Family Organizational Basics

Family Organizational Basics:

Leadership, Communication, Environment, and Culture

By

Sandra Vélez Candelario

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Family Organizational Basics:
Leadership, Communication, Environment, and Culture

By Sandra Vélez Candelario

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

This book is dedicated to the memory of the greatest family leader that I ever met, my mom. Always cleaning, decorating, cooking, facing our family's economic challenges, taking care of her young human capital at school and forever learning how to do it better and better. My mom was clear about how important a superior education was for her children; every day she moved forward until her death, striving to see her young human capital at home become successful at school so that we could go to college. Finally, she made her dream come true: from six children came six college degrees. Thank you mom, Luz Aida, for being there for me always—even after passing away. I also dedicate this book to her family leadership partner, my dad Artemio, who always said 'yes' to his co-worker at home. When my mom passed away, my father accepted his fulltime home management as the most precious thing in his life. I also dedicate this book to my daily partner at home, my husband Vicente and to my active and valued young human capital, my children. You guys, Vicente Eduardo and Vicente Andres, are the ones who support me each day to complete our family goals, mission, and vision of shared love and goods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Every single day we know that our family is there waiting for us to share stories, food, experiences, and anecdotes, amongst other things. For each one of us, family is like our feet; we know how difficult it would be to walk without them, but frequently we don't care like we should. The same thing happens with our house or domestic building, even when we own it. We usually treat this space like a thing that has to be there, not like a privilege that is protecting our body from the weather, from distress, or the environment; we should treat it like something that comes between us and other dangerous situations, as a great gift. Life's routine can make great things look casual and insignificant, while also making us unable to care for those gifts and assess them correctly. The reality is that being able to count on our own family is a privilege. A familiar lifestyle gives us the opportunity to practice and polish our social and emotional intelligence while we make mistakes and stupid decisions without the risk of being suspended or fired. Traditionally, our family is the organization that has more persistence with managing our non-functional behavior; this group usually supports us even when we don't support ourselves. This book will provide for the reader a scientific guide to understanding what the family is and how as an organization it can build an affordable and functional relationship and productive behavior among its members.

The family organization has a huge responsibility on its hands as the exclusive producer of human beings; it has to introduce valuable and productive human capital to the macro-socioeconomic system. Without the family organization, the socio-economic system cannot receive new human capital input. Due to the needs of healthy and functional human capital the country's legal system empowers family leaders with the legal authority to engender, raise, feed, train and supply the emotional needs of their little or young human capital from their first day of life. In addition, the domestic place is the most assertive scenario that any human being has to share their sexual needs, their affectivity, and their emotional expression openly, without judgments, in the privacy of their home. However, even as this space offers a certain amount of liberty, it is also a production space, a space that has to deliver mental and physical health and productive human capital to the socio-economic system. To achieve this social responsibility the leaders of this social organization have to work hard and appropriately

because they manage the most powerfully intelligent creatures on earth. On the other hand, to bring love and goods into a secure place for the family members is not enough to make this group successful; it needs to use scientific knowledge like any other human organization to be efficient during its familial and human capital development.

CHAPTER I

FAMILY ORGANIZATION:
VISION, MISSION AND GOAL

Delineating a vision, mission and goal is the way that human beings start to organize themselves to make any dream come true. The human being as an intelligent natural resource organizes every project systematically to be able to handle it appropriately, using their natural brain activity. Before or after any particular vision, human beings will also delineate a mission that helps them to be motivated throughout the whole process in order to reach their goals. The family as an organization of human beings follows this same procedure during its establishment and permanence, due to the natural organizational characteristics of the brain. 'The family is a group of people related by blood or marriage' (Oxford English Dictionary, 2019). It is also a human organization that is usually born spontaneously and during informal activity, with the exception of those that work towards an explicit business. This basic human organization, as any other, is created with a purpose; they frequently delineate this purpose after they become a group, not before.

The family also has goals. 'Goals are the end toward which effort is directed' (Merriam-Webster, 2018). This social group usually delineates its goals, mission and vision when it starts to increase its familiarity. Because of this, the family is categorized as an informal organization. Moreover, many of its goals never exist in a formal document, but can be considered formal by its use of verbal contracts, like the historical businessman. Moreover, Vélez, Rosario, Mendez, and Vargas (2009) found that 'some of the most common family goals are reproducing, sharing emotional feelings, accomplishing sexual needs, becoming economically independent, developing other aspects, and sharing their lives forever'.

On the other hand, the sociologist Urie Brofrenbrenner (1917-2005, cited in Oswalt, 2019) argues that 'families are directly influenced by different social systems with whom they have a responsibility to work hand in hand'. According to Oswalt (2019) Brofrenbenner also explains that

'families cannot exist without this social system, which has a strong influence on their members and how they are active participants'.

Following this statement, Oswalt (2019) also lists Urie Brofrenbrenner's four social systems:

- *The microsystem*
- *The mesosystem*
- *The exosystem*
- *The macrosystem*

To reach its own goals, the family cannot ignore the social systems' own objectives, because both depend on each other to be alive and functional. As a consequence, Brofrenbrenner defined the microsystem as:

> The small and immediate environment the child lives in. Children's microsystems will include any immediate relationships or organizations they interact with, such as their immediate family or caregivers and their school or daycare. The way that these organizations interact with the child will have an effect on how the child grows; the more encouraging and nurturing these relationships and places are, the better the child will be able to grow (Brofrenbrenner, cited in Oswalt, 2019).

Moreover, according with Oswalt, Brofrenbrenner's mesosystem is defined as:

> How the different parts of a child's *microsystem* work together for the sake of the child. For example, if a child's caregivers take an active role in a child's school, such as going to parent-teacher conferences and watching their child's soccer games, this will help ensure the child's overall growth. In contrast, if the child's two sets of caretakers, e.g. mom with step-dad and dad with step-mom, disagree how to best raise the child and give the child conflicting lessons when they see him, this will hinder the child's growth in different channels (Oswalt, 2019).

The Bronfenbrenner's theory (cited in Oswalt, 2019) explain that, 'the *exosystem* includes the other people and places that the child herself may not interact with often but that still have a large affect on him or her, such as parents workplaces, extended family members and the neighborhood'. This author interprets the effect of the exosystem as how those around us and the places where we interact daily influence our lives:

> If a child's parent gets laid off from work, that may have negative effects on the child if her parents are unable to pay rent or to buy groceries; however, if her parent receives a promotion and a raise at work, this may

have a positive effect on the child because her parents will be better able to care for his physical needs (Oswalt, 2019).

Bronfenbrenner's (cited in Oswalt, 2019) final level is the *macrosystem*. He establishes that 'it is the largest and most remote set of people and thing to a child but still has a great influence on them'. 'The macrosystem includes things such as the relative freedoms permitted by the national *government*, *cultural values*, *the economy*, and *wars* (Oswalt, 2019)'.

The family usually delineates its mission as something that includes other people outside of its intra-familiar group. The research of Vélez et al. (carried out in 2009 but published in 2016), explained that families usually see their mission as an activity that they have to do to achieve their macrosystem expectations, such as make their adult and young human capital very productive at school and work, reproduce, and contribute to the socio-economic system.

Finally, a vision, in this context, is an assignment or purpose of work. The vision is also 'the act or power of seeing and a thought, concept, or object formed by the imagination' (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2018). Contrary to the goals and the mission, Velez et al. (2009) also found that the family delineates its vision from the beginning of the process of its establishment; it happens when the group leader creates their vision about what they want to build as a family, even when they do not document these expectations. This vision can evolve during the different life stages of the family members.

The family's goal, mission, vision, and ecosystem

It is important to understand that the family as an organization is not an independent social unit, but a small unit of the whole social system; it is part of a macrosocial group that has its own characteristics and subdivisions with its own goals, mission and vision. Each family has its particular biological characteristics and psychosocial activity. In fact, Velez et al. (2009) found that each family is a social organization with specific biological and psychosocial characteristics that do not exist outside of its nucleus; they can be similar to those of other families but never the same. In this study, the productive family—where adults are active in the workforce and their young human capital (children) acquire a high Grade Point Average (GPA) at school—has a similar management pattern, even when formed of different compositions such as the traditional family, uni-parental family and compound family. This productive family also has in

common the delineation of its *goal, mission and vision*, using the expectative and formal regulations of its entire ecosystem.

In the same study, unproductive family groups, where family leaders are unemployed and their children have low GPAs at school—with different compositions such as traditional families, uni-parental families and compound families—also show the same organizational pattern. They demonstrated variations in their *vision, mission* and *goal* delineation. They never have a consensus identifying clearly their *mission, vision* and *goal* even when they identify their leader. Moreover, Vélez et al. (2009) also found that the ones inside this family organization that could delineate their *goal, mission and vision* clearly never mention that their ecosystem inspired them to create their values and moral rules or to delineate their goal, mission and vision; even so, they do this modeling their ecosystem characteristics. This study also found that family composition is not a relevant factor in family organizational and administrative functionality. The functionalities of the four organizational basics, *leadership, communication, environment* and *organizational culture* are the most important factors that influence the group members' behavior during their basic daily administration.

Formal and informal organization

The human organization has different characteristics depending on how it starts, from the beginning of its establishment. The organization's creator will be the first to delineate those characteristics. If any adult is motivated to have a family, they will probably start creating a vision. Usually, the family organizer does this without delineating a mission or specific goal as a future family organization. This happens after they formalize the group. In contrast, when a human resource wants to develop a business organization, they delineate everything about the business vision, the mission to complete, and the goals that they want to achieve long before establishing the business. After they have the vision, the mission, and the goals clear and delineated, the leader who will start the business organization starts to look for the people who can help them formalize it. Social science has established that the way the organization is created from the beginning identifies what kind of organization it is, either formal or informal.

Furthermore, Quain (2019) explained that 'the organizational structure refers to the way management levels are established, and the way decisions are made and implemented to achieve your desired goals'. He

also said that 'it is your responsibility to decide whether the organizational structure that underlies your organization is formal or informal'. On the other hand, Ganguly (2019) explained that 'formal organizations have an official hierarchy and lines of authority, with their spans of control, and informal organizations have ways in which official rules are negotiated or subverted through the informal practices of subordinates'. According to Ganguly (2019), 'formal or informal structure in an organization refers to the distinction between procedures and communications which are prescribed by writing rules, and those which depend more upon ad hoc, personal interaction within work groups'.

Formal organization

In a formal organizational structure, the management and divisions are typically written and explained so all human capital understand how things work from the beginning of their participation. This documentation may take the form of an organizational chart that visually depicts how each level of management works to prevent misunderstandings and time lost. Because of these efficiency needs Quain (2019) demonstrated 'how a formally structured organization usually has a hierarchical pyramid structure with a company president, CEO and senior managers at the top, mid-level managers in the middle, and low-level managers at the bottom'. This researcher explained that 'any staff or employees are ready to implement decisions and processes made at the levels above them, and they are not usually solicited for their opinions or ideas about how the company should work'(Quain, 2019).

On the other hand, Ganguly provided his own definition of formal organizations. He characterizes the formal organization as a structural one:

> The formal organization has a structure that is consciously designed to enable the people of the organization to work together to accomplish common objectives. This formal organization is more or less an arbitrary structure to which the individual must adjust. It tells individual members to do certain things in a specific manner, to obey orders from designated individuals and to cooperate with others (Ganguly, 2019).

Families also have a formal organizational structure due to the hierarchy that exists, imposed by natural order and by the government through law enforcement; for example parents and offspring, or adults and children under their charge. In the family-specific case, the social system should re-categorize the family as an informal group, due to the above characteristics that do not reflect family organizational reality. The social system should

describe the group as a biosocial organization with a diverse and complex organization that has both formal and informal characteristics. Due to this complexity the leaders of the group have to make double the effort to attain a functional, productive and successful family, both as a group and as individual human resources. Those leaders have to deal with their family's emotional and affective needs, their law enforcement responsibilities and their socioeconomic contributions.

Informal organization

The term *"informal"* may suggest a mess or something close to it, but in reality, this is not the case. Informal organizational characteristics start when our spontaneous emotions and affectivity characterize the moment where we select the people that will be part of our human organization. Quain (2019) explained that 'an informal organizational structure does not operate under the guidelines of a written document that spells out the rules, regulations and chain-of-command'. He also revealed that 'under an informal structure, an organization operates using a system developed by its human capital that has proven effective'.

Ganguly also has his own explanation about how informal organizations work:

> This structure relies on relationships forged between the group members, cooperation between teams, and communication that focuses on achieving shared goals. Informal structures are unique for every organization, because they are based on the personalities of the human capital and collaborative techniques developed over time. In informal organizations the relationship between people in the organization is based on personal attitudes, emotions, prejudices, likes, dislikes, etc. These relations are not developed according to procedures and regulations laid down in the formal organization's structure; generally large formal groups give rise to small informal groups. These groups are not pre-planned, but rather develop automatically/spontaneously according to the organizational environment (Ganguly, 2019).

Family Organization Structures

It is clear that the family cannot just be considered an informal organization due to the reality of its hierarchy, chain of command, and the law enforcement obligations that it faces from the first day of its establishment. It is also true that when a group starts a familial relationship, the members first take an informal approach after observing each other's personal

characteristics, including attitudes, emotions, prejudices, likes, and dislikes, among other things. However, after the group decides to continue their familial partnership under the same roof, the legal organizations within the macrosystem impose legal responsibilities with specific rules and regulations. Marriage, cohabitation, and parenting have a law enforcement regulation that makes their functionality one of the most complex social activities. This fact makes the union of two adults that want to develop a family one of the hardest dreams to achieve. This complexity continually provokes new family structural changes where the adults try repeatedly to lead their own family organization.

The family organization structure starts when the family leader selects the structure type of their family group. One of these family structures is the traditional family, which is also one of the most common family structures. According to Williams (2019), 'a traditional family is a structure that consists of a man, woman, and one or more of their biological or adopted children'.

In most traditional families, the man and woman are husband and wife, but in modern society homosexual couples can also be married an established a family too. In this regard, though, the website Healthychildren.org (2019) states that:

> In today's society, homosexual marriage is legal in many countries and is of course a family structure too. The children whose parents are homosexuals show no difference in their choice of friends, activities, or interests compared to children whose parents are heterosexual. Their career choices and lifestyles are similar to those of children raised by heterosexual parents (Healthychildren.org, 2019).

Moreover, cohabitation also creates kinship between the members of any group, because cohabitants below the same roof can lead to the development of a family organization too, even without children. Due to the institutionalization of the family as a socio-economic organization that has to be managed according to the legal system, a couple without descendants can become a successful economic community. Otherwise, single parents compose a family structure due to the natural hierarchical characteristics of the family, where parents lead their subordinates at home. The single parent family is one formed by at least one minor child with only one parent (father or mother). Furthermore, according to Lifepersona.com (2019) 'different types of uniparental families also exist; in fact, they have increased in the last few years worldwide due to the increase in divorces or couples who do not want to get married'.

Single parents have a very hard job due to the many tasks to complete at home without a co-worker to assist them. Even so the single family type is increasing daily. Lifepersona.com comment on this phenomenon, stating:

> The most common single-parent families are those formed by the mother and her children, whether biological or adopted, although those families formed by only one parent are increasing considerably. Types of uniparental families include divorced mothers or fathers, widowed mothers or fathers, and single mothers or fathers with adopted or assisted reproduction children (Lifepersona.com, 2019).

Otherwise, the blended or compound family is another family structure where children of two different family leaders from previous relationships start to be part of the same family after their parenting leaders start a consensual relationship below the same roof or get married. According to the Open Education Sociology Dictionary (2019), 'a blended family consists of two or more adult partners and their children, together with their children from previous relationships either living with them or living nearby'. In other words, two divorced or widowed people with children living together or marry each other.

The pre-nuptial agreement

This legal union is the formalization of the *family administrative system* before the establishment of it, which allows the participants—before they start their marriage—to create a pre-nuptial family socio-economic management plan as in any business. Today's family law around the world allows different types of marital associations where the couple pre-determines how they will share their goods before their joint celebration; this is known as a pre-nuptial agreement. The pre-nuptial agreement is a management system where a couple selects their administrative format as a family or decides how they will manage their individual income and goods during their legal union or marriage. The existence of a pre-nuptial agreement is another reason why families cannot be considered as purely informal organizations. Indeed, even when a couple does not enter a pre-nuptial agreement, once they are married the socio-economic concept named community property may govern. As a legal concept it automatically determines how the goods of the couple acquired during their legal union have to be legally and economically managed. According to the Legal Information Institute of the Cornell Law School (2019) 'community property is made up of assets that come into the marriage during the marriage through any means other than inheritance or gift'.

They also explained that 'assets acquired by the husband or wife, regardless of how those assets are titled are viewed as assets of the marital community' (Cornell Law School, 2019). This same Institute also distinguish however that 'not all states recognize community property, in community property states, community property belongs equally to each spouse. This is often contrasted with *separate property states'*.

On the other hand, Rešetar (2008) indicates how 'historically a limited form of the community of property, based on the principle of equality and emancipation was introduced for the first time in Europe in the Soviet Union in 1926, replacing the *separate property regime*'. This same researcher also said that 'under the influence of the Soviet Union's example, the eastern European states introduced the limited community of property after World War II, as did a number of other countries (e.g., France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Portugal and Malta)'.

The community of property is still the most common regime in today's marriage couple even when the legal system already creates others. On this topic Rešetar explained that:

> The problem of spousal inequality was, almost at the same time, also being resolved in another part of Europe with the introduction of deferred community systems, which were first developed in the Nordic region from 1920 to 1929. Such systems were later introduced in Germany, Austria, Greece and Switzerland. The common goal of these regimes was to ensure the economical protection of the weaker spouse, i.e., women, in cases of divorce or the termination of marriage. The intention was to equalize the position of women and men in the traditional sense of marriage with a male bread winner and a female housewife, which was common at that time (Rešetar, 2008).

In the same way that law enforcement created regulations over marital status, it would also do the same thing with the status of parenting almost all over the world. For instance, law enforcement regulates how the paternity role must be managed worldwide. In many countries mothers and fathers are not just those related by blood; legal systems have also established a parenting figure that is born through a legal joining. This legal type of parenting also defined the family chain of command or the hierarchy. The hierarchy is then also defined as the authority line or the power order. Due to this hierarchical characteristic, the legal system also delegates the subordinator and the subordinates at home. Good examples of these legal parenting models outside of the natural bloodline are the adopted parents, the substitute parents, and the stepfather and stepmother.

As mentioned earlier, this hierarchy is a natural chain of command in a biological family line that starts with the couple and continues with the parenting role. In other words, the natural order has defined the subordination process at home as an intrinsic characteristic of the family. This hierarchy distributes the power between the group members, but without any specific explanation about how it should be applied. Once again, the family is not a simple informal organization; it has informal human expressions with emotionally open activities but also a natural and legally regulated relationship between the group members set by the laws of Mother Nature and by the legal enforcement systems lay down by human beings.

Formal and informal organizational structures

Black and white are opposites, but at the same time very related, because without black it is not possible to recognize white (and vice-versa). The same thing goes for formal and informal organizations; each one has its specific characteristics but each one generates the other. The researcher Quain (2019) argued that:

> The primary advantage of a *formal* organizational structure is that it clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities, from the top level to the community knows what they have to do and how they're supposed to achieve the desired goals. The formal chain of command also keeps work processes under control, because there is an established method of decision-making and implementation from the leaders (Quain, 2019).

Other scientists have defined formal organizations with other characteristics. In this case Ganguly (2019) mentions that the following characteristics of the formal organization can be discerned:

- ✓ *It is deliberately impersonal*
- ✓ *It is based on ideal relationships*
- ✓ *It is deliberately constructed to achieve some goals*
- ✓ *It is based on the rabble hypothesis of human nature, i.e. that hierarchy is necessary for social order*

In contrast, for Quain (2019), the major advantage of an *informal* organizational structure is that 'it's highly adaptable to change'. He also said that 'if your organization must respond to external influences that demand an organizational shift, an informal structure is fluid enough for you to make that change quickly and efficiently'. At the same time,

Ganguly, (2019) mentions that 'informal organizations do not operate completely by the book'.

According to Ganguly the informal organization manifests itself, explaining that:

> In real settings, the relationship that actually exists among human capital in this organization does not follow formal lines. The communication in an informal organization is very fast and efficient. If handled properly, it helps in forming the activities of the formal organization very efficiently and effectively (Ganguly, 2019).

The family organization has both formal and informal characteristics; even so, it is still categorized as an informal organization by the social sciences. No matter what composition the family has, it will always have a hierarchy, created either by Mother Nature or by legal family enforcement. 'Hierarchy is defined as any person's system or things ranked above another' (Dictionary.com, 2019). Interestingly, even though today's family structure can be diverse—i.e. it can have a traditional composition (a heterosexual married couple [a mom and dad] with children), or a non-traditional one (e.g. two homosexual dads with an adopted child)—it will still have a hierarchical composition. The parents as the leaders who create the group are always at a high level of the hierarchy; having the responsibility of training and influencing the members of the intra-familiar at a low level position (their children). These parenting leaders have a number of responsibilities and must train their subordinates at home according to their individual, familial, social and legal needs.

More family formal characteristics

In the majority of countries around the world, law enforcement delineates the legal rights that each member of the couple, in case of separation, has to accomplish as an individual. This legal statement for couples is another formal characteristic of the family as a socio-economic organization.

Furthermore, marriage was one of the most fundamental social institutions in the ancient period. During this time, the socio-economic status of the groom was the main consideration for marriage, just like any economic exchange in a formal organization. In relation to this, the Acropolis Museum noted that:

> However, the main purpose of marriage was to ensure legal offspring, and therefore [it] did not require an emotional bond between the prospective bride and groom. Girls were married off at a young age to someone often much older, who would have been chosen by the guardian. The bride would go to live with her husband. The wedding would take place in the bride's home, usually during a full moon in the month of Gamelion, i.e. mid-January to mid-February (Acropolis Museum, 2019).

The family organization, as any other social group, has changed significantly over the years. Stimel, Stimel & Smith (2019) a legal group from the USA explain how 'family as an organization and what constitutes a couple has been radically altered over the past half century and how the law, perhaps too slowly, has adjusted to the new realities it has been confronted with'. They also expose that 'the law has not traditionally looked favorably upon individuals living together out of wedlock'. However, Stimel, Stimel & Smith (2019) also said that 'the law in this area has changed considerably in the past 50 years, since cohabitation has increased dramatically'.

This same group of law experts delineate how unmarried cohabitation works, discuss its status, and reflect on how the legal system manages it in the USA. They also mention some statistical results:

> In 1970, about 530,000 couples reportedly lived together outside marriage. This number increased to 1.6 million in 1980, 2.9 million in 1990, 4.2 million in 1998, and 5.5 million in 2000. The numbers continue to increase and with marriage between couples of the same sex becoming legal in an increasing number of states, so the laws applying to cohabitation have become increasingly beneficial for the couple. Moreover, unmarried cohabitation can be beneficial from a legal standpoint. Unmarried partners may define the terms of their relationship without being bound by marriage laws that can restrict the marriage. When a relationship ends, unmarried cohabitants need not follow strict procedures to dissolve the living arrangement. However unmarried cohabitants do not enjoy those same rights usually automatically granted to married individuals, particularly with respect to property acquired during a relationship (Stimel, Stimel & Smith, 2019).

Furthermore, Stimel, Stimel & Smith (2019) explained that 'marital property laws usually do not apply to unmarried couples, even in long-term relationships'. They go further and add that 'the laws regarding distribution of property of one spouse to another at death, rights to take care of the property of the other during periods of mental incompetency, and even visitation rights at hospitals do not apply to unmarried couples'.

This law firm from Los Angeles, CA, USA explained the rights of the children who come from unmarried couple vs the children that come from married couples as follows:

> In fact, the children of unmarried couples have traditionally not been afforded the same rights as those of married couples, though most of these laws have now been revised to avoid unfairness towards offspring. Indeed, unmarried couples can avoid the so-called *marriage tax* in the Internal Revenue Code that at times provides a greater tax rate for unmarried couples than it does for two unmarried individuals (Stimel, Stimel & Smith, 2019).

The direct intervention of law enforcement in the family organization is clear here: it regulates their rights and economic responsibilities from the beginning and supposes a formal administrative process because it is a pre-designed system. At the same time it has altered the natural family hierarchy since it includes the participation of an authority external to the group. In this case the hierarchy starts in the macrosystem, from the governmental structure to the lower leadership position, i.e. married/unmarried couples or domestic cohabitants. The power descends from the community law enforcement to the family leaders. The purpose of the law enforcement is to share, implement the community rules, and bring responsibilities to the family as a socio-economic organization. These formal procedures also change the nature of the family, usually categorized as an informal group. After legal marital status or a cohabitant relation below the same roof is attained, the family assumes a formal administrative process with the same characteristics as any other formal association, where improvization can create disharmony and an unproductive atmosphere at home.

Family anthropological history

The anthropological origins of the family as an organization have been analyzed by anthropologists for decades. To cite an anthropological opinion, Mpora (2019) has defined the family 'as the smallest unit of human grouping composed of spouses and eventually their children'. This researcher also explained that at 'the time of Thomas Aquinas, the family was not only composed of parents, children, and close relatives but also slaves'. Moreover he said that the 'term family etymologically is from famul (us) which means a slave'. According to Mpora (2019), Thomas Aquinas used the term 'domues more than familia when referring to the family; it connotes a group legally recognised, ordained to an essential end which is the common good'.

Mpora, during his analytical process of understanding Thomas Aquinas' philosophical point of view about what family is, made his own conclusions and shared his reflections in his own words:

> This implies that the family is not only a concept but is above all a live and stable structural reality in the objective order. Elsewhere, in other research that has applied this materialistic conception, the determining characteristics of the family in terms of anthropological fact is the production and reproduction of the immediate essentials of life. This, again, is of a twofold character. On the one hand, production refers to the means of existence, of articles of food and clothing, dwellings, and of the tools necessary for that production; on the other hand, it connotes the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species (Mpora, 2019).

On the other hand, Engels (1884) exposed that the 'social organization under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: the stage of development of labor on the one hand and of the family on the other'.

Twenty first century family anthropological theory

Anthropology as a discipline creates scientific knowledge and a new perspective every day, and that includes familial anthropological characteristics. The Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family (2019) demonstrates how anthropology has devoted a great deal of attention to families.[1] According to the study:

> Anthropologists do not generally speak of studying the *family*, a word whose meaning varies so much throughout history and around the world that it may be said to have no objective or transcultural meaning whatsoever. Many of the families that anthropologists and historians study bear little resemblance to the nuclear family portrayed in American mass culture (The Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family, 2019).

The Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family (2019) delves further into this topic of what the family is and makes an effort to explain it as a phenomenon that has become influenced by different social beliefs in different parts of the world:

---

[1] Particular acknowledgement should be given here to the Science Encyclopedia on the JRank Science and Philosophy website, which this subsection is based off: https://science.jrank.org/pages/7692/Modernist-Anthropological-Theory-Family.html

For instance, there are the enormous, rigidly hierarchical patrilineal families of pre-revolutionary China, which bound together ranked sets of wives, sons, and servants under the control of a senior male; the gender-segregated villages of twentieth-century Amazonian South America, where men might well consider *home* to be the central men's house where they live for years at a time, rather than the smaller residences occupied by their wives, children, and dogs; or, on the other hand, the 'bands' of foraging societies like the Ju/'hoansi (ZHUN-twasi) of Southern Africa, with their flexible membership and fluid boundaries. Moreover, there are the *houses* of some gay prostitutes in the urban United States, where senior transvestites rename themselves *Mother* and take in younger boys off the streets, offering them a new kind of family to replace the biological kin who disowned them (Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family, 2019).

Furthermore, 'this confounding word, *family,* is made even more slippery by the great burden of quite specific emotional, symbolic, and pragmatic meanings with which people invest it: it is the opposite of a value-neutral descriptive term' (Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family, 2019). Otherwise, Mpora (2019) also explained that:

In the family there have traditionally existed three types of relationships; namely, the *conjugal relation* between husband and wife, the *paternal relation* between parents and children and the *economic relation* between master and servant. These relations manifest the structure of authority in the family. The objective of this subsection is to make evident the character and natural foundation of these relations (Mpora, 2019).

The Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family goes deep and explained that:

Their efforts to bring some analytical rigor to the study of this confusing but important concept, anthropologists have come to speak not of *the family* but of *the kinship*. It is a larger, more inclusive category that can refer to any and all of the ways in which we find or forge relationships between ourselves and others. It is usually also confined to those relationships that are at least metaphorically connected to *co-residence* and/or *reproduction* (The Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family, 2019)

Because of that modernist definition of what family is, the study was named the *Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family*. This theory sees kinship as the main aspect of the familiar relationship. As a result:

By the same token, the emergence of a revitalized but vastly changed form of kinship studies at the end of the last century seemed to indicate that anthropology, too, would continue to reinvent itself to fit the changing

circumstances of the twenty-first century (Modernist Anthropological Theory of Family, 2019).

The anthropological evolution of family structures in Europe

The old world probably has the oldest point of view about what family is and what kinship means. In relation of that the researcher Greif mentions the medieval age with reference to the topic of kinship:

> In Europe, the conquest of the Western Roman Empire by Germanic tribes during the medieval period probably strengthened the importance of kinship groups. Yet the actions of the church caused the vision of the nuclear family—consisting of a husband and wife, children, and sometimes a handful of close relatives—to dominate Europe by the late medieval period (Greif, 2006).

Otherwise, Goody (1983, cited in Greif, 2006) explains that the 'medieval church instituted marriage laws and practices that undermined kinship groups'. He also said that 'its dogma was self-serving in that it increased, for example, the likelihood that an individual would make a bequest to the church'.

According to this author religion and organized groups with the goals of imposing religious practices and values established what the family is. In this regard, Goody, explains:

> The church discouraged practices that enlarged the family, such as adoption, polygamy, concubinage, divorce, and re-marriage, and restricted marriages among individuals of the same blood (consanguineous marriages), which had historically provided one means of creating and maintaining kinship groups. It also curtailed parents' abilities to retain kinship ties through arranged marriages by prohibiting unions that the bride didn't explicitly consent to. European family structures did not evolve monotonically toward the nuclear family, nor was their evolution geographically or socially uniform (Goody 1983, cited in Greif, 2006).

Moreover, in an exploration of how the European family structure has worked historically, Bittles states:

> By the late medieval period, however, the nuclear family was dominant. Even among the Germanic tribes, by the eighth century the term *family* denoted one's immediate family and, shortly afterwards, tribes were no longer institutionally relevant. Thirteenth-century English court rolls reflect that even cousins were as likely to be in the presence of non-kin as with each other. The practices the church advocated (e.g., monogamy) are

still the norm in Europe. Consanguineous marriages in contemporary Europe account for less than one percent of the total number of marriages, in contrast to Muslim and Middle Eastern countries where such marriages account for between twenty and fifty percent per country (Bittles, 1994, in Greif, 2006).

In modern societies the corporation conjures images of a huge building with little spaces with desks and papers, computers and many secretaries, but some things do not have the same image during their start up process. This term, *corporation*, as any other human creation has a history and an origin. On this subject, Greif also shares his thoughts:

> The incorporation as a function of family structure and the decline of large kinship groups in Europe transpired during a period in which the state was also disintegrating and the church's secular authority was diminishing. *Nuclear family's* structure and the weakness of the state and church contributed to the rise of corporations. Until the modern period, corporations and nuclear families constituted a distinguishing feature of the particularly European institutional foundations of markets, polities, and knowledge. Yet it is informative to note that Europe's economic ascendancy started after corporations began to dominate (Greif, 2006).

Basic needs of the family's human capital

As any other socio-economic organization, the family has active human capital at different life stages: adults and minors (children). The economist Gary Becker (1998) explored many questions and answers on this matter, including: 'how do human capital populations grow? Where does human capital come from? And what constitutes a successful investment in human capital, either at the individual or national level?' According to Becker 'families have differed over time, but they are still very important in the modern economy'. To understand human capital Becker declared that 'you have to go back to the family, because it is the family that is concerned about its children and tries, with whatever resources it has, to promote its children's education and values' (Becker, 1998).

Becker, who was awarded the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences in 1992, expresses openly the relevance of the family as the main part of the economy. He specially mentions the relevance of the childhood stage where the human capital starts their participation in their socioeconomic group. He writes:

> Families are the major promoters of values in any free society and even in not-so-free societies. The significant role of human capital in the economy means that policies toward education, health, and other investments are

important partly for their implications about economic prosperity, economic growth, and income inequality (Becker, 1998).

The meaning of human capital

Goldin (2019) explained that 'human capital is the stock of skills that the labor force possesses. The flow of these skills is forthcoming when the return to investment exceeds the cost (both direct and indirect)'. He also mentions:

> The returns to these skills are private in the sense that an individual's productive capacity increases with more of them and nevertheless, there are often externalities that increase the productive capacity of others when human capital is increased. The concept of human capital goes back at least to Adam Smith. The fourth definition of capital according to Adam Smith is that 'the acquisition of … talents during … education, study, or apprenticeship, costs a real expense, which is capital in a person. Those talents are part of his fortune and likewise that of society' (Smith, 1776, cited in Goldin, 2019).

Moreover, Pettinger, (2019) said that 'human capital, is a measure of the skills, education, capacity and attributes of labor, which influence their productive capacity and earning potential'. Furthermore, Amadeo affirms the words of his predecessors and defines human capital as:

> The abilities economic value and qualities of labor that influence productivity. These qualities include higher education, technical or on-the-job training, health, and values such as punctuality. Investment in these qualities improves the abilities of the labor force. The result is greater output for the economy and higher income for the individual (Amadeo, 2019).

According to Goldin (2019) 'the earliest formal use of the term *human capital* in economics is probably by Irving Fisher in 1897. It became considerably more popular after Jacob Mincer's 1958 Journal of Political Economy article *Investment in Human Capital* and Personal Income Distribution'.

Amplifying his analysis about the origin of human capital as an economic term, Goldin writes that:

> In Gary Becker's *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, published in 1964 (and preceded by his 1962 Journal of Political Economy article, *'Investment in Human Capital'*), Becker notes that he hesitated to use the term *human capital* in