

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL COVER SHEET  
University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

LSC Use Only  
Number \_\_\_\_\_  
Action PASSED  
Date 2-25-93

UWUCC Use Only  
Number 92-36  
Action App  
Date 4/20/93  
Senate App 5/4/93

I. TITLE/AUTHOR OF CHANGE  
COURSE/PROGRAM TITLE Marriage, Kinship, and the Family  
DEPARTMENT Sociology-Anthropology  
CONTACT PERSON Dr. Stephen Sanderson; Dr. Miriam Chaiken

II. THIS COURSE IS BEING PROPOSED FOR:  
 Course Approval Only  
 Course Approval and Liberal Studies Approval  
 Liberal Studies Approval only (course previously has been approved by the University Senate)

III. APPROVALS

Miriam Chaiken  
Department Curriculum Committee  
[Signature] 2/24/93  
College Curriculum Committee  
[Signature] 2-25-93  
Director of Liberal Studies  
(where applicable)

[Signature]  
Department Chairperson  
[Signature] 2/24/93  
College Dean\*  
Provost  
(where applicable)

\*College Dean must consult with Provost before approving curriculum changes. Approval by College Dean indicates that the proposed change is consistent with long range planning documents, that all requests for resources made as part of the proposal can be met, and that the proposal has the support of the university administration.

IV. TIMETABLE

Date Submitted to LSC \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Year to be implemented \_\_\_\_\_ Date to be published in Catalog \_\_\_\_\_  
to UWUCC \_\_\_\_\_  
• Spring 1994 or Fall 1994

Description of Curricular Change

SO/AN 286 Marriage, Kinship, and the Family 3 credits

Prerequisites: None

Sociological and anthropological study of patterns of marriage, kinship, and family life, with emphasis on the relationship between family patterns and other social institutions. Topics covered include the family and marriage in historical and comparative perspective; worldwide patterns of gender stratification; incest and incest avoidance; class and race contexts of family patterns; mate selection and love; parenthood and child rearing; domestic and sexual violence; alternative family lifestyles; and the current crisis and possible future of the family. Intended for a broad audience, but also open to sociology and anthropology majors and minors. SO/AN 286 may be taken for credit along with SO 336.

Description of Curricular Change

SO/AN 286 Marriage, Kinship, and the Family

3 credits

Prerequisites: None

Sociological and anthropological study of patterns of marriage, kinship, and family life, with emphasis on the relationship between family patterns and other social institutions. Topics covered include the family and marriage in historical and comparative perspective; worldwide patterns of gender stratification; incest and incest avoidance; class and race contexts of family patterns; mate selection and love; parenthood and child rearing; domestic and sexual violence; alternative family lifestyles; and the current crisis and possible future of the family. Intended for a broad audience, but also open to sociology and anthropology majors and minors. May be taken for credit along with SO 336.

Proposed Changes

New course.

Justification for Changes

A number of sociology departments around the country teach courses in marriage and the family as intermediate-level courses designed for a broad audience. We are introducing a new family course of this type. The department's other family course -- SO 336, Sociology of the Family -- is designed as a course for sociology majors, especially those in the clinical sociology track. The new course differs appreciably from the existing course not only in being intended for a broader audience, but specifically in having a strong comparative and historical focus. It looks at patterns of marriage and family life throughout the wide range of human societies, as well as at the historical development of the Western family. This not only distinguishes it from the existing family course in our department (which focuses on the contemporary American family), but also from the Liberal Studies family course -- HE 224, Marriage and Family Relations -- offered by Home Economics Education. The new course would be highly complementary to both these courses.

Department of Sociology-Anthropology  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
Indiana, Pennsylvania

SO/AN 286  
MARRIAGE, KINSHIP, AND THE FAMILY

COURSE SYLLABUS

I. General Information

Professor: Dr. Stephen Sanderson  
Office & Hours: 120 Keith Hall, phone 357-2732  
TR, 11:15-12:15 AM; Wed., 9:30-12:30

II. Required Reading Materials

1. Randall Collins and Scott Coltrane, Sociology of Marriage and the Family: Gender, Love, and Property. 3rd edition. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1991.
2. Robin Fox, Kinship and Marriage. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.
3. One of the following:  
  
 Brigitte Berger and Peter L. Berger, The War over the Family. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.  
  
 Donald Symons, The Evolution of Human Sexuality. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979.  
  
 Pierre L. van den Berghe, Human Family Systems: An Evolutionary View. New York: Elsevier, 1979.

III-A. Course Content.

Different kinds of courses in marriage and the family have been taught for decades in American universities. Courses with these words in the title are frequently taught in departments of home economics or similar departments, and this is the case in our own university. Moreover, virtually all sociology departments teach one or more courses in the family. Some of these courses have a rather practical focus, others are more theoretical, and still others combine practical and theoretical concerns. This course falls into the more theoretical category. It will introduce you to a broad range of social-science theory regarding the family, drawing on the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. The course will also have another focus that distinguishes it sharply from other family courses at IUP: it will be a comparative course, which means that it will explore the vast array of family and marriage patterns that

11

is found throughout the broad range of human societies. The course, or at least some parts of it, may very well have a practical value for you, but that is incidental to its main purpose, which is the social-scientific understanding of the family as a basic type of human social arrangement.

One can look at the family from either a macrolevel or a microlevel perspective. A macrolevel perspective emphasizes the study of patterns of marriage, family, and kinship as they exist at the level of entire societies. This perspective emphasizes the relationship of the family to other social institutions, and also looks at how the family is embedded in the class, racial, and ethnic structures of complex societies. This course will have a strong macrolevel flavor, and it will give considerable attention to the cross-cultural, comparative, and historical analysis of family life. However, we will also take a microlevel look at the family, especially later in the course. Here we will be concerned with the interactions of individuals within marriages and families. Such issues as mate selection, marital interaction, divorce and remarriage, parenthood and child rearing, and domestic and sexual violence are some of the most important microlevel aspects of the family that we will be exploring. To the extent possible, we will also explore these more micro issues from a comparative and historical perspective.

There should be something for everybody in this course. I am more interested in the macrolevel issues, while many students are likely to be more interested in the microlevel issues. But this course will offer a balanced treatment of both kinds of issues.

### III-B. Course Structure

The course is formally planned as predominantly a lecture course, but I hope to have quite a bit of discussion and debate. Many of the issues that we will be exploring are hotly controversial, and this ought to stimulate many questions and a lot of discussion. I will deliberately try to stir up controversy at various points in the course. I love controversy. Truth be told, I crave it!! And the introduction of controversy into college courses can be a great learning experience. Everybody learns more when they encounter sharply opposing sets of ideas and are required to think them through.

### IV. Examinations

There will be 3 major exams in the course, the final included. These will be a combination of essay and objective questions, but with more emphasis on objective questions.

V. Written Paper Assignment

You are to write a 10-page paper on one of the books listed under item #3 on page 1 of this syllabus. These are all very controversial books that should serve as excellent stimulants to critical thought. I won't say anything more about these books here, or even that much in class, because I want you to develop your own thinking about them.

Further guidelines about preparation of this paper will be given out at the same time as the syllabus. They should give you a pretty good idea of what I'm looking for. Because of the controversial nature of these books, I am especially interested in a critical reaction to them. Be sure to summarize and discuss your book's main points, of course, but also tell us what you think of it. And try your best to support your arguments with logic, reason, and, if possible, empirical evidence.

VI. Grading

Your three exams and your term paper each count 25% of your final grade. I use a straight percentage system of grading as follows:  
85% and above = A; 75-84% = B; 65-74% = C; 50-64% = D; below 50% = F.

VII. Course Outline and Reading Assignments  
 (CC = Collins and Coltrane; RF = Fox)

CLASS MEETING	TOPIC	READING ASSIGNMENT
1	Course Introduction	
2	Conceptual & Theoretical Foundations I: Functionalism, Conflict Theory, and Sociobiology	CC, chs. 1-2
3	Conceptual & Theoretical Foundations II: Types of Human Societies	CC, pp. 81-86
4	Cross-Cultural Analyses of Marriage, Family, & Kinship	RF, chs. 1 and 3-8 (ch. 9 is optional)
5	Cross-Cultural Analyses (cont'd)	
6	Cross-Cultural Analyses (cont'd)	
7	Cross-Cultural Analyses (cont'd)	
8	Incest & Incest Avoidance	CC, pp. 58-61; RF, ch. 2
9	Gender Stratification in Human Societies	CC, ch. 3
10	Gender Stratification (cont'd)	
11	Gender Stratification (cont'd)	
12	EXAM I	
13	Human Sexuality in Historical & Comparative Perspective	
14	Human Sexuality (cont'd)	
15	Historical Development of the Modern Western Family	CC, ch. 4
16	Historical Development (cont'd)	
17	Family Variations in Industrial Societies	
18	Class, Race, & Ethnic Contexts of Family Organization	CC, 6-7
19	Mate Selection, Love, & Marital Dynamics	CC, chs. 8-10
20	Mate Selection, Love, & Marital Dynamics (cont'd)	

- 21      **EXAM II**
- 22      **Divorce & Remarriage**                      **CC, ch. 12**
- 23      **Parenthood & Child Rearing**                      **CC, ch. 14**
- 24      **Domestic and Sexual Violence**                      **CC, ch. 11**
- 25      **Alternative Family Lifestyles**
- 26      **Open discussion on Berger and Berger,  
Symons, and van den Berghe**
- 27      **The Current Crisis and Possible Future  
of the Family**                      **CC, chs. 5, 16**
- 28      **Grand Conclusions (wide open discussion)**



14a

PRIMARY REFERENCES DRAWN ON FOR COURSE PREPARATION

(Note: If some of the references seem a bit old, that is either because the works are classics, or because they still represent some of the most important statements on any particular issue. In the comparative sociology of the family, freshness of reference is not nearly as crucial as it would be in courses on the modern family.)

Richard Gelles and Jane Lancaster, CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT. Aldine de Gruyter, 1987. (Compares child abuse in humans with abuse and neglect in non-human primates.)

Janet Giele and Audrey Smock, WOMEN: ROLES AND STATUSES IN EIGHT COUNTRIES. Wiley, 1977.

Rayna Rapp Reiter, TOWARD AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF WOMEN. Monthly Review Press, 1975.

Marvin Harris and Eric Ross, DEATH, SEX, AND FERTILITY: POPULATION REGULATION IN PREINDUSTRIAL AND DEVELOPING SOCIETIES, Columbia U. Press, 1987.

Gary Becker, A TREATISE ON THE FAMILY, 2nd ed., Harvard U. Press, 1991.

Anthony Giddens, THE TRANSFORMATION OF INTIMACY: SEXUALITY, LOVE, AND EROTICISM IN MODERN SOCIETIES. Stanford U. Press, 1992.

Andrew Cherlin, MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, REMARRIAGE, 2nd ed., Harvard U. Press, 1992.

Eli Zaretsky, CAPITALISM, THE FAMILY, AND PERSONAL LIFE. Harper & Row, 1976.

Vern Bullough, SEXUAL VARIANCE IN SOCIETY AND HISTORY. U of Chicago Press, 1976.

Roger Keesing, KIN GROUPS AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Jeffrey Weeks, SEXUALITY. Routledge, 1986.

Stephen Sanderson, MACROSOCIOLOGY, 2nd ed., chs. 14-16 (on gender stratification worldwide, comparative kinship systems, and the formation of the modern Western family system). HarperCollins, 1991.

Kathryn Ward, WOMEN WORKERS AND GLOBAL RESTRUCTURING. Cornell U. Press, 1990.

Michael Ruse, HOMOSEXUALITY. Blackwell, 1988.

Nancy Levine, THE DYNAMICS OF POLYANDRY. U of Chicago Press, 1988.

Clellan Ford and Frank Beach, PATTERNS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR. Harper & Row, 1950. (Classic work)

Philip Blumstein and Pepper Schwarts, AMERICAN COUPLES. Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Benjamin Zablocki, ALIENATION AND CHARISMA: A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN COMMUNES. Free Press, 1980.

Lee Ellis, THEORIES OF RAPE, 1990.

David Popenoe, DISTURBING THE NEST: FAMILY CHANGE AND DECLINE IN MODERN SOCIETIES. Aldine de Gruyter, 1988.

Arthur Alderson and Stephen Sanderson, "Historic European household structures and the capitalist world-economy." JOURNAL OF FAMILY HISTORY, 1991.

Rae Lesser Blumberg, "A general theory of gender stratification." In R. Collins (ed), SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY 1984. Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Janet Chafetz, SEX AND ADVANTAGE: A COMPARATIVE, MACROSTRUCTURAL THEORY OF SEX STRATIFICATION. Rowman and Allanheld, 1984.

William Divale and Marvin Harris, "Population, warfare, and the male supremacist complex." AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, 1976.

Robin Fox, KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE. Cambridge U. Press, 1983.

Ernestine Friedl, WOMEN AND MEN: AN ANTHROPOLOGIST'S VIEW. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Jack Goody, PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DOMESTIC DOMAIN. Cambridge U. Press, 1976.

Herbert Gutman, THE BLACK FAMILY IN SLAVERY AND FREEDOM. Pantheon, 1976. (Classic work)

Eleanor Leacock and Helen Safa (eds.), WOMEN'S WORK: DEVELOPMENT AND THE DIVISION OF LABOR BY GENDER. Bergin and Garvey, 1986.

Claude Levi-Strauss, THE ELEMENTARY FORMS OF KINSHIP. Beacon, 1969. (Classic work originally published in 1949.)

Christopher Lasch, HAVEN IN A HEARTLESS WORLD: THE FAMILY BESIEGED. Basic Books, 1977.

Kay Martin and Barbara Voorhie, FEMALE OF THE SPECIES. Columbia U. Press, 1975. (Classic work)

David Mandelbaum, WOMEN'S SECLUSION AND MEN'S HONOR. U of Arizona Press, 1988.

Karen Sacks, SISTERS AND WIVES: THE PAST AND FUTURE OF SEXUAL EQUALITY. Greenwood Press, 1979.

David Schneider and Kathleen Gough, MATRILINEAL KINSHIP. U of California Press, 1961. (Classic work)

Edward Shorter, THE MAKING OF THE MODERN FAMILY. Basic Books, 1975. (Classic work)

Lawrence Stone, THE FAMILY, SEX, AND MARRIAGE IN ENGLAND, 1500-1800. Harper and Row, 1979. (Classic work)

Pierre van den Berghe, AGE AND SEX IN HUMAN SOCIETIES: A BIOSOCIAL PERSPECTIVE. Wadsworth, 1973.

Pierre van den Berghe, HUMAN FAMILY SYSTEMS: AN EVOLUTIONARY VIEW. Elsevier, 1979. (Classic work)

Viviana Zelizer, PRICING THE PRICELESS CHILD: THE CHANGING SOCIAL VALUE OF CHILDREN. Basic Books, 1985.

Gwen Broude and Sarah Greene, "Cross-cultural codes on twenty sexual attitudes and practices." ETHNOLOGY, 1976.

Robert Winch, FAMILIAL ORGANIZATION. Free Press, 1977.

Stuart Queen and Robert Habenstein, THE FAMILY IN VARIOUS CULTURES. Lippincott, 1967. (Classic work)

William Goode, WORLD REVOLUTION AND FAMILY PATTERNS. Free Press, 1963. (Classic work)

Judith Stacey, BRAVE NEW FAMILIES: STORIES OF DOMESTIC UPHEAVAL IN LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICA. Basic Books, 1990.

Gary Lee, FAMILY STRUCTURE AND INTERACTION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. Lippincott, 1977.

Robert Staples, THE BLACK FAMILY. 3rd ed. Wadsworth, 1986.

Jack Goody, THE ORIENTAL, THE ANCIENT, AND THE PRIMITIVE: SYSTEMS OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY IN THE PREINDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES OF EURASIA. Cambridge U. Press, 1990.

COURSE ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

A1. This course is designed primarily for a broad audience of students. It is specifically intended for inclusion in the list of Liberal Studies Electives. The course is also likely to appeal to some sociology and anthropology majors and minors.

A2. This course does NOT require changes in any existing courses.

A3. This course takes a novel approach in that it combines a sociological and an anthropological focus in a single course. In so doing it makes extensive use of comparative and cross-cultural materials, something not common in other courses offered in our department.

A4. This course was offered in Spring 1992 under the title of the existing family course, SO 336--Sociology of the Family. It was exceptionally well received, suggesting that it will be a very popular course. Attendance in the class was excellent, often approaching 100% on any given occasion, and students were much more attentive and responsive than usual. Student grades were also unusually high, suggesting that they really wanted to put a lot of effort into the course.

A5. This is NOT to be a dual-level course.

A6. The course may NOT be taken for variable credit.

A7. Because of its unique comparative approach, undoubtedly few other universities offer such a course. I am not aware of such a course in any other university, although I'm sure that some universities have must have one. This means that the course reflects a highly innovative approach.

A8. Neither the content nor the skills of the course are recommended by a professional body, accrediting authority, law, or other external agency.

B1. This course will be taught by one instructor.

B2. No additional or corollary courses are needed with this course.

B3. There is very minimal overlap between this course and any course offered in our own or another department. Outside of sociology, the only department to offer undergraduate family courses is Home Economics Education. The content of this course has been shared with that department and it is agreed that the new course would be quite different from any family course they teach (see memo from Home Economics Education). As already explained, this course is distinct in terms of its strong comparative, cross-cultural focus.

B4. A few seats will be made available to students in continuing education.

C1. No new resources of any kind will be needed to teach this course. Existing resources are fully adequate.

C2. None of the resources of this course are funded by a grant.

C3. This course will be offered at least once every two years, and possibly once every year.

C4. One or two sections of 25-35 will be offered each time.

C5. Approximately 25-35 students will be accomodated in a section of this course.

C6. No professional society recommends enrollment limits for this course.

C7. This course will NOT be a curriculum requirement. However, it will satisfy a requirement, specifically the Liberal Studies Elective requirement.

### LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE APPROVAL FORM INSTRUCTION SHEET

Use this form only if you wish to have a course included in a Liberal Studies Learning Skill or Knowledge Area category. Do not use this form for synthesis or writing-intensive sections; different forms are available for these. If you have questions, contact the Liberal Studies Office, 352 Sutton Hall, telephone 357-5715.

This form is intended to assist you in developing your course to meet IUP's Criteria for Liberal Studies and to arrange your proposal in a standard order for consideration by the Liberal Studies Committee (LSC) and the University-wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UWUCC). When you have finished, your proposal will have these parts:

- Standard UWUCC Course Proposal Cover Sheet, with signatures (one page)
- Completed copy of LS General Information Check-List--Parts 1-3 of this form. (one page)
- One sheet of paper for your answers to the four questions in Part IV of this form. (one page)
- Completed check-list for each curriculum category in which your course is to be listed--e.g. Non-Western Cultures, Fine Arts, etc. (one page each)
- Course Syllabus in UWUCC Format.

Note: If this is a new course or a course revision not previously approved by the University Senate, you will also need a catalog description on a separate sheet and answers to the UWUCC Course Analysis Questionnaire. These are not considered by the LSC but will be forwarded to the UWUCC along with the rest of the proposal after the LSC completes its review. For information on UWUCC procedures, see the UWUCC Curriculum Handbook.

**SUBMIT ONE (1) COPY OF THE COMPLETED PROPOSAL TO THE LIBERAL STUDIES OFFICE (352 SUTTON HALL).** The Liberal Studies Committee will make its own copies from your original; the committee does reserve the right to return excessively long proposals for editing before they are duplicated. (If you happen to have extra copies of the proposal, you are invited to send multiple copies to the LSC to save unnecessary copying.)

**PLEASE NUMBER ALL PAGES.**

**LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE APPROVAL, PARTS 1-3: GENERAL INFORMATION CHECK-LIST**

I. Please indicate the LS category(ies) for which you are applying:

**LEARNING SKILLS:**

First Composition Course  
 Mathematics

Second Composition Course

**KNOWLEDGE AREAS:**

Humanities: History  
 Humanities: Philos/Rel Studies  
 Humanities: Literature  
 Natural Sci: Laboratory  
 Natural Sci: Non-laboratory

Fine Arts  
 Social Sciences  
 Non-Western Cultures  
 Health & Wellness  
 Liberal Studies Elective

II. Please use check marks to indicate which LS goals are primary, secondary, incidental, or not applicable. When you meet with the LSC to discuss the course, you may be asked to explain how these will be achieved.

Prim Sec Incid N/A

**A. Intellectual Skills and Modes of Thinking:**

1. Inquiry, abstract logical thinking, critical analysis, synthesis, decision making, and other aspects of the critical process.
2. Literacy--writing, reading, speaking, listening.
3. Understanding numerical data.
4. Historical consciousness.
5. Scientific Inquiry.
6. Values (Ethical mode of thinking or application of ethical perception).
7. Aesthetic mode of thinking.

**B. Acquiring a Body of Knowledge or Understanding Essential to an Educated Person**

**C. Understanding the Physical Nature of Human Beings**

**D. Collateral Skills:**

1. Use of the library.
2. Use of computing technology.

III. The LS criteria indicate six ways that courses should contribute to students' abilities. Please check all that apply. When you meet with the LSC, you may be asked to explain your check marks.

1. Confront the major ethical issues which pertain to the subject matter; realize that although "suspended judgment" is a necessity of intellectual inquiry, one cannot live forever in suspension; and make ethical choices and take responsibility for them.

2. Define and analyze problems, frame questions, evaluate available solutions and make choices.

3. Communicate knowledge and exchange ideas by various forms of expression, in most cases writing and speaking.

4. Recognize creativity and engage in creative thinking.

5. Continue learning even after the completion of their formal education.

6. Recognize relationships between what is being studied and current issues, thoughts, institutions, and/or events.

LIBERAL STUDIES COURSE APPROVAL, PARTS 4-6:

A. This a NOT A multiple-section, multiple-instructor course.

B. How will the course include the perspectives of ethnic minorities and women? The course will give explicit attention to women throughout. Indeed, how could a course on marriage and the family do otherwise? One and a half weeks will also be devoted to gender stratification throughout the world. Discussion of feminist perspectives on the family occur throughout. A section devoted to the relationship between class, race, and ethnicity on the one hand and family structure on the other is also an important part of the course. (See syllabus for more explicit information.)

C. Reading other than a textbook. Students will choose one of three provocative books for the purpose of writing a critical paper. The books to choose among are Brigitte and Peter Berger, The War Over the Family (Doubleday, 1983); Donald Symons, The Evolution of Human Sexuality (Oxford Univ. Press, 1979); and Pierre L. van den Berghe, Human Family Systems: An Evolutionary View (Elsevier, 1979). All of these books are well-known, highly provocative treatments of their respective topics. They take strong stands and are highly controversial, and thus they ought to do a great deal to stimulate thinking, especially the kind of critical thinking we are so concerned about these days.

D. This course is intended for a general student audience, but it is not really an introductory course in the strict sense. It is an intermediate level sociology and anthropology course that would have appeal to a very broad audience, but at the same time would probably attract a certain number of sociology majors and minors. In addition to sociology and anthropology students, the course should have strong appeal to students in such fields as education, child development, counseling, psychology, and probably others.



## CHECK LIST – LIBERAL STUDIES ELECTIVES

---

### Knowledge Area Criteria which the course must meet:

- Treat concepts, themes and events in sufficient depth to enable students to appreciate the complexity, history and current implications of what is being studied; and not be merely cursory coverage of lists of topics.
- Suggest the major intellectual questions/problems which interest practitioners of a discipline and explore critically the important theories and principles presented by the discipline.
- Allow students to understand and apply the methods of inquiry and vocabulary commonly used in the discipline.
- Encourage students to use and enhance, wherever possible, the composition and mathematics skills built in the Skill Areas of Liberal Studies.

### Liberal Studies Elective Criteria which the course must meet:

- Meet the "General Criteria Which Apply to All Liberal Studies Courses."
- Not be a technical, professional or pre-professional course.

**Explanation:** Appropriate courses are to be characterized by learning in its broad, liberal sense rather than in the sense of technique or preprofessional proficiency. For instance, assuming it met all the other criteria for Liberal Studies, a course in "Theater History" might be appropriate, while one in "The Craft of Set Construction" probably would not; or, a course in "Modern American Poetry" might be appropriate, while one in "New Techniques for Teaching Writing in Secondary Schools" probably would not; or, a course on "Mass Media and American Society" might be appropriate, while one in "Television Production Skills" probably would not; or, a course in "Human Anatomy" might be appropriate, while one in "Strategies for Biological Field Work" probably would not; or, a course in "Intermediate French" might be appropriate, while one in "Practical Methods for Professional Translators" probably would not.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

December 22, 1992

**SUBJECT:** Family Course Proposal: Marriage, Kinship, and the Family

**TO:** Stephen Sanderson  
Sociology-Anthropology Department

**FROM:** Linda Nelson, Chair *Linda Nelson*  
Phil Gordon  
Home Economics Education Department

Our department has received your revised course proposal for SO/AN 286 and we agree with the changes in the justification section. The degree of overlap with our existing courses, HE 224, Marriage and Family Relations and HE 324, Family Dynamics appears to be minimal. Although the material listed in your class outline section for class sessions 19-25, may have some coincidental overlap, put in the context of the course material that precedes it, the course should be a welcome addition to the study of marriage and family on the campus.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact our department.

**cc:** Hilda Richards  
Gary Buterbaugh

#23

1-MAR-1993 14:13:44.58

NEWMAIL

From: GROVE::BLCARTER "Brenda Carter"  
To: JAN PARKER  
CC: FRED MORGAN, BRENDA CARTER  
Subj: No New Resources Needed: SO/AN 286

Sorry I failed to note this when I signed. I have a statement from the department stating that no new resources are needed. Thanks.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

JAN 04 1993  
*Curriculum  
Committee*

December 22, 1992

SUBJECT: Family Course Proposal: Marriage, Kinship, and the Family

TO: Stephen Sanderson  
Sociology-Anthropology Department

FROM: Linda Nelson, Chair *Linda S. Nelson*  
Phil Gordon  
Home Economics Education Department

Our department has received your revised course proposal for SO/AN 286 and we agree with the changes in the justification section. The degree of overlap with our existing courses, HE 224, Marriage and Family Relations and HE 324, Family Dynamics appears to be minimal. Although the material listed in your class outline section for class sessions 19-25, may have some coincidental overlap, put in the context of the course material that precedes it, the course should be a welcome addition to the study of marriage and family on the campus.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact our department.

cc: Hilda Richards  
Gary Buterbaugh

Date: November 16, 1992

Subject: Your new course proposal: Marriage, Kinship and the Family

To: Stephen Sanderson  
Sociology Department Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

From: Philip B. Gordon  
Home Economics Education Dept.

Please excuse the delay in response to you memo of 10-28-92, but I have been away attending NCFR and the preconference workshop on theory and research methodology. The department has asked me to respond to your course proposal, and we believe it necessary to do so in a strong and clear voice.

Let me begin by responding to your statement in the Justification for Changes paragraph, where you express the need for an intermediate level course in family. Our liberal studies course, HE224, Marriage and Family Relations, is an intermediate level offering which speaks to your concern of reaching larger numbers of students. We currently serve up to 215 students per semester when we offer four sections, and up to 150 students in the semesters in which we offer only three sections. (The number of sections which can be offered depends on the number of required major's courses. We try to offer six sections of liberal studies courses per semester as our contribution to the Liberal Studies program, three to four of them HE224.)

In response to you section on Course Content, our focus is not practical in the sense that you imply. Our course(s) is offered from the perspective of family science (which is a growing social science discipline in its own right as I am sure you are aware--see Burr). As opposed to your statement about the "practical focus" of our discipline, we do not offer public school level family life education courses. Our emphasis is family studies -specifically, HE 224, Marriage and Family Relations is a survey course which is interdisciplinary in nature. We take our focus from developmental, interactionist, and structural-functional frameworks, as well as integrating systems, exchange, and other theoretical bases. We do exactly what you purport, i.e., a social scientific review of marriage and family. Perhaps you are unaware that Ph.D's in Family Studies (such as I) probably have a broader and deeper perspective on Family Science than representatives of single focus departments often do!

The microlevel issues to be covered in proposal are precisely those that we teach in HE 224 on the level that you are proposing. Additionally, those topics are expanded upon in our majors courses in family: HE 324, Family Dynamics; HE 424, Family Issues; and, HE 463, Family and the Community. I would be happy to review the content of our offerings with you at our mutual convenience, particularly the precise content taught in HE 224. The content specifically includes gender issues as they affect family relationships. Additionally, you may be unaware that Dr. Groves has offered an LS 499 course for the previous three semesters titled, " The Changing American Family."

In reviewing your the course outline section of your proposal, I actually don't see as much overlap with our course as you indicate in your preceding paragraphs on course content. In particular, your intent to cover cross cultural analyses and to a somewhat lesser extent (vis a vis, family studies and relationships), gender stratification issues might be an complement to what is offered in our department. I have difficulty in reconciling the course outline and the course content sections of your proposal. They appear to have two different levels of focus. Well taught macrolevel approaches to family studies might be a welcome supplement, particularly the study of the family as a social structure among others.

Members of the department have expressed concern to me that your conceptualization of what we do in our department is essentially marriage enrichment, parenting skills, and nutrition, which we don't do at all!! In particular we don't teach undergraduate students how to change diapers!!! HE 317, Infant Development, is a content oriented course which focuses on the cognitive and social-emotional aspects of out-of-home care of infants, toddlers and their families. Because it is a laboratory course, students may "change diapers" only as a necessary function of interacting with and assessing infants and toddlers.

Our students graduate with a BS in Child Development and Family Relations. My degree is in Family Studies, with a minor in sociology. I hold memberships in NCFR and ASA, with section memberships in family (ASA), research and theory feminism and family studies, and family policy (all NCFR). Additionally, I am a member of the national Family Theory and Research Methodology Group, associated with, but independent of NCFR.

In summary, I think you need to contact us concerning your course proposal before sending it on for further action. We are concerned with both the confusing nature of the proposed specifics of the course, as well as your perspective on our department.

copy: Chair, Sociology Department  
Chair, Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Miriam Chaiken, Sociology Department