provide an overview of the universe of Mexican families. This lack is beginning to be compensated for by the implementation in recent years of various local and national surveys devoted to studying the complex world defined by kinship links and family intimacy.

Focusing on the dynamics of intrafamilial relations, this article seeks to explore three relatively unexplored dimensions patterns of interaction, affectivity and conflictivity, highlighting the way these are modified when three axes of social differentiation are considered: socio-economic stratum, gender and age. The underlying assumption is that comprehending intrafamilial dynamics must be based on a multidimensional conception of the asymmetries that cut through them, if one wishes to achieve a reasonable understanding of its complexity.

The article is divided into three parts. The first describes the three dimensions mentioned – interaction, affectivity and conflictivity - in terms of their relevance to intrafamilial dynamics. Statistical analysis was used to determine what factors were included in the various dimensions. The second part specifically analyzes the way in which class (the family's socio-economic stratum), gender (sex) and age exert a varying influence on them, according to the results yielded by the multiple classification analysis. The third contains a number of final considerations by way of a conclusion. The data source used was the National Survey on Family Dyamics in Mexico, 2005 (ENDIFAM).

Patterns of interaction, affectivity and conflictivity: three central dimensions of family life.

Bonded by kinship links, family members interact on an everyday basis around a set of basic activities that permit the maintenance and intergenerational reproduction of the group within collectivity. These activities lead to the use of various individual skills, aptitudes and resources in a collective sense – a sort of economy of scale – afforded by the facilities granted by co-residence under the same roof. The provision of food, clothes and footwear, rest and the replenishment of energy, protection from the elements and even entertainment and leisure are some of the activities on the basis of which family members interact on a day-to-day level. These encourage socialization and the acquisition of values and patterns of social response, so crucial to social integration. The combination of both processes – material and cultural reproduction – leads to a feeling of social worth (or the opposite), a sense of social belonging, assertiveness (or the lack of) and a certain amount of dignity (or conversely, of shame) with which to cope with the world, which, despite being less tangible assets, are no less important. Spending time together is therefore the main way through which intrafamilial interaction takes pace[2]. This strengthens socio-culturally defined family links, whose durability will probably subsequently constitute an invaluable resource for coping with a variety of contingencies (social capital).

Generally speaking, the few studies that have explored this aspect of analysis within Mexican socio-demographic research (Oliveira et al., García and Oliveira, 2006) have focused on certain conceptual axes in the characterization of the family's dynamic. García and Oliveira (2006) for example, focused on the analysis of three indicators: wives' participation in decision-making inside the home, the degree of female autonomy and the existence of domestic violence as an expression of the type of gender relations that prevails within the home. In this approach, the assessment of the degree of inequity in the internal distribution of

---

[2] By this we mean co-residential families, excluding situations such as migration where this interaction is mediated by physical distance.

power between men and women is obviously the analytical axis guiding the choice of indicators to evaluate the couple's interrelationships. Among other aspects, their results corroborate the existence of different spheres of power between men and women, and smaller amounts of autonomy for the latter, with major differences between social sectors and cities of residence (Mexico and Monterrey). Generally speaking, gender asymmetry tends to increase as one moves down the social scale from middle to working class sectors, while differences between cities are more diverse: while violence is greater in Mexico City, women in Monterrey enjoy less relative autonomy, although men play a greater role in certain domestic tasks (Ibidem).

The evaluation of *family interaction* on the basis of the National Survey on Family Dynamics 2005 focuses on the series of basic activities that constitute everyday family life: having breakfast, lunch or supper, watching TV, going to the movies, going out for a drive or eating out together. The objective was to determine what type of family interaction emerged from the simplest, most regular activities between family members, those that are unquestioned and flow apparently smoothly in everyday life.

The bivariate analysis conducted in the initial approaches to empirical information had shown that eating, followed by going out, were the activities through which families spent most time together, while going to the cinema or playing some kind of sport were regarded as less important (Table 1). When the various items contained in the questionnaire on spending time together were subjected to factor analysis to determine whether certain analytical dimensions emerged around types of interaction, two clearly differentiated ones emerged: spending time together inside and outside the home. These two dimensions accounted for over half the variance (52.7%). Thus, in families where everyday interaction mainly takes place within the home, it includes eating (breakfast, lunch and supper). The remaining families tend to relate to each other outside the home by engaging in activities such as going out or eating out, engaging in some kind of sport or going to the cinema (Tables 1 and 2). As we will see in the following

section, the family's socio-economic stratum has the greatest impact on spending time together outside the home.

As an analytical dimension, *affectivity* refers to a more qualitative sphere of the family environment, and is linked to the world of emotions and subjectivity, and the search for care, attention and emotional well-being of those one takes care of and loves. As such, it belongs to the field of affective social action, relegated by the long rationalist tradition of positivist social science (Bericat, 2000; Mora, 2005)[3]. The social nature of emotional action is due to the confirmation of the fact that, like the rest of social actions, it is subject to processes of regulation (both social and cultural). In short, it can be understood as a symbolic structure comprising the relationship between individual experience of everyday life and the normative referents by which it is governed (Mora, 2005: 18), which link both sensations (physical corporeity) and social meanings (cultural reference) (Leavitt, 1996). It also possesses a cognifitive element that constitutes a sort of device or signal that tells the subject how to act (operativity) at the same time as it elicits thoughts associated with what is felt (Hochschild, 1975; Mora, 2005). Feeling, thinking and acting are intimately related processes, since emotional action usually triggers some sort of action linked to it, aimed either at oneself (self-reflexively) or others, what is expressed and how and when it is culturally defined, since each social structure has an affective system to which it is linked (Leavitt, 1996).[4] Emotional actions are by nature self-reflexive (Denzin, 1983), and must be intersubjectively constructed and interpreted on the basis of objectifiable and perceptible signs, and of codes with a particular significance. In the last analysis, emotions depend on the perception of the historically and contextually located subject meaning that there

---

[3] A thought-provoking line of reflection in the field of the sociology of emotion, whose precursors are located in the mid-1970s, attempts to link the affective and rationalistic aspects of social action that were artificially separated by means of a sort of Cartesian division that has lasted until the present. By giving affective action a residual nature with regard to instrumental rationality, in view of the difficulties of measuring it, in Post-Weberian sociology, particularly Parsons' translation of it, the understanding of the social actor as a feeling actor was eliminated. Social action includes not only doing and thinking but also feeling. See Kemper, 1978; Denzin, 1983; Scheff, 1997; Hochschild, 1998; Bericat, 2000; Mora, 2005.

[4] From the perspective of Kemper's inter-relational theory (1978), researchers have proposed that there is an essential link between affective subjectivity and the objective social situation (Bericat, 2000).

may be more than one "emotional culture" in a society (Hochschild, 1998). Thus, the life experience characterized by belonging to a particular social sector is different not only as regards physical and status aspects but also in emotional respects. This experience may be interpreted by using the "emotional dictionary" each culture possesses (Mora, 2005).[5] In every society there are therefore various patterns or models of emotional exchange, since emotions are the result of a social construction.

An important aspect of emocional action is its normative dimension[6]. This exerts social control over affective subjectivity. So-called emotional norms define what it is appropriate to feel at each step and their power to sanction is obvious when the emotions we feel and express are regarded as inappropriate in a specific social situation (for example: laughing during a solemn ceremony) (Hochschild, 1998, Bericat, 2000; Mora, 2005). By virtue of this normative dimension, maintain an intrinsic link with the coercive nature of social events in the Durkheimian sense, since it is in fact through them that the subjection to collectivity is achieved (Scheff, 1997)[7]. Although processes of normative contention cut through all social structures, they may be different depending on the position occupied by the subject. In an interesting analysis, Hochschild (1975) mentions, for example, that the expression of rage or anger is usually vented at people with less social power, as is humor.

As a type of particular emotion, affection and fondness have distinctive features. Kemper (1978, 1989) conceives of it as a form of gratification or reward that is offered voluntarily, in the absence of coercion and which lends status (esteem, recognition, deference, respect) to the person receiving it.[8] From this

---

[5] Author's emphasis

[6] In addition to their normative dimension, emotions have an expressive and political dimension (Hochschild, 1975).

[7] As noted by Bericat (2000: 170), for Scheff (1997) there are two emotions that play a key role in the process of subjecting oneself to the collective will: shame and pride. In his words: "…Maintaining dignity and respect and preventing the pain of shame is what makes the control system operative as a motivational system or system of force in the individual."

[8] In order to understand this conception, it is essential to know some of the assumptions of the author's inter-relational theory. These can be briefly summarized as follows: 1) power and status are the two basic dimensions of sociability, 2) the former comprises coercive actions based on force, threats and even punishment, while the second is defined as "...a type of social relationship in which there is voluntary behavior oriented towards the satisfaction of the desires, demands, lacks

perspective, the main characteristic of affection as an emotion is that it constitutes an asset which at least one of the two people involved is prepared to give voluntarily; otherwise, it loses its value. Since power is an inherent feature of social relations, the flow of affection between two people may be unequal, producing significant nuances in the characterization of its nature. It is one thing to love and quite another to be loved. According to Kemper (1978), when you love, you give status and when you are loved, you receive (Bericat, 2000). Although it is impossible to know beforehand whether one person feels affection for another, his behavior towards that person will probably be a fairly unmistakable sign of the type of emotion that person arouses: interest in her, care, attention, giving gifts and satisfying her desires. All these actions undoubtedly boost self-esteem and the sense of worth in one's own and others' eyes in the person who receives them. They undoubtedly constitute a type of reward[9] .

That is why, as social actions, emotions require a certain amount of effort, and a willingness to undertake the activities that revealing them involves. Hence the phrase "emotional work," understood as the act of meeting the affective needs of one or more other people, in which face-to-face interaction possesses a strategic value (Bubbeck, 1995; Andersen, 2000). It goes without saying that women, whether as mothers, daughters or wives, shoulder the greatest burden of emotional work. It is through the satisfaction of a series of the other person's needs (and desires) that the affective inclination towards her is revealed, despite the fact that this person may be perfectly capable of providing himself with them (care, food, clothing, material goods, emotional containment, and physical warmth).

In the various social spheres, everyday life occupies a central position in setting the standards for emotional behavior, since it provides the necessary cultural referents for interpreting the meaning of emotional action, i.e. its social

---

and needs of others..." (quoted by Bericat, 2000:153). 3) Individuals are reciprocal sources of positive and negative reinforcement. 4) There are four possible negative emotions in the social exchange between individuals (guilt, fear-anxiety, depression and shame) also known as structural emotions. These necessarily result from the deficit or excess – the imbalance- in the provision of status or power by one individual with respect to another or others.

[9] Conversely, depression, for example, is an emotion caused by a lack of rewards or status in the sense described here (Kemper, 1978; Bericat, 2000).

significance (Mora, 2005). It is, indeed, in everyday life that the interpretative codes we use in our daily lives, to feel and act emotionally, are formed. Given the importance of the family in the dynamics of everyday life, it is unnecessary to insist on their centrality in acquiring patterns of emotional response.

A little-known aspect of families as an affective space is the way in which emotions are transmitted. Studies by Larson and Almeida (1999) for the United States highlight the fact that the transmission of emotions is not random and instead follows very precise patterns, which normally move parallel to gender hierarchies: the father's emotional influence is greater than the mother's, while the influence of both of them flows more strongly towards the children.[10] The authors use the concept of "border" to refer to the higher or lower degree of porosity in the reception or transmission of the flow of emotions. It is therefore true that within a family nucleus, the emotions of one member affect those of the others, albeit to varying degrees. In the same way, certain emotions are more easily transmitted than others (particularly negative ones) while fathers and mothers differ in their ability to reduce the harmful effect of negative external emotions (such as stress at work) on family dynamics (Ibidem).[11] There are therefore considerable differences in the degree of porosity of the emotions that flow in and out of a home, depending on the position and hierarchy of its members.

In order to empirically approach the sphere of affective subjectivity of Mexican families on the basis of ENDIFAM, we decided to assess what feelings were expressed towards the two central figures in the household: the father and mother. To this end, we used statistical analyses to extract the factors around which the various items contained in the questionnaire on affectivity were structured. Two distinct aspects clearly emerged: 1) closeness, affection and respect versus 2) distance, fear and conflict, both as regards the mother and the

---

[10] In the case of families led by single mothers, the authors report that the mother's negative emotions were directly passed on to their teenage children, although the opposite was not verified (Larson and Gillman, 1999, quoted by Larson and Almeida, 1999: 13).

[11] Although parents' experience at work constitutes a major source of emotions in the family, women, regardless of their family structure, appear to be more successful when it comes to avoiding the negative effects of emotions caused by work (Larson y Almeida, 1999: 14).

father (Tables 4 to 7).[12] The data in Table 3 show that the relationship with the mother is a link with considerably more affective intensity than the relationship with the father. In fact, according to the interviewees' perception, the mother –far more than the father- is the person from whom they receive most affection, and either the closest parent or the one with whom they said they got on better. Nevertheless, both the mother and the father elicit a considerable amount of respect from other family members although generally speaking, the set of emotions elicited by the father inclines more towards affective distance than proximity than in the case of the mother, as shown by the data in Table 3.[13] This aspect is probably related to their role as authority figures and their lack of involvement in many of the tasks comprising everyday family life.

It is worth reflecting on the meaning of these results. An initial interpretation leads us to evaluate the different social meanings associated with motherhood and fatherhood and the way they can affect the affective subjectivity of household members and their patterns of interaction. It is a well-known fact that although motherhood and fatherhood constitute social representations with a heavy normative content, the social significance attributed to each of them is very different. They both refer to central aspects of female and male identity and include an element of transcendence. Within this social construction, the realization of men and women as such would not be complete if they lacked the vital experience of being mothers or fathers. In experiencing it, they both transcend the material world due to the fact of leaving a legacy in the offspring they have produced. But whereas the nourishing aspect of motherhood is oriented more towards the private (domestic) sphere of the family world, of whose emotional stability she is the safeguard par excellence, fatherhood maintains an essential link with the public sphere, since the male represents the family group in society (Fuller, 2000: 37). In the words of this author: "…the father works and accumulates assets and prestige to provide for the family and protect it."

---

[12] An analysis of the relationship with children and siblings yielded the same structure (data not contained in tables).
[13] In keeping with this, factor analysis shows that proximity with the mother accounts for 54% of the variance explained and 49.9% in the case of the father.

This different orientation, public versus private, in the socio-cultural prescription of father's or mother's roles - which is in itself an ideologization resulting from the social construction of gender- is undoubtedly linked to the significance of our findings. By spending more time at home, and engaging in a considerable amount of emotional work with their children, women build intense links with family members and in return receive greater status awards from them, in other words, a higher frequency of items indicating affective closeness or proximity. But fathers are also the object of emotional perceptions of closeness, affection and respect, except that in this case, the percentage explained by variance is smaller, according to the results of factor analysis. In keeping with these results, qualitative studies conducted in Mexico show that the lack of greater physical and emotional proximity and the father's genuine affective presence in the home is one of the deficiencies that young people most regret when looking back on their lives (Ariza, 2005)[14]. Lastly, the fact that both figures, father and mother, elicit emotions of both proximity and distance reflects the contradictory feelings that may emerge in the complex world of family dynamics and the extent to which the exercise of these roles may differ from the socio-cultural prescription.

Conflictivity, the last aspect of family life on which we focused, refers more to the type of interelationship characterizing family life, based on the assumption that a certain degree of conflict is inherent in human interaction
in society (Simmel, 1986, Frisby, 1984).[15] In this respect, families may be situated along a continuum of lesser or greater conflictivity, with maximum harmony (or minimum conflictivity) at one end and absence of harmony or extreme disagreement (maximum conflictivity) at the other end, which could lead to the

---

[14] Nevertheless, the exercise of an emotionally and affectively distant fatherhood, focusing solely on providing material needs, is beginning to be questioned by the new generations of Mexicans, who are no longer willing to settle for being what has been called "paycheck fathers" according to studies conducted in communities with a significant presence of international migration (Mummert , 2005; D´Aubeterre, 2005).

[15] For Simmel, conflict as an antagonistic relationship, forms part of the general abstract structural principles that operate in forms of sociation, since both friendliness and hostility are found at the basis of human relations. In certain amounts, conflict plays an undeniably integrative role in collectivity. From Simmel's point of view, forms of sociation are simply various ways of belonging to society (Frisby, 1984; Simmel, 1986).

exercise of violence. Conflict does not necessarily imply violence, although it often precedes it. This can be seen as an inappropriate way of handling emotions or resolving disagreements, based on the recognition of the power hierarchies that structure the family world.

It is a matter of discussion which particular dynamic leads to conflict: Is it the consequence of the rupture of a social link or, on the contrary, its pre-condition? Is the social link severed because conflict exists or vice versa? One of the trends in the sociology of emotions referred to earlier favors the first position, highlighting the sequence of emotions that accompany the spiral of conflict (Scheff, 1997; Bericat, 2000). On the basis of this conception, it is the threat of the breakage of the link in terms of what is understood as a lack of reciprocity from the person with whom one interacts (little respect or attention, negligence, insults, scorn, etc.) that would give rise to a feeling of humiliation that is a precursor of anger and conflict and often violence (Ibidem).

Although in most cases, Mexican socio-demographic research has not directly dealt with the dimension of family conflictivity, a growing number of studies focus on one of its most visible expressions: domestic violence, particularly the kind aimed at women (Riquer, 1995; Casique, 2003; Castro, 2004; Inmujeres, Inegi and Crim, 2004; García and Oliveira, 2006)[16], from which a series of relevant findings have emerged. Conjugal violence, in which the man is usually the aggressor, tends to begin at a very early stage in the couple's life and to continue throughout their lives. Factors closely associated with this include: alcoholism, drug addiction, shortage of financial resources, lack of schooling, jealousy and a background of violence in the family of origin (García and Oliveira, 2006; González Montes and Irracheta, 1987; García and Oliveira, 1994; Granados Shiroma and Madrigal, 1998; Castro, Riquer and Medina, 2004).

Triggers for men's violent behavior include pregnancy, the birth and sex of the first child and the start of the sexual relationship. Some situations increase the

---

[16] Various data sources are used in Mexico for the study of domestic violence, ranging from judicial files through local and national surveys to service providers' and physicians' records and interviews with women (Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, Inegi y Crim, 2004; Torres Falcón, 2004).

risk of women's becoming victims of domestic violence, including the increase in their decision-making power and freedom and belonging to a younger age cohort (Inmujeres, Inegi and Crim, 2004). According to an analysis carried out by Castro (2004), volatile, explosive everyday life is a common feature of interaction in households in which pregnant women are an object of violence.

Some of the consequences of violence for women include: personality changes, nervousness, feelings of insecurity, fear and trembling, insomnia and many other physical, mental and reproductive health problems (Valdez and Shrader, 1992; González Montes, 1998; Granados Shiroma and Madrigal, 1998; Ramírez Rodríguez and Vargas Becerra, 1998 and various studies compiled by Torres Falcón, 2004). Fear, in particular, often becomes an integral part of the female experience (Castro, 2004).

The data obtained from ENDIFAM, given in Table 8, show that conflict is barely perceived by the population, since a mere 16.4% of the interviewees reported an event of this nature in the previous month. This perception is greater in the case of women than men. The main reactions to conflict include verbal violence (52.2%) and the acceptance of the other person's will (41.5%) as habitual answers. When the various items contained in the questionnaire on reactions to conflict were subjected to factor analysis, four types of systematic response emerged: extreme violence, lack of negotiation, verbal violence and acceptance of another person's intermediation. Together they account for 55.9% of the variance, a not inconsiderable percentage.

In all these possible types of reaction, extreme violence accounted for the highest percentage of variance (17.9%). They involve the following types of behaviors: blows, the fact that someone in the family went to live elsewhere, the fact that someone in the family was denounced to the police and the fact that one of the members of the household was hurt. This is undoubtedly an extraordinarily important aspect, since the answers grouped together under this first factor by statistical analysis are extremely serious. They are unmistakable expressions of the scope of the damage inflicted on victims which in most cases, one should recall, are women. Lack of negotiation (it was not discussed, no agreement was

reached) is the second factor in order of importance and accounts for 13.3% of the variance. It is possible that situations in which family disagreements do not find suitable outlets for their expressin simply delay the occurrence of a new event, keeping it latent until the next time. Lastly, the acceptance of mediation by other persons, either because what someone in the family said was done or because the intervention of another person was sought accounts for 11.6% of the variance explained. It is a dimension that points towards the intervention of authority figures, (who for some reason wield influence over the family) in the family nucleus, either inside or outside the latter.[17]

Other authors have found that the existence of one type of violence is in itself a strong predictor of the occurrence of other types of violence (Castro, 2004). Our data obviously provide a fairly desolate image of families in which violence constitutes a habitual response to conflict, revealing not only the poverty of intra-familial life in this sub-set of Mexican households, but also the considerable situations of risk for the physical and moral integrity of some of its members.

In short, the three dimensions of intrafamilial dynamics analyzed to date, interaction, affectivity and conflictivity provide a complex, unequal perspective on the quality of intrafamilial life in 21st century Mexico. Let us now analyze the way they are modified by the intervention of three axes of social differentiation.

II. Social Inequalities and Intrafamilial Life: class, gender and age

In this section, we will take a different look at the three dimensions of intrafamilial dynamics that concern us. On this occasion, we will attempt to interpret the data in a way that isolates and highlights the impact of the three axes of social differentiation on each of them: class, via the family's socio-economic stratum, age as an expression of a stage in the life course and gender, whose empiric indicator is simply a person's sex. The underlying assumption is not only that these three axes can have a different influence on intrafamilial dynamics by affecting the

---

[17] The survey opens up the possibility of finding out about the kinship link to this figure, an aspect we did not deal with in our initial approach to the information.

quality of life of Mexican families, but that these spheres – patterns of interaction, affectivity and conflict- maintain systemic links with equality as a social process.

The debate about social inequality, an old concern in sociology, has revived in recent decades as the social consequences of the new economic model have been exacerbated. Indeed, in both central and peripheral coutrnies, developed economies and those with less relative development, the increase in inequality has been the distinctive note accompanying structural changes in the economy.[18]

Analytical efforts have focused both on documenting the various ways in which it is expressed and in expanding the conceptual and methodological tools for its study. Thus, for example, the field of labor markets uses a series of concepts - some drawn from the more general sphere of social sciences- to attempt to understand its various nuances. Social exclusion (economic, political and cultural), vulnerability (social, economic and demographic), quality of employment, decent employment and job precariousness, are some of the new concepts used to describe the characteristics of social inequality in the world of labor.

Parallel to these efforts, recent decades have seen the emergence of critical voices pointing to the need to include other axes of social differentiation in the evaluation of inequality, in addition to class, such as gender, ethnic group and age. These authors have attempted to increase the complexity of their analysis by starting with the assumption that since the outset, sociology was overly concerned with explaining the inequalities resulting from the market society (Crompton and Mann, 1986). Thus, for Stacey (1986), the majority of the contemporary world's inequalities derive from two types of sources: the family and kinship system on the one hand and occupational hierarchy on the other, with obvious links between the two. For their part, Delphy and Leonard (1986) understand that given the centrality of the family in the creation of gender relations and the reproduction of inequality, the latter should be considered the unit of analysis of the process of social

---

[18] Some long-term processes have been cited as being directly or indirectly responsible for the increase in inequality levels, such as: the deindustrialization of the economy, the expansion of personal and distributive services, salary control policies, the reduction of state social spending and reframing the welfare state.

stratification in general.[19] Adopting a less radical position, Laslett (2000) emphasizes the importance of the family as the first sphere that socializes in inequality, as a space where the emotions and meanings that can either reinforce or withstand situations of inequity are produced. In any case, there is a consensus that the complexity of current society demands a multidimensional approach to inequality, an approach that includes the multiplicity of forms of solidarity and affiliation that characterize it (Grusky, 1994; Oliveira, 2007). In an influential book published a number of years ago, Charles Tilly (2000) analyses the persistence of social inequalities in the modern world, elaborating a complex theory to explain its trans-historical continuity. According to this author, persistent inequalities, those that shift from one type of social interaction to the next and last a lifetime, are the result of the exploitation and monopolization of opportunities and social resources as a result of a determined structure of social relations. Persistent inequalities are sytems of social organized distintions between social categories (blacks and whites, men and women, foreigners and citizens). When these categorical inequalities are institutionalized, systems of closure, exclusion and social control, in the Weberian sense, are automatically established that prevent equal access to social assets (Ibidem).

The persistence of these inequities is undoubtedly expressed in the inequalities that cut through the family world, in the particular way in which class, gender and age condition interact within the family and affect the quality of life of its members. As an axis of social stratification, class stands out because it limits the resources and material living conditions to which people may gain access on the basis of a hierarchical graduation. For its part, gender redistributes goods and status according to the different value of anatomical sexual difference that belittles women in relation to men and exercises an iron control over their sexuality and reproductive capacity. Conversely, age restricts people's autonomy and tends to determine growing access to it as one advances through the life course, a situation

---

[19] Whereas inequality is relatively ubiquitous, stratification constitutes a form of disparity that groups people together into homogeneous layers regarding a range of goods. These layers or strata follow a single order in a well-defined hierarchy (Tilly, 2000).

that is reversed when one reaches old age. These axes obviously overlap and produce various scenarios in which inequalities may be increased or decreased (Ariza and Oliveira, in press; Oliveira, 2007) but on this occasion, our efforts have focussed on attempting to isolate their different effects, given the exploratory nature of the dimensions studied.

In both Mexcian and international socio-demographic research, there is abundant evidence of the impact of social class on various aspects of intrafamilial dynamics. Major differences have been documented by social sector as regards the more conservative or liberal nature of gender conceptions, the incidence of domestic violence, the exercise of parenthood and fatherhood, the sexual division of labor, child care and the performance of household chores and child raising patterns, among other aspects (Ariza and Oliveira in press; Castro, 2004; Casique, 2003; Inmujeres, Inegi and Crim, 2004; Esteinou, 2004; García y Oliveira, 2006; Lareu, 2002). Generally speaking, research points towards the predominance of relatively less asymmetric practices and conceptions in middle-class sctors than in lower-class sectors, since the upper classes have rarely been studied.

In order to evaluate the varying importance of the different axes of differentiation (class, gender and age) on the intrafamilial dimensions studied, we used a multiple classification analysis and compared the beta coefficients adjusted for a set of factors, grouped together conceptually according to their contextual, familial and individual nature.[20] The idea was to evaluate the effect of the axes of differentiation mentioned earlier, while controlling for the influence of the rest of the aspects considered.

Our data reveal the decisive impact of social class[21] on at least three aspects: spending time together outside the home, the perception of affection and the perception of extreme violence. As regards spending time together outside the

---

[20] *Contextual's* variables include: size of locality (rural/urban); the *family's* variables incorporate: the family's socio-economic level, type of household and position in the family*; individuals'* variables consider: sex, age, marital status and educational attainment.
[21] The "socio-economic stratum of the family" is a combination of aspects related to housing, possession of domestic appliances and educational attainment. See Appendix 2 of the report on ENDIFAM in: Rabell, Ariza, DAubeterre and Solís (2006), Encuesta Nacional sobre la Dinámica de las Familias, 2005. Informe, DIF and IISUNAM, Mexico City.

home, Table 14 clearly shows that this is a pattern of family interaction that characterizes persons at the top end of the socio-economic hierarchy, in the fourth and fifth quintile, and is usually engaged in by heads of household and persons under the age of 45.

The link between medium and high socio-economic level and spending time together outside the home is closely linked to both material and cultural aspects. A certain level of income is required to be able to cover the cost of a family spending time together outside the home, either because they are going to the movies, eating out or going out for a drive (items considered in the questionnaire). But it is no less true that the way recreational and leisure activities are carried out is also a social construction. Family interaction practices grouped together by factor analysis within spending time outside the home, refer mostly to leisure and recreational activities (going out, going to the movies, engaging in some kind of sport, eating out). We do not know what the leisure styles of the different social sectors are. Material conditions and leisure styles may be inextricably linked. Thus, although class determines the material possibilities of choosing ways of spending time together as a family, some activities involving interaction outside the home are more closely linked to middle-class living styles (such as going to the movies) (Bordieu, 1988).

As for affectivity, the data contained in Table 12 show that the family's socio-economic level is the variable that has the strongest impact on the perception of affection received, once all the other variables have been controlled for, a perception that tends to increase as one moves up the social scale. Thus, the perception of affection is much lower among lower than middle and upper classes. Once again, we face the problem of whether the survey data is recording styles of affectivity that are characteristic of a particular social sector. It is possible that the perception of a lack of provision of affection is greater among those exposed to models of family relationship that emphasize the importance of physical contact or idealize amorous relationships as tends to happen in urban environments bombarded by the media. If these models are different from what predominates in other social sectors, for example, the middle class versus the lower class, it may

create a feeling of relative deprivation resulting from exposure to different standards of affectivity. However, as for the feelings of affective closeness to or distance from the father or mother, the family's socioeconomic level is not the aspect with the greatest explanatory force. Position in the family and age are the variables with the greatest impact on this relationship, according to the results shown in Table 12, as we shall see further on.

As for the perception of extreme violence as a reaction to conflict, the association with the socio-economic stratum is extremely consistent: it is expressed by people in the lower sectors (Table 13). This fact merely confirms previous findings on the relationship between domestic violence and social class. This research shows that although domestic violence cuts through all social sctor, it is usually more common among those located at the base of the social pyramid[22] (Castro, 2004; Inmujeres, Inegi and Crim, 2004; Infante, 20005; García and Oliveira, 2006). As a pattern of family conflict, violence is not restricted to the most disadvantaged social classes, although it acquires particular features in the latter. It is significant that in our data, it is the extreme expression of violence, the kind that poses a serious risk to people's physical and moral integrity that is most closely linked to the lower socio-economic strata. According to Castro (2004: 244), poverty merely lends violence a specific dynamic, increasing the risk it poses and its severity[23]. In the author's hypothesis, there are characteristics of life in situations with acute material deprivation, such as the existence of precarious social links and a pragmatic view that sanctions violence provided it does not entail negative consequences for the aggressor that will further increase the risk of violence. In short, it is necessary to explore the affective and material living conditions of the poor sectors within their world view and life situation to understand how the dyanamics of violence in households is exacerbated.

---

[22] By contrasting quality of employment with quality of family life, in both material aspects and the lack of marital violence, Infante (2005) found that as income rises, so does the quality of employment and the material quality of life, whereas intrafamilial violence only gradually declines.

[23] The population to which these data refer are expectant mothers using two types of food services: those of the Mexican Social Security Institute (IMSS) and the Morelos Health Services.

Let us now examine the way gender construction affects intrafamily dynamics. As for the time the family spends together, the interaction within the household occurs mainly among women and sons and daughters and other male or female relatives (Table 14). The adjusted average is negative in the case of men. This aspect is perfectly coherent with the cultural prescription that establishes two different spheres according to the gender to which one belongs: the street for men and home for women. Whereas the former is the prime sphere of risk and adventure, where men have to publicly prove their manhood to other men, the home is primarily the safeguard of female chastity, the guarantee of control over their sexuality and the sphere of reproduction.

As for the feelings of proximity or closeness to the two central figures in the family sphere, the data from Table 15 show that women perceive both closeness and distance in the relationship wiht their mothers and less affective closeness to their fathers. In other words, the link with the mother elicits ambivalent but intense emotions, whereas with the father it is more univocal: there is less closeness. Conversely, males feel closer to their fathers and less ambivalence to the mother (more proximity and less distance with her).

This sort of gender segregation in the construction of affectivity towards the central figures in the family, suggests that the delimitation of spheres of male and female competence, whether inside or outside the home, finds a correlation in the construction of affectivity. Previous studies have shown that in the perception of their link to their homes, men define their spheres of competence very clearly (Dann, 1987; Ariza and Oliveira, 1997). They see themselves primarily as material providers and instructors of their male offspring in matters of life, which include learning forms of interaction with other men and patterns of alcoholic consumption, while they regard women as educators of their daughters.[24]

As one would expect, it is women who perceive the existence of extreme violence in their homes, since it is they who suffer it in an overwhelming majority of

---

[24] Looking after small children and cooking are the spheres usually regarded as typically female from the male point of view (Gutmann, 1993; Figueroa and Liendro, 1994).

cases.[25] The fact that it is women that perceive extreme violence, which is not only palpable and evident but essentially interactional, leads one to think about the disparity of the processes of perception of intrafamilial dynamics. Data from other studies confirm similar discrepancies: systematically, and in various spheres of intrafamilial life, men and women fail to agree on their assessment of each person's contribution to the household in aspects such as contribution to housework, bringing up the children, and the family budget, among others (Inmujeres, 2001; Wainerman, 2000; García and Oliveira, 2006). The data used by García and Oliveira for the cities of Mexico and Monterrey showed that men and women had a different perception of the degree of men's participation in reproductive work that was due more to gender construction than to their sociodemographic and family features, since the latter had been statistically controlled for. Thus, the dissimilarity in the perception of gender inequality is in itself an aspect determined by one's own gender construction.

Lastly, the question is how does age affect family dynamics? As an indicator of the life course, age is undoubtedly a crucial axis of differentiation. Passing through the successive age intervals determines variations in the performance of family roles and the transitions one has to undergo according to the social construction of life calendars (leaving school, getting one's first job, forming an independent family nucleus). In Neugarten's words (1986), the aging process is not only biological but also social destiny.

Our data show that age has a varying impact depending on the family dimension involved: a) it encourages spending time with the family outside the home, especially when one is under 45 (Tables 11 and 14; b), it is the variable that most strongly explains the emotional distance from or proximity to the father or mother, in certain cases together with their position in the family; (Table 12); c) and it is also important in the acceptance of the mediation of others in situations of conflict, such as verbal violence (between the ages of 25 and 44) (Tables 13 and 16).

---

[25] Recent data from INEGI (2007) show that approximately one out of every two women aged 15 or over, whether married or living together, had suffered at least one display of violence from their partner or husband in the 12 months leading up to the survey

The influence of age assumes a similar pattern when we analyze the family interaction outside the home and emotional closeness to the mother and father figures: whereas this is positive in the earlier age groups, it tends to be inverted in the later groups. On the one hand, after the age of 45, people stop spending time with their families outside the home, thereby changing their patterns of interaction. Also, the relationship of closeness to the mother and father changes during the life course. Affective proximity towards either parent figure occurs mainly when one is young (between the age of 18 and 29) or when one is a son or daughter living with the parents. These same characteristics –age and position within the family-affect the feelings of distance towards the father but not the mother, where the only statistically significant factor is age (Table 12). These data merely reaffim the fact that affectivity towards one's parents changes during the course of life, as do certain patterns of spending time with one's family.

Lastly, the fact that age (25-44) is important in explaining the verbal violence and the acceptance of another person's intermediation suggests the need to explore how family conflictivity varies throughout the course of one's life. It is a well-known fact, for example, that youth is the time of the greatest relative risk of violence for women (Inmujeres, Inegi and Crim, 2004) and that age tends to give them progressive quotas of authority up to a certain point, provided they do not exceed the limits established by gender construction (Safilious-Rothschild, 1982). It has also been suggested that the desexualization of women at late stages of the life course relaxes social controls over their mobility and independence, in addition to the influence they acquire over other women in the household (such as daughters-in-law, for example) with age.

Final Considerations

This paper focuses on the study of the dynamics of intra household relations through the examination of three aspects that have rarely been explored in Mexican research: patterns of interaction, affectivity and conflictivity. We analyze the way in which these dimensions are modified when three axes of social differentiation are considered: socio-economic stratum (as an indicator of class),

sex (as a gender referent) and age. We begin by highlighting the conceptual importance of each of these dimensions in the study of intra household relations. Certain notions developed in the field of the sociology of emotions proved extremely useful in framing the analysis. We began with the study of social interaction whereby household members share a series of activities related to everyday reproduction. Conversely, for us, affectivity is a type of emotional social action that is subjectively constructed and interpreted on the basis of codes of particular meaning that are highly dependent on the subject's social location (Hochschild, 1978). Lastly, conflict, a structural element of forms of sociation (Simmel, 1986) is understood as the constitutive principal of human interaction in society and the precursor of violent situations. The inadequate handling of emotions may lead to situations of acute confrontation and the severing of social interaction links.

The empirical approach to these three dimensions was carried out through the use of the factor analysis tool, which enabled us to group a set of items recorded in the Family Dynamics Survey into hierarchical factors for each of the three analytical dimensions (interaction, affectivity, and conflictivity). Using multiple classification analysis, we calculated the adjusted means of the factors mentioned in each dimension for the various axes of inequity, as well as the standardized beta coefficients. Among the control variables for adjusting averages, we included contextual (size of locality), familial (type of household and position in the family) and individual factors (marital status and educational achievement). This statistical analysis enabled us to determine the way class (the family's socio-economic stratum), gender (sex) and age have a different effect on each of the factors in the three aspects taken into account.

The results of the statistical analysis merely highlight the implicit complexity of the world of affects and everyday interaction. Factor analysis was used to reveal the multiple sub-dimensions, which in turn are distinct from those we express conceptually. Among the early 21st century Mexican population, spending time with

other household members in tasks related to reproduction and/or recreation is primarily carried out through two distinct patterns of interaction, spending time inside or outside the home, in which a person's socio-economic stratum has a decisive impact.

At the same time, the world of the affects as the prime sphere of emotional social action, in which the meager rewards of status and the recognition provided by the latter are fought over, is divided into two antithetical dimensions surrounding the central figures of the father and mother, dimensions that denote opposing, ambiguous feelings of proximity or distance in relation to each of them. In themselves, these feelings underline the contradictions and tensions inherent in intra-familial life, which can easily lead to situations of conflict. As a specific type of familial interaction, this elicits a varied set of responses which -according to the results of statistical analysis- point to greater heterogeneity: from extreme violence through verbal violence and lack of negotiation to the acceptance of the mediation of third parties.

The various axes of social inequality considered lend each of these dimensions particular characteristics. Class (socio-economic stratum) determines a higher frequency of spending time together outside the home of the middle and upper classes. It also promotes a greater perception of extreme violence in the lower socio-economic strata, although violence as such (with the exception of extreme violence) cuts through every level of the social hierarchy. In this aspect, we confirm the idea already expressed by other authors (Castro, 2004) that the context of acute deprival characterizing poverty merely increases the risk of the occurrence of violence. It is not that poverty determines violence, but rather that acute material deficiencies also impoverish the quality of intra-familial life and increase the likelihood of violence as a pattern of family interaction. Social class is also crucial in the perception of the affection given to each other by household members, which, once again, is much less among the lower strata.

There is, however, the problem of the extent to which the instrument for gathering information is biased towards a particular style of family life. Socio-economic stratum, relevant in most aspects, is less able to explain the proximity to or distance from the maternal and paternal figures, in which age (18-24) and position in the family (children) proved to be crucial variables.

Although gender is not the factor with the greatest relative importance in any of the dimensions considered, it encourages women to spend more time together inside the home, while increasing their perception of extreme violence. This last aspect constitutes not only an unequivocal expression of the asymmetric nature of intra household relations but also of the complexity they involve. Although extreme domestic violence as a pattern of family relations is necessarily interactional, the dissimilarity of the perception of its occurrence between men and women denotes the way this perception is also a product of gender construction itself. These inter-gender differences are also expressed in affectivity, since women feel closer to their mothers and less so to their fathers, as our results have shown. Among these two central figures in the family world, it is undoubtedly mothers who elicit more intense emotions, which are not necessarily free of contradiction.

Finally, age encourages greater interaction with the family outside home or reduces the feelings of closeness to parents or makes it easier to accept the intermediation of third parties in situations of conflict, depends upon the aging process. Thus, spending time together, affectivity and conflictivity are not only complex, crucial dimensions of intra-familial life but -like most social processes- show a high degree of dynamism depending on the social sector to which the families belong, the gender of their members and the stage of life they are at, all factors that must be taken into account if one wishes to propose moderately effective policies to promote families' well-being.

References

Andersen, Bridget (2000), Doing the Dirty Work?The Global Politics of Domestic Labor, Zed Books, New York, New York.

Ariza Marina (2005), "Juventud, migración y curso de vida. Sentidos y vivencias de la migración entre los jóvenes urbanos mexicanos", in Marta Mier-y-Terán and Cecilia Rabell (cooordinators), Jóvenes y niños. Un enfoque sociodemográfico, Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM, FLACSO, Porrúa Editores and Cámara de Diputados, Mexico City, pp. 39-70.

Ariza Marina and Orlandina de Oliveira (1997), "Formación y Dinámica Familiar en México, Centroamérica y El Caribe", Ibero-Ameriknisches, Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaften und Geschite. Neue Folge, Jahrgang 23 1997, Heft 1-2, pp. 27-44, Berlin.

Ariza, Marina and Orlandina de Oliveira, (in press), "Género, clase y concepciones sobre la sexualidad en México", in Susana Lerner, Ivonne Szasz, Salud Reproductiva y Condiciones de vida en México, El Colegio de México, Mexico City.

Bericat Alastuey, Eduardo (2000), "La sociología de la emoción y la emoción en la sociología", in Papers 62, Spain, pp. 145-176.

Bordieu, Pierre (1988), La distinción. Criterio y bases sociales del gusto, Taurus Humanidades, Madrid, Spain.

Bubeck, Diemut (1995), Care, Gender and Justice, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Casique, Irene (2003), "Trabajo femenino, empoderamiento y bienestar de la familia", in Nuevas formas de familia. Perspectivas nacionales e internacionales, Montevideo, Universidad de la República y Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia (Unicef), pp. 271-299.

Castro, Roberto (2004), Violencia contra mujeres embarazadas. Tres estudios sociológicos, CRIM-UNAM, Cuernava, Mexico.

Castro, Roberto, Florinda Riquer and María Eugenia Medina (2004), "Introducción", in Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (inegi) and Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de

México (crim), Violencia de género en las parejas mexicanas. Resultados de la Encuesta Nacional sobre la Dinámica de las Relaciones en los Hogares 2003, Mexico, Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, pp. 8-27.

Crompton, Rosemary and Michael Mann (eds.) (1986), Gender and Stratification, Cambridge: Polity Press.

D´Aubeterre, Ma. Eugenia (2005) "Mujeres trabajando por el pueblo: género y ciudadanía en una comunidad de transmigrantes oriundos del Estado de Puebla". Estudios Sociológicos 23, no. 67 (January-April 2005): 185-215. Mexico.

Delphy, Christine and Diana Leonard (1986), "Class Analysis, Gender Analysis and the Family" in Rosemary Cromton and Michael Mann (eds.) Gender and Stratification, Cambridge Polity Press, pp. 57-73.

Denzin, Norman K. (1983), "A Note on Emotionality, Self and Interaction", in American Sociological Review, vol.89, no.2, pp.402-409.

Esteinou, Rosario (2004), "La parentalidad en la familia: cambios y continuidades", in Marina Ariza and Orlandina de Oliveira (coord.), Imágenes de la familia en el cambio de siglo, Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM, Mexico City, pp., 251-282.

Figueroa Perea, Juan G. and Eduardo Liendro (1994), "Algunos apuntes sobre la presencia del varón en la toma de decisiones reproductivas", paper delivered at Seminar on Households, Families: Inequality, Conflict, Solidarity and Parental Networks, Mexico, Aguascalientes, June 27-29, (mimeo).

Frisby, David (1984), Georg Simmel, Breviarios del Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico, D.F.

Fuller, Norma (2000), "Significados y prácticas de paternidad entre varones urbanos del Perú", in Norma Fuller (ed.) Paternidades en América Latina, Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Peru, pp. 35-90.

García, Brígida and Orlandina de Oliveira (1994), Trabajo femenino y vida familiar en México, Mexico, El Colegio de México, 301 pp.

García, Brígida y Orlandina de Oliveira (2006), Las familias en el México metropolitano: visiones femeninas y masculinas, El Colegio de México, Mexico City.

González Montes, Soledad (1998), "La violencia doméstica y sus repercusiones en la salud reproductiva en una zona indígena (Cuetzalan, Puebla)", in Asociación Mexicana de Población y Fundación MacArthur, Los silencios de la salud reproductiva, violencia, sexualidad y derechos reproductivos, Mexico, Fundación MacArthur, Asociación Mexicana de Población, pp.17-54.

González Montes, Soledad and P. Iracheta (1987), "La violencia en la vida de las mujeres campesinas: el distrito de Tenenago, 1880-1910", in Carmen Ramos et al., Presencia y transparencia: la mujer en la historia de México, México, El Colegio de México, pp. 111-141.

Granados Shiroma, Marcela and Romeo Madrigal (1998), "Salud reproductiva y violencia contra la mujer. Una análisis desde la perspectiva de género (El caso de la zona metropolitana de Monterrey)", in Asociación Mexicana de Población y Fundación MacArthur, Los silencios de la salud reproductiva, violencia, sexualidad y derechos reproductivos, Mexico, Mac Arthur Foundation, Asociación Mexicana de Población, pp. 55-106.

Grusky, David B. (1994) The Contours of Social Stratification: Class, Race and Gender. In Sociological Perspective. Stanford: Westview Press.

Gutmann, Matthew (1993), "Los hombres cambiantes, los machos impenitentes y las relaciones de género en México en los noventa", Estudios sociológicos, vol. 11, no. 33, September-December, pp. 725-740.

Hochschild, A. R, (1978), "Emotion, Work, Feeling Rules and Social Structure", in American Journal of Sociology, 85: 551-575.
Hochschild, A. R. (1981), "Power, Status and Emotion", Contemporary Sociology, 10: 73-77.

Instituto Nacional de Geografría, Informática y Estadística (2007), Mujeres y Hombres en México, 2007, Mexico City.

Infante, Ricardo (2005), "Chile: inserción laboral, tipo de relaciones familiares y calidad de vida. 2000", in Ximena Valdés and Teresa Valdés (editors), S., Familia y vida privada. ¿Transformaciones, tensiones, resistencias o nuevos sentidos? , FLACSO, Chile., pp.251-276.

INMUJERES, FNUAP, et. Al (2001), "El enfoque de género en la producción de las estadísticas sobre trabajo en México. Una guía para el uso y una referencia para la producción de información ", Serie Estadísticas de Género, Mexico City.

Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (inegi), y Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (crim) (2004), Violencia de género en las parejas mexicanas. Resultados de la Encuesta Nacional sobre la Dinámica de las Relaciones en los Hogares 2003, México, Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, inegi and crim.

Kemper, Th. D. (1978), "Toward a Sociology of Emotions: some Problems and some Solutions", in The American Sociologist, 13: 30-41.

Kemper, Th. D. (1989), "Love and like and love and love", in Franks, D.D; Doyle McCartthy, E. (ed.), The Sociology of Emotions: Original Essays and Research Papers., Greenwhich; Jai Press Inco., p. 249-270.

Larson W., Reed, David Almeida (1999), "Emotional Transmission in the Daily lives of Families: A new Paradigm of Studying Family Process", in Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 61, No.1, Febrero, pp. 5-20.

Larson, R. and Gillman, S. (1999), "Transmission of emotions in the daily interactions of single-mother families," in Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61, 21-37.

Leavitt, John (1996), "Meaning and Feeling in the Anthropology of Emotions", in American Ethnologist, Vol. 23, No.3, August, pp. 514-539.

Mora, Manuel (2005), "Emoción, género y vida cotidiana: apuntes para una intersección antropológica de la paternidad", in Espiral, September-December, yr./vol.XII, no. 034, Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico, pp.9-35.

Mummert, Gail. 2005. "Transnational Parenting in Mexican Migrant Communities: Redefining Fatherhood, Motherhood and Care-giving". Paper delivered at The Mexican International Family Strengths Conference: Building Family Relations. Cuernavaca, 1-3 de June, 2005.

Neugarten (1986), Bernice (1985), "Interpretative social science and research on aging", in Alice Rossi (comp.) Gender and the Life Course. University of Massachussetts-Amherst, American Sociological Association Presidential Volume, Aldine Publishing Company, New York.

Oliveira, Orlandina de (1999), "Familia y género en el análisis sociodemográfico", in Brígida García (coord.), Mujer, Género y Población, El Colegio de México, México.

Oliveira, Orlandina de (2007), "Reflexiones acerca de las desigualdades sociales y el género", paper delivered at Seminar on Glances at Inequality in Latin America, 13 April, El Colegio de México, México, D.F.

Oliveira, Orlandina de and Marina Ariza (1999), "Trabajo, familia y condición femenina: una revisión de las principales perspectivas de análisis", in Papeles de Población, Year 5, no. 20, April-June, pp. 89-128, México.

Rabell, Cecilia, Ariza, M., DAubeterre, M. E., and Solís, P. (2006), Encuesta Nacional sobre la Dinámica de las Familias, 2005. Informe, DIF and IISUNAM, Mexico City.

Ramírez Rodríguez, Juan Carlos and Patricia N. Vargas B. (1998), "La cifra 'negra' de la violencia doméstica contra la mujer", in Asociación Mexicana de Población y

Fundación MacArthur, Los silencios de la salud reproductiva, violencia, sexualidad y derechos reproductivos, Mexico, Fundación MacArthur-Asociación Mexicana de Población, pp. 107-133.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina (1982), "Female Power, Autonomy and Demographic Change in the Third World", in Richard Anker, Mayra Buvinic and Nadia H. Youssef, Women's Roles and Population Trends in the Third World, Geneva, International Labor Organization, pp. 117-131.

Scheff, Th, J, (1997), Emotions, the social bond, and human reality. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Simmel, George (1986), El individuo y la libertad. Ensayos de Crítica de la Cultura. Ediciones Península, Barcelona, Spain.

Stacey Margaret (1986), "Gender and Stratification", in Rosemary Crompton and Michael Mann (eds), Gender and Stratification, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 214-223.

Tilly, Charles (2000), La Desigualdad Persistente, Editorial Manantial, Buenos Aires, 302p.

Torres Falcón, Marta (comp.) (2004), Violencia contra las mujeres en contextos urbanos y rurales, México, El Colegio de México, 447 p.

Valdez, R. and E. Shrader (1992), "Características y análisis de la violencia doméstica en México: el caso de una microrregión de ciudad Nezahualcóyotl", in Aún la luna a veces tiene miedo, Mexico, Centro de Investigación y Lucha contra la Violencia Doméstica, A.C., pp. 35-49.

Wainerman, Catalina (2000), "División del trabajo en familias de dos proveedores. Relato desde ambos géneros y dos generaciones", Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos, vol. 15, no. 1, January-April, pp. 149-184.

Table 1

Activities usually engaged in with other household members	Percentage of occurrence	Communalities	Factors	
			time spent together outside the home	Time spent together inside the home
Have breakfast or lunch	82.8	0.57		0.75
Eat	82.6	0.58		0.76
Have supper	86.1	0.48		0.68
Got out for a drive	72.2	0.52	0.70	
Go to the movies	30.4	0.51	0.72	
Play some kind of sport	31.7	0.44	0.66	
Eat out	60.9	0.59	0.77	

Percentage of occurrence and results of factor analysis of time spent together
Matrix with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 2

Summary of results of factor analysis between variables

Factor	Eigenvalues	% of Variance	% Accum
Time spent together outside the home	2.26	29.18	29.18
Time spent together inside the home	1.44	23.55	52.73

Method: Main components

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 3

Perception of affection received and relationship with mother and father (percentages)		
Perception of affection received	**Percentage**	
Unaffectionate	24.9	
Very affectionate	75.1	
Distance or closeness	**Relationship with mother**	**Relationship with father**
He/she is the family member he most respects	26.0	22.3
He/she is the family member he gets on best with	21.2	5.6
He/she is the family member who gives him most affection	27.5	4.6
He/she is the family member he feels closest to	23.7	4.3
He/she is the family member he feels most distant from	3.6	6.8
He/she is the family member he is most frightened of	2.2	4.4
He/she is the family member he quarrels most with	2.1	1.7

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 4

Summary of results of factor analysis of relationship with mother			
Matrix with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization			
		Factors	
Relationship with mother	Communalities	Closeness to mother	Distance from mother
She is the family member he most respects	0.41	0.64	
She is the family member he gets on best with	0.63	0.79	
She is the family member who gives him most affection	0.68	0.83	
She is the family member he feels closest to	0.69	0.83	
She is the family member he feels most distant from	0.32		0.55
She is the family member he is most frightened of	0.52		0.71
She is the family member he quarrels most with	0.54		0.73

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 5

Summary of results of factor analysis of relationship with mother

Factors	Eigenvalues	% of Variance	% Accum
Closeness to mother	2.46	34.97	34.97
Distance from mother	1.33	19.11	54.08

Method: Main components.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 6

Summary of results of factor analysis of relationship with father
Matrix with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization

Relationship with father	Communalities	Factors	
		Closeness to father	Distance from father
He is the family member he most respects	0.38	0.58	
He is the family member he gets on best with	0.55	0.74	
He is the family member who gives him most affection	0.55	0.74	
He is the family member he feels closest to	0.58	0.76	
He is the family member he feels most distant from	0.41		0.64
He is the family member he is most frightened of	0.54		0.72
He is the family member he quarrels most with	0.49		0.70

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 7

Summary of results of factor analysis of variables of relationship with father

Factors	Eigenvalues	% of Variance	% Accum
Closeness to father	2.03	28.91	28.91
Distance from father	1.46	21.06	49.96

Method: Main components.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 8

Frequency of Conflicts and Reactions to the latter (percentages)	
How many times have you quarreled in the past month?	Percentage
None	83.6
Once	7.3
Twice	4.4
Three times or more	4.7
Reactions to conflict	*Percentage*
They did what a family member suggested	41.5
They shouted at each other	52.2
They hit each other	5.4
Intervention by another person was sought	13.9
They did not talk about the matter or reach an agreement	23
Nothing was done	13.8
Someone in the family went to live elsewhere	12.4
Someone in the family was reported to the police	3.1
Someone was physically hurt	4.7

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 9

		Factors			
		Extreme	Lack of	Verbal	Mediation
Reactions to conflict	Communalities	violence	negotiation	violence	of others

Summary of Results of Factor Analysis of Reactions to Conflict
Matrix with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization

Reactions to conflict	Communalities	Extreme violence	Lack of negotiation	Verbal violence	Mediation of others
How many times have you quarreled in the past mont	0.47			0.67	
They did what a family member suggested	0.54				0.73
They shouted at each other	0.63			0.78	
They hit each other	0.33	0.45			
Intervention by another person was sought	0.55				0.73
They did not talk about the matter or reach an agr	0.69		0.78		
Nothing was done	0.74		0.84		
Someone in the family went to live elsewhere	0.39	0.58			
Someone in the family was reported to the police	0.60	0.77			
Someone was physically hurt	0.66	0.80			

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 10
Summary of results of factor analysis between variables
of reactions to conflict

Factor	Eigenvalues	% of Variance	% Accum
Extreme violence	2.08	17.98	17.98
Lack of negotiation	1.35	13.36	31.34
Verbal violence	1.14	13.00	44.34
Mediation of others	1.02	11.61	55.95

Method: Main components.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 11

Index of spending time together outside and inside the home

(Beta coefficients adjusted by factors)

Variables	Outside	Inside
Contextual		
Size of locality	0.11	0.13
Relatives		
Family's socioeconomic stratum	0.36	0.04
Type of household	0.04	0.02
Position in the family	0.08	0.04
Individuals		
Sex	*	0.06
Age	0.16	0.04
Marital status	0.16	0.09
Educational attainment	0.07	0.08
R squared	0.26	0.04

* Not significant.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 12
Perception of affection received and relationship with mother and father
(Beta coefficients adjusted by factors)

Variables	Affection received	Affectivity			
		With mother		With father	
		Closeness	Distance	Closeness	Distance
Contextual					
Size of locality	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.03
Relatives					
Family's socioeconomic stratum	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.01
Type of household	0.05	*	0.02	*	0.03
Position in the family	0.05	0.20	*	0.18	0.12
Individuals					
Sex	*	0.04	0.04	0.04	*
Age	*	0.22	0.14	0.12	0.18
Marital status	0.06	0.17	*	0.02	0.07
Educational attainment	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.03	0.04
R squared	0.02	0.25	0.03	0.08	0.11

* Not significant.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 13

Indices of presence of conflict and reactions to latter

(Beta coefficients adjusted by factors)

Variables	Conflict	Extreme violence	Lack of negotiation	Verbal violence	Mediation of others
Contextual					
Size of locality	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.07
Relatives					
Family's socioeconomic stratum	0.07	0.11	0.07	*	*
Type of household	*	0.04	*	*	*
Position in the family	0.06	0.09	0.13	*	*
Individuals					
Sex	*	0.04	*	*	0.04
Age	0.13	*	*	0.05	0.07
Marital status	*	*	*	0.11	0.16
Educational attainment	*	0.07	*	*	0.07
R squared	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05

* Not significant.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 14
Indices of time spent together as a family
(Averages adjusted by factors)a

Variables	Outside	Inside
Socioeconomic index		
First quintile	-0.57	-0.02
Second quintile	-0.26	-0.06
Third quintile	-0.02	0.04
Fourth quintile	0.18	0.01
Fifth quintile	0.47	0.02
Age		
18 to 24	0.15	-0.01
25 to 29	0.11	-0.09
30 to 44	0.06	0.03
45 to 64	-0.18	-0.01
65 and over	-0.37	0.09
Sex		
Man	*	-0.06
Woman	*	0.05
Position in the family		
Type of household	0.10	-0.02
Spouse	-0.04	-0.04
Son or daughter	-0.09	0.06
Other relative	0.02	0.02
N	17386	17386

* Not significant.

Averages adjusted by socio-economic index, age, sex, position in the family, size of locality, type of household and marital status.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 15

Perception of affection received from mother and father

(averages adjusted by factors)a

Variables	Affection received	Affectivity			
		With mother		With father	
		Closeness	Distance	Closeness	Distance
Socioeconomic index					
First quintile	1.68	0.07	-0.03	0.03	0.01
Second quintile	1.72	0.07	-0.04	-0.01	0.01
Third quintile	1.74	0.01	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01
Fourth quintile	1.78	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
Fifth quintile	1.83	-0.09	0.10	0.03	0.01
Age					
18 to 24	*	0.27	0.23	0.10	0.31
25 to 29	*	0.17	0.06	0.10	0.08
30 to 44	*	0.05	-0.02	0.07	-0.06
45 to 64	*	-0.21	-0.14	-0.13	-0.16
65 and over	*	-0.45	-0.18	-0.23	-0.19
Sex					
Man	*	-0.03	-0.03	*	0.02
Woman	*	0.04	0.04	*	-0.01
Position in the family					
Head of household	1.78	-0.09	*	-0.10	-0.06
Spouse	1.74	-0.04	*	-0.09	-0.03
Son or daughter	1.73	0.32	*	0.31	0.19
Other relative	1.74	-0.33	*	-0.16	-0.18
N	16992	22789	22789	22789	22789

* Not significant.

Averages adjusted by socio-economic index, age, sex, position in the family, size of locality, type of household and marital status.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.

Table 16
Presence of conflict and reactions to latter
(averages adjusted by factors)a

Variables	Conflict	Violence extreme	Lack of negotiation	Violence verbal	Mediation of others
Socioeconomic index					
First quintile	0.14	0.10	0.14	*	*
Second quintile	0.14	0.11	0.08	*	*
Third quintile	0.17	0.09	-0.04	*	*
Fourth quintile	0.15	-0.04	-0.08	*	*
Fifth quintile	0.21	-0.14	-0.04	*	*
Age					
18 to 24	0.24	*	*	-0.03	-0.03
25 to 29	0.18	*	*	0.07	0.07
30 to 44	0.16	*	*	0.05	0.05
45 to 64	0.12	*	*	-0.01	-0.01
65 and over	0.08	*	*	-0.26	-0.26
Sex					
Man	*	-0.04	*	*	0.05
Woman	*	0.03	*	*	-0.03
Position in the family					
Head of household	0.16	-0.09	-0.13	*	*
Spouse	0.19	-0.04	-0.09	*	*
Son or daughter	0.14	0.08	0.13	*	*
Other relative	0.13	0.20	0.20	*	*
N	22468	3014	3014	3014	3014

* Not significant.

Averages adjusted by socio-economic index, age, sex, position in the family, size of locality, type of household and marital status.

Source: Table drawn up by authors based on ENDIFAM 2005 data.