

The Shadow of the Family: Historical Roots of Particularism in Europe

(New project)

Maria Kravtsova
(LCSR HSE, Moscow)

Aleksey Oshchepkov
(CLMS and LCSR, HSE, Moscow)

5th International Annual Research Conference
“Cultural and Economic Changes under Cross-National Perspective”,
Nov 16 - 20, 2015, Moscow

Particularism

What is particularism?

- Particularistic vs. Universalistic cultures (Lipset and Lenz, 2000; Trompenaars, 1994)
- Particularism: people tend to treat or assess other people depending on **specific circumstances or personal backgrounds** including kinship or social ties. The value of social connections in these cultures is high.
- Universalism: people treat or assess other people based on the **same universal rules equally applied to all**, regardless of circumstances, particular situations, kinship or social ties. These rules are often closely linked to meritocratic principles or formal laws.
- Particularism includes familism, nepotism, cronyism, blat, corruption, etc.

Why this is important?

- The high level of particularism hampers the emergence and effective work of the rule-of-law principle and denies the impartiality of state institutions, especially order institutions like police or courts. It is also conducive to corruption (e.g., Banfield, 1967; Fukuyama, 2001; Ledeneva, 1998; Lipset and Lenz, 2000).

Why some countries are more particularistic than others?

- Our general idea: look at the past
- Not new (see voluminous literature triggered by Acemoglu et al., 2001 and Putnam, 1993)
- What historical factors?
- Family structure dominated in the country hundreds years ago has impact on its economic, political, and cultural aspects at the present (see Alesina and Giuliano, 2014 for an excellent review).

Why does family matter?

Family psychology: family is a basic institution that lays the foundations of people's values, beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, habits... (abundant literature comparing complete vs. incomplete or stepfamilies, poor vs. rich, religious vs. atheistic, alcoholic vs. non-drinking, etc...)

Children grow up and...

- transmit what they internalized in the family to other spheres of social life
- form their own families following inherited rules (intergenerational transmission)

We assume that the way how individual's family was organized affects the extent to which she or he accepts and supports particularism

Historical demography perspective

Family size and composition

(Hajnal, 1983; Laslet, 1983, Todd, 1990)

- *Nuclear family* is a relatively small household that typically includes only one or two generations (usually parents with children).
- *Extended (joint or stem) family* is a relatively large household that consists of more than two generations (e.g., parents with adult children + grand-parents) and may include other relatives.

Nuclear vs. extended family

Traditional family values:

- mutual obligation for help
- in-group solidarity
- suspicious attitude to the out-group
- hierarchy of men against women, old against young and adult against child

are more cultivated and pronounced in extended families than in nuclear families (e.g., Todd, 1990; Duranton et al., 2009).

Extended families are “production units” and “social cells” that tend to fulfill all needs of their members

Nuclear households are more vulnerable and often had to contact with outsiders to secure their economic and physical survival

Nuclear family pattern stimulated the establishment of impersonal relations and institutions. In societies with a higher incidence of extended families most social interactions were personal and regulated by values, norms, and rules ripened in families. Lack of cooperation with outsiders contributed to the fact that the mechanisms of external control, impersonal and impartial institutions, were underdeveloped (Hartman, 2004).

+ gender equality within families

- How power relations are distributed among the family members?
- Age difference between husband and wife OR women's age at first marriage
- The larger age difference is, the less equal position of man and woman and the stronger the hierarchy in the family.
- Women who got married relatively late when they matured as a personality and possessed some material resources were less likely to obey their husbands. Thus, in the societies where age at first marriage was relatively high the power relations within the family unit were more equal. In turn, more gender equality within the family should be supportive for gender equality in the society as a whole (Hartman, 2004)

+ inheritance rules (IR)

IR reflect the nature of relationships among siblings (Todd, 1990; Duranton et al., 2009) as an important indicator of equality/inequality dimension of family organization and an important addition to nuclear/extended family division

Family patterns in the region may be influenced by dominant IR (e.g., Sklar, 1974).

3 types of IR:

- equal partible male inheritance (all male siblings receive equal parts of the land)
- impartible inheritance (all land is inherited by the elder son)
- unequal partible inheritance (all siblings receive some part of the land but some of them may receive larger shares)

E.g., equal partible inheritance usually assumes that siblings stay living close to each other, cooperate and, at the extreme case, form a sort of joint family.

Data on particularism today

- Life in Transition Survey, 2010 by EBRD
- Covers 35 countries:
 - 17 of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe
 - 13 of CIS
 - 5 of Western Europe (France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Sweden)
- Representative national samples
- Various manifestations of particularism: family values and the strength of family ties, perceived importance of social connections and readiness to use them, actual engagement bribery and its perception, etc.

Historical data on family organisation

- End of 18th – beginning of 19th century
- All countries covered by LiTs
- Most countries: national censuses (Rothenbacher, 2002, 2005, 2012).
- Russian Empire: first universal census of 1897 (Troinitskiy, 1899-1904)
- Few countries: Mosaic project by MPIDR
- Inheritance rules: Putzger historical atlas + many additional sources (e.g., Brunnbauer, 2003 for the Balkans; Gerber, 1989 for Turkey; Silverman, 1968 for Italy).
- For 5 western countries: Todd (1990) and Duranton et al., (2009). Indicators both for the prevalence of extended families and dominant inheritance rules. We compare our data with these data.

Our historical indicators

Prevalence of the extended families:

- mean household size (=N of households/population)
- % of households with > 5 members

Age at the first marriage:

- % of non-married women among all women at 20-29

Inheritance rules:

- dummies for the prevailed IR in the region

How to match contemporary data with historical data?

- Both boundaries between countries and boundaries between regions within countries were unstable in the 19th century
- Some historical regions do not exist now or have another names
- Our approach:
 - unit of analysis: historical territory (administrative division available from national censuses)
 - place contemporary localities covered by LiTS within borders of historical regions

England and Wales, 1911



General methodology

$$Y = a + b1*Family + b2*IR + Country + e$$

Y – a measure of particularism

Family – indicators of family organization (all together or separately)

IR – dummies for dominant inheritance rules

Country – country dummies or some contry-level variables

N \approx 400 – 600 territories/localities

3 level HLM is potentially possible

Possible implications

- better understanding of sources of particularism in contemporary societies (if we find significant correlations)
- useful data for any future research devoted to historical roots of the present day institutions in Europe and former SU republics (even if correlations are not significant)

Thank you for your attention!

Questions, comments, and suggestions
are welcome!

This report was presented at the 5th LCSR International Annual Conference “Cultural and Economic Changes under Cross-national Perspective”.

November 16 – 20, 2015 – Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia.

<http://lcsr.hse.ru/en/conf2015>

Настоящий доклад был представлен на V ежегодной международной конференции ЛССИ «Культурные и экономические изменения в сравнительной перспективе».

16-20 ноября 2015 года – НИУ ВШЭ, Москва, Россия.

<http://lcsr.hse.ru/en/conf2015>