

## Response to Schrodt

This article was more straight forward than the Coontz article assigned last week and was more specific to research and findings. It is significant today in our seemingly unstable society to look at family behaviors and what type of schema or environment children are brought up in. To better understand the world, we must look at how parents influence their children, or how parents let children choose from different influences by taking a more expressive approach. While this article was about “family satisfaction and strength,” I felt as if it was more about parenting and the implications the heads of households have on the younger generation. For much of the reading it talked about the parent primarily and the children as a reaction to the primary’s behavior.

I agree but have further questions with the research and findings that family strength and satisfaction is positively correlated with family expressiveness. The subjects the researches asked the questions to were primarily white and lived in the Mid-West. One would think that if the same exact experiment was done with a different set of subjects, one might get a different result. Let’s ask the same questions with the same approach to a diversified group of people of a similar age group (still around the age of 20) and from first-married families. I can see how the study would get a little more complicated with having to factor in second and third-married families. The other part I would debate is how expressive a family is and how that correlates to child behavior. If the family is way too expressive and lets their children do and say whatever they want, what kind of environment are they simulating to teach their children? Is it possible that kids with parents who emulate more of this expressiveness behavior find themselves less responsible and experimenting more with risky behavior such as drugs and alcohol?

Children mimic much of their behavior from their parents, and an example is that most children associate more with the political party that their parents associate with. The goal of this reading was to measure family strength and satisfaction but looking forward I would debate that it is equally as important to see where these children end up 20 years down the road. As the article described, many of the children also created a similar household environment for the next generation.

The article made it seem like being in the structural traditionalism category was a mainly negative attribute in relation to family strength and satisfaction. I think there are certain times and conditions in a children’s life where it is almost crucial to experience some rules or punishment when they’ve done something wrong, otherwise too much non-conformity could result in a lack of core values and accountability. Growing up in this structural traditionalism type of household will teach kids more that society sometimes will not be accepting and so open to your expressiveness and that sometimes in life they will “just have to deal with it.” Whereas on the other hand, the more expressive family would raise kids that are very vocal in their opinions and maybe won’t be as understanding when something negative happens to them out in the real world. But on the other hand, perhaps if families make their youth conform too much it could result in much more rebellion and negative behavior, not only leading to more weakened family strength but a less fortunate future. It would be interesting to see more questions geared to how these children ended up in regards to wealth, job satisfaction and their future families.