

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Allocation of Income within the Household. Edward P. Lazear , Robert T. Michael

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/64k744xk>

Journal

American Journal of Sociology, 95(3)

ISSN

0002-9602

Author

Bielby, Denise D

Publication Date

1989-11-01

DOI

10.1086/229354

Peer reviewed

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Allocation of Income within the Household. by Edward P. Lazear and Robert T. Michael

Review by: Denise D. Bielby

Source: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (Nov., 1989), pp. 803-805

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2780576>

Accessed: 21-12-2018 20:34 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Sociology*

for children disadvantages them in both labor markets and their marriages. Fuchs is unusual among economists in acknowledging an imbalance of power within marriage, though this has long been obvious to sociologists. He apparently holds out little hope that individual men will take more responsibility for children, so his ideas about how to help both women and children focus on making responsibility for children more a collective matter.

The basic thrust of his policy recommendations is a preference for child-oriented policies such as child allowances and subsidized day care over labor-market policies such as flextime, affirmative action, or comparable worth. He thinks that the best way to help children is directly but that the best way to help women is indirectly, through helping the children for whom they care. Fuchs's incorrect minimization of the role of sex discrimination probably contributes to his choice here.

Fifteen years ago, most empirical researchers ignored gender inequality. Today, many basic facts about women's employment, the sex gap in jobs and wages, the division of labor and power in marriages, and children's well-being are agreed on by scholars. Empirical research will and should continue. But debates over the theoretical and prescriptive slants authors take on these facts are bound to move toward center stage, even in as empirical a discipline as sociology, because there now are more theories informed scholars can disagree about. Fuchs's book presents one slant on the material: one that is neoclassical with a few deviations, that is animated by real concern for children and women, and that is liberal rather than conservative, libertarian, socialist, or radically feminist.

Allocation of Income within the Household. By Edward P. Lazear and Robert T. Michael. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988. Pp. vi + 220. \$34.95.

Denise D. Bielby
University of California, Santa Barbara

Allocation of Income within the Household is an important first empirical effort to address inequality in the family. The authors challenge the assumptions commonly held by economists that a uniform distribution of income exists within the household and that neither the family as a whole nor the primary earner is sufficient as a unit of analysis for determining individual-level economic well-being.

Economists Edward Lazear and Robert Michael are concerned with the allocation of income between adults and children. However, the differential allocation of income among adults in the household (and among children) is beyond the scope of their study. Using data from the 1960–61 and 1972–73 Consumer Expenditures Surveys, they first estimate the ratio of observable adult expenditures (tobacco, alcohol, and adult clothing) to unobservable adult expenditures in households without children as

a function of schooling, age, income, region, race, sex of household head, and employment status of head. This information is then used to impute total expenditures on adults in households with children. The difference between this figure and total expenditures is an estimate of the amount spent on children. With this information, they can then examine how attributes of adults such as income, race, education, age, employment status, and the age and sex of children affect the distribution of expenditures on adults and children. They also examine how this balance is reallocated as family members enter and leave the household. The strength of this procedure is that it avoids having to classify types of specific household expenditures according to the degree to which they benefit adults versus children. The major weakness is that it depends on the assumption that the ratio of observable to unobservable adult expenditures is constant across households with and without children.

The authors show that the allocation of income varies with household attributes in some interesting ways. For example, the share of income allocated to children varies with the education of the household head but not with gender. When income is held constant, blacks allocate a greater share of household income to children, but, because they tend to have larger families, income per child tends to be smaller. Surprisingly, when an additional adult is added to the household, the reallocation of expenditures is disproportionately away from children. The authors speculate that this may be because the additional adult provides services previously obtained through market-oriented child care. Unfortunately, there is little substance and no empirical content to their discussion of the effect of a new spouse on a single-parent household or an aged parent on a two-parent household.

In a chapter titled "Guidelines for Alimony and Child Support," the authors examine the consequences of different criteria for transferring income between ex-spouses after a divorce. They suggest a criterion whereby postdivorce households have incomes proportionate to family size when adjusted to allow for children's taking a smaller proportion of total expenditures than adults (even in intact families). They argue that their suggested criterion is both equitable and flexible, able to handle such complications as joint custody, remarriage, joint families, and income changes after the divorce. To underscore the "real world" applicability of this approach, Lazear and Michael present tables showing appropriate transfers as a function of parents' income and number of children.

Allocation of Income within the Household is written by and for economists. References to research and (especially) theory by sociologists are scarce. That all is not equal within households is not news to sociologists, however surprising it may be to the authors' disciplinary colleagues. However, Lazear and Michael are economists who actually examine empirical data, and for that reason alone their work will be of interest to sociologists interested in families, inequality, gender, and the life course. Their conceptual approach is carefully reasoned, and they are explicit about their assumptions and the limitations of their approach. Sociolo-

gists with interest in marital power, noneconomic bases of individual well-being, children in poverty, or economic advantages (or disadvantages) for those elderly who share households with adult children will find something of interest in the empirical contribution this monograph makes to our understanding of the economic bases of the quality of life in families.

The Sexual Bond: Rethinking Families and Close Relationships. By John Scanzoni, Karen Polonko, Jay Teachman, and Linda Thompson. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1989. Pp. 296. \$35.00 (cloth); \$16.95 (paper).

Raymond T. Smith
University of Chicago

The authors of *The Sexual Bond* claim that they “have struggled together for four years to come up with what [they] believe is a fresh way to view” families, marriages, and close relationships. It is a pity they wasted so much time. A week spent in close study of the anthropological literature on kinship (conspicuous by its absence from the list of references) would have revealed that far from being a “fresh” way of thinking, their most general propositions have been advanced repeatedly. To give only one example, Richard N. Adams suggested in 1960 that the concept of the nuclear family should be replaced by a more general model in which conjugal, maternal, paternal, and sibling “dyads” are the units of analysis (“An Inquiry into the Nature of the Family,” in *Essays in the Science of Culture in Honor of Leslie A. White*, edited by Gertrude E. Dole and Robert L. Carneiro [New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1960]). However, this four-year struggle has been stimulated by recent changes in sexual behavior, marriage patterns, and gender roles rather than by purely theoretical considerations. Consequently, the book contains much interesting discussion of these topics, including a short final section that addresses the crucial issue of how to distinguish “healthy” relationships in a period of massive nonconformity to conventional norms. And, as one would expect from the title, the focus of interest is upon conjugal relations rather than on child rearing.

The core of the theoretical argument is that the structural-functional paradigm is dead, along with the idea that the “normal American family” consists of “one man and one woman, coresiding and legally joined in a permanent and sexually exclusive first marriage, who have children, and the husband maintains full-time commitment to the labor force and the wife withdraws to a large degree from the labor force to assume full-time homemaker and child-care responsibilities” (p. 13). If they believe that this is the prevailing paradigm among social scientists in 1989, they must lead very sheltered lives, though they do say that the paradigm has been “critiqued,” particularly—but not exclusively—by students of black