

How Postindustrial Families Talk

Elinor Ochs and Tamar Kremer-Sadlik

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095-1553;
email: eochs@anthro.ucla.edu, tksadlik@ucla.edu

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2015. 44:87–103

First published online as a Review in Advance on July 22, 2015

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev-anthro-102214-014027

Copyright © 2015 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

Keywords

postindustrial childhood, family communication, child-centeredness, parenting, individualism, intimacy

Abstract

The nuclear family is both crucible and product of capitalism and modernity, carried forth and modified across generations through ordinary communicative and other social practices. Focusing on postindustrial middle-class families, this review analyzes key discursive practices that promote “the entrepreneurial child” who can display creative language and problem-solving skills requisite to enter the globalized knowledge class as adults. It also considers how the entrepreneurial thrust, including the democratization of the parent–child relationship and exercise of individual desire, complicates family cooperation. Family quality time, heightened child-centeredness, children’s social involvement as parental endeavor, children’s autonomy and freedom, and postindustrial intimacies organize how family members communicate from morning to night.

INTRODUCTION

This review considers talk as a medium through which families constitute themselves as a domestic, moral, and affective unit and bring children into social being. It focuses on talk in middle-class families grappling with exigencies of postindustrial, globalized economies. The discussion is two-pronged: It examines familial communication in middle-class households and steps back to ponder how these vernacular moments are entrenched in societal pressures to raise children who will be well-rounded, entrepreneurial, and competitive members of the global marketplace.

In the Durkheimian perspective (Durkheim 1933), communication takes a back seat to economic and domestic cooperation and ideologies as foundational to family solidarity. This article suggests instead that family talk sometimes takes a front seat, sometimes a back seat in knitting family members together, depending on the situation and family habitus. Nonetheless, families across historical time have been sustained through acknowledging one another's social face, narrating life events, proffering moral advice, expressing feelings, airing dilemmas, and formulating plans. Family is both a legal institution and a social achievement, and talk plays an important role in its formation.

Durkheim claimed that families became vulnerable to fragmentation and individualism after industrialization. Macfarlane (1978) instead provides evidence that small, ego-centered families in England and Europe existed since the seventeenth century. Monogamous households—with adolescents leaving home to work, servants recruited to maintain property, and loose restrictions on inheritance—constituted an individualistic family system that facilitated capitalism. In this perspective, the family is a social crucible of the political economy. Focusing on quotidian family life, the present article indicates how family communication propels the political economy as part of a habitus geared toward preparing children for a projected entrepreneurial future.

This stance is not to argue that the family unit is built from the bottom up by dint of the human capacity for language. Instead, top-down economic and political conditions and on-the-ground communicative practices converge to rally or menace family connectedness. In addition, technological advances accompanying modernity both isolate and link family members (Calvert & Wilson 2008, Turkle 2011). Throughout these transitions, talk prevails as a locus in which family and economic parameters in flux are propped.

Solidarity has been viewed as complementary to power relationships (Brown & Gilman 1960). Tannen (1990, 2007), however, convincingly argues that solidarity and power are intertwined. Displays of intimacy or distance temper power, and power recruits degrees and kinds of solidarity. Central to the dynamics of family solidarity are the porous ideologies of communitarianism (social attachments are crucial to one's well-being) and individualism (personal freedom, will, rights, and self-sufficiency are prioritized) [Bell 1974, Dewey 1999 (1930), Popper 1945, Rawls 1993]. Following the anthropological perspective that all societies promote and depend on both an individuated and interdependent self (Spiro 1993), this review demonstrates the role of talk in reconciling individual conscience/desire and family affiliation. Although widespread, the ways that interdependence and individualism are displayed and understood in families vary across the life span, social groups, and historical moments. The review probes how late capitalism's free-market entrepreneurial ideal of unfettered self-interest infiltrates middle-class family talk in postindustrial societies.

This article examines the pulls on family communication in economies subjected to incipient or sedimented postindustrial forces that have forever changed families' ways of life. Postindustrial societies rely on a deregulated global market in which manufacturing is increasingly relocated to other countries (Bell 1974, 1993; Drucker 1967). They privilege continual future-oriented thinking, creative problem solving, and time-saving technologies that store, diffuse, and implement

information and knowledge. High-level language skills, including digital and traditional literacies, dialogic brainstorming and communicative competence across cyberspace using multimedia registers, are central to postindustrial entrepreneurship (Castells 1998). Higher education is vital to gaining these skills as a path to membership in the knowledge class.

The increased value of education has led to a ferocious competition for access to higher-education institutions, adding new pressures on parents and children. Middle-class parents' involvement in their children's education is understood to be critical for academic achievement. Parents routinely assume hands-on participation in homework and school projects, resulting in the pedagogicalization of the home (Popkewitz 2003). More and more middle-class children in postindustrial societies spend time in after-school enrichment programs, which have multiplied in response to parental concerns over access to gateway higher-education institutions.

The postindustrial era is marked by the increased participation of middle-class women in the workforce, creating ubiquitous dual-earner families. In the United States, this change is coupled with an increase in working hours (Bianchi et al. 2006). During their school week, middle-class postindustrial children are similarly busy with school and extracurricular activities. Many middle-class Americans talk about time as being hurried and in short supply. Being "busy" has become a popular idiom and badge of pride (Darrah et al. 2007), even though Americans have more free time than ever before (Robinson & Godbey 1997).

Rapid social transformations are accompanied by heightened uncertainty regarding life decisions (Giddens 1990). Postindustrial parents feel that they cannot depend on their childhoods as childrearing models and rely increasingly on psychologists, educators, physicians, and religious authorities for sometimes contradictory advice on parenting. Expertise from Benjamin Spock's postwar parenting manuals to blogs in the twenty-first century is part of a growing disenfranchisement of autobiographical intuition in favor of specialists to resolve existential doubts. Whereas some parents rebel at outside guidance, and others voice exhaustion in trying to achieve the perfect harmony between a flourishing career and a happy family, all are keenly aware of ever-shifting moral criteria that set the bar for "good" middle-class parenting (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013).

Yet, middle-class parents in postindustrial societies are by no means uniform in voicing uncertainties regarding childrearing and family expectations. Some are invested in preserving religious and other cultural ideologies and practices across generations, alongside taking advantage of modern advancements (Fader 2009). In addition, parents who migrate from rural to urban environments or postindustrial countries for work often want their children to gain the linguistic, academic, and social skills necessary for economic success yet not buy into middle-class caregiving ideologies (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008).

The remainder of this review draws on ethnographies of family life to illustrate five themes that dominate postindustrial family communication: (a) family quality time, (b) heightened child-centeredness, (c) social involvement as endeavor, (d) freedom and autonomy in childhood, and (e) postindustrial family intimacies.

FAMILY QUALITY TIME

The diminished import of the modern family as an economic unit of production has radicalized the idea of kinship as an all-encompassing unit of society (Faubion 2001, Peletz 1995). Instead, kinship has become one locus of power, intimacy, conflict, and support amid a tangle of shifting social and personal constellations (Stacey 1998). Actor- and practice-centered approaches emphasize that kinship is a process that requires investment of family members' time, effort, emotion, and material resources, and talk materializes and orchestrates this process.

Beginning before, but fueled by, the Industrial Revolution, families in England, Europe, and North America became increasingly separated from the public sphere (Demos 1970, Hareven 2000). Family members also separated from one another during the day, as wage-earning adults, especially men, spent long hours in the workplace and children were required to attend school. Separation of men from the daily life of the household gave rise to the Victorian father as stranger (Gillis 2001). Separation of children from the adult world of work presaged the idea of childhood as a distinct stage in life (Ariès 1960). In the twentieth century, US middle-class families were further isolated by exodus to suburban single-family dwellings demarcated by lawns and fences (Lynd & Lynd 1929). Under these conditions the middle-class family became idealized as a haven from the demands of the workplace, and family togetherness became a moral endeavor (Donzelo 1979). As time together grew scarce, Victorian middle-class parents made efforts to carve out family rituals (Gillis 2001). The issue of family togetherness has not abated. In the United States, for example, dinnertime continues to be viewed as a critical time to communicate as a family, and its apparent demise is met with chagrin (Ochs & Shohet 2006).

In the late twentieth century, as middle-class women in the United States increasingly joined the workforce and workdays became longer, “quality time” and “family time” emerged as public idioms for an “unstressed, uninterrupted special time with children . . . to enhance and maintain family well-being” (Kremer-Sadlik & Paugh 2007, p. 287). These terms were supplemented by the need for “work-family balance” (Bianchi et al. 2006). This lexicon actualized an American ideal of family time as separate from time spent with other members of the community. These terms have counterparts in Scandinavia but not in Italy, suggesting that workplace demands alone cannot account for the preoccupation with the balkanization of the nuclear family (Forsberg 2009). American parental discourse about quality time implicates cultural notions of time as a scarce commodity that requires scheduling as well as a value placed on privacy (Kremer-Sadlik 2013). In contrast, Italian middle-class parents consider time spent with children to be part of the fabric of their lives and integrated with social time with friends and extended kin (Kremer-Sadlik et al. 2008).

HEIGHTENED CHILD-CENTEREDNESS

Child-centeredness entails a range of accommodating practices, including a simplification of cognitive and physical activities to match the perceived capabilities of children and the dedication of extensive parental time, money, and effort to child-oriented activities (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984). Child-centeredness is ubiquitous during infancy and early childhood. Postindustrial middle-class families, however, extend child-centeredness into adolescence. Many contemporary middle-class parents engage in “concerted cultivation” of a child’s creativity, personality, academic prowess, and talents to enhance the child’s future prospects in the class hierarchy (Lareau 2003). This heightened child-centeredness organizes how these families communicate across many domains of daily life.

Middle-class school-age children are often apprenticed into academic, domestic, and other skills through highly simplified, step-by-step verbal instructions, explanations, and demonstrations (Rogoff et al. 2003). These discursive practices resemble the cross-culturally prevalent (but not universal) use of baby talk to infants (Snow & Ferguson 1977). For both the infant and the older child, a high degree of simplification is viewed as the moral responsibility of the caregiver. This responsibility translates into heightened communicative labor that involves parents routinely reframing messages and verifying children’s understanding. The extensive communicative work (e.g., reminders, explanations, and justifications) through middle childhood and into adolescence stands in contrast to indigenous rural communities in the Americas and elsewhere, where children

are apprenticed primarily through “guided participation” in the nexus of ongoing activities and where talk is used parsimoniously (Rogoff et al. 2014).

A controversy has recently arisen in the United States surrounding the importance of the number of words used to communicate with infants and young children. A vocabulary-rich input combined with directing children to label objects are features of middle-class caregiving but have been less frequently observed in lower-income households (Hoff-Ginsberg 1991, Weisleder & Fernald 2013). An argument called the language gap (or the word gap) proposes that a culture of poverty is perpetuated in low-income families because children are not exposed to a high number of new vocabulary items. Interventions with parents of low socioeconomic status (SES) have been initiated to encourage middle-class-like child-directed speech and labeling activities to enhance the children’s language skills and academic success. This argument harks back to the cultural deficit hypothesis and association of “restricted codes” with working-class and “elaborated codes” with middle-class family communication (Bereiter & Engelmann 1966, Bernstein 1964). The language gap highlights the cultural value placed on a large and varied vocabulary. The perspective seamlessly meshes with the heightened postindustrial emphasis on the verbal display of creative problem solving as the signpost of intelligence requisite for membership in the knowledge class. It also places the burden of intergenerational cycles of poverty on how and how much parents talk to children.

It is worth pondering benefits and trade-offs of practices that prioritize adults directing abundant linguistic input to toddlers (the language gap argument) versus caregiving that envelops infants’ bodies and minds as collaborative participants alongside adults in activities. The language gap argument holds that academic and economic success depends on adults modifying their behavior to create a language-rich environment for toddlers. An alternative model, which Rogoff et al. (2014) call LOPI (learning by observing and pitching in), holds that toddlers’ immersion in ongoing endeavors inculcates a sense of belonging and motivates youngsters to collaborate. The distinction rests in the skills and dispositions that are considered key to children becoming productive members of their communities. The present review suggests that a strict cross-cultural polarization of these caregiving priorities masks the possibility that they could co-occur as situationally dependent practices within a single social group.

The caregiving disposition to intervene and verbally instruct school-age children is encouraged by policies in countries such as the United States, Europe, Japan, and China. Japan, for example, created the Fundamental Law of Education in 2006, declaring parents morally responsible for their child’s productivity at school and devotion to the nation (Arai 2013). The US formal education system calls for parental involvement in children’s schoolwork at home as the path to academic success. Parental engagement in homework dominates US middle-class parent–child communication during the week. From the moment that parents and children reunite after school and work, homework talk starts, with queries about assignments (e.g., “What’s your homework situation?”) and time-management socialization (Wingard 2007, p. 79):

Daughter: Can I go shopping with you today?

(0.6)

Mother: .hh No I want you to take a bath, and do your homework.

Daughter: And the:n can I go shopping with you?

Mother: If y- we have ti:me.

These parents feel responsible for the quality and completion of assignments, which fuels tension as children are pushed to answer neatly and correctly: “I’m telling you, if you don’t take

your time, I'm gonna rip them [assignments] up. You understand me?" (Kremer-Sadlik & Fatigante 2015).

Homework talk occurs in middle-class Asian families, but parental responsibility for and involvement in homework are diminished in Western European families (Fong 2007, Kremer-Sadlik & Fatigante 2015, Kuan 2011, Wingard & Forsberg 2009). In a cross-cultural comparison, American parents routinely coached children to excel in school assignments, whereas Italians placed far less importance on children completing, much less excelling, in these endeavors (Kremer-Sadlik & Fatigante 2015). American parents bought educational materials to supplement homework to stimulate their child's cognitive skills, whereas Italian parents disparaged overworking one's children and assignments that exceeded what they could reasonably manage.

Heightened anxiety about children's academic success characterizes capitalized China, fueled by the one-child policy and rapid enmeshment in the global economy (Anagnost et al. 2013). Chinese middle-class mothers set very high goals for their child and do everything possible to enhance competitive edge (Kuan 2011). Chinese educational policy urges parents to inculcate creativity, competitiveness, self-motivation, independence, and well-roundedness, alongside often historically rooted virtues of obedience and caring (Fong 2007, Kuan 2011). Time management and self-discipline are deemed essential, as in a mother's lament about her daughter: "I want her to cultivate the kind of habit where she . . . she goes and plays piano on her own For her to manage her time on her own" (Kuan 2011, p. 87).

Time management is heightened when middle-class children are expected to be well-rounded and participate in (and excel at) sports, music, and other activities (Hofferth & Sandberg 2001). In US middle-class homes, activity calendars are typically positioned strategically in the kitchen for all to consult (Arnold et al. 2012). Scheduling talk about who needs to be where and when is commonplace. In one exceedingly busy Los Angeles family, the children are enrolled in hockey, karate, basketball, tennis, fencing, music, and a tutoring program. Parents urge children to get ready for activities ("Jake, really we got to hurry please"), and couples coordinate child pick-up arrangements ("You'll pick him up at hockey, I mean at karate. That's the plan."). The whirl of child-centered activities become the *raison d'être* of some US middle-class parents, who eagerly devote their considerable talents to maximize their children's choices in life. As one mother explains, "I think that my job is to give them all that they need to be able to have the most choices That's why I went back to work . . . so that we can afford all the extra things to add to the richness of their childhood" (Kremer-Sadlik & Fatigante 2015).

Despite children's legal rights and mandatory schooling, some argue that new kinds of labor—extensive schoolwork and extracurricular activities—are imposed on middle-class children (James et al. 1998, Kremer-Sadlik et al. 2010, Levey 2009, Qvortrup 2005). In this light, middle-class child-centeredness is not simply overindulgent parental involvement. Postindustrial child-centeredness may be the effect of neo-liberal pressures on parents to do everything possible to raise entrepreneurial children who are ready to compete in a postindustrial market of talents and ideas. Compounded by the dramatic decline in employment opportunities, many parents are uncertain about how best to secure their children's future as part of the middle class.

SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT AS ENDEAVOR

Face-to-face involvement is universally the bedrock of family connectedness. Tomasello et al. (2005) argue that culture is born out of routine moments of joint attention of caregivers and infants around common objects of interest. Yet, differences prevail in how family members secure the gaze and attention of young children across societies.

In indigenous communities in the Americas, the Pacific Islands, Southeast Asia, and Africa, small children are primarily directed to notice the activities of people in their surroundings (Brown 2012, de León 1998, Howard 2012, LeVine et al. 1988, Ochs 1988, Rogoff et al. 2003, Schieffelin 1990, Takada 2012). Infants are held outward to face others, immersed in multiparty interactions and prompted to call out names or otherwise participate in verbal exchanges. Some caregivers ventriloquize for the infant, modeling what to say (Schieffelin 1990). In American middle-class households, an infant or toddler is likely to be with a solo caregiver, who is keen to pedagogically direct the child to notice physical properties of objects. These caregivers produce and elicit words for things, colors, shapes, and sizes. Caregivers in postindustrial countries such as Japan and the Netherlands, however, prioritize both social and cognitive skills, ensuring that children act considerately and appropriately and know properties of objects (Burdelski 2012, Harkness et al. 2000). Japanese parents, for example, routinely prompt young children in family politeness, e.g., “Say welcome home [to father]” (Burdelski 2006).

In many indigenous and rural communities children’s observation of what people in their surroundings say and do is cultivated early in life, as reported for Guatemala (Rogoff et al. 2003), Mexico (Brown 2012, de León 2012), Samoa (Ochs 1988), Papua New Guinea (Schieffelin 1990), and Africa (Takada 2012). Joint attention to tasks in these communities is often secured without relying on language to prompt the child. In many middle-class postindustrial households parental directives and face-to-face alignment are necessary to get children to perform household tasks. The labor involved in securing children’s attention is considerable, with parents having to repeat their efforts and even issue appeals. Once parents secure mutual eye gaze with children they can “bracket off” competing activities and concentrate on the task in progress (Tulbert & Goodwin 2011). In contrast, when these parents issue task directives from another room, they are less effective, and directives can evolve into arguments between multitasking parents and reluctant children absorbed in other activities. Middle-class parents observed in both the United States and Sweden also often physically “shepherd” a child along each step, if they want to see the task completed (Goodwin & Cekaite 2013).

When American middle-class parents and children return home at the end of the day, sustained face-to-face interaction can be a challenge. Fathers tend to arrive home after working mothers and experience difficulty getting their children—engrossed in a computer game, television, homework, or other activities—to notice them (Kendall 2007, Ochs & Campos 2013). In a study of middle-class Los Angeles families, returning fathers were ignored by at least one child 86% of the time (Campos et al. 2009). This pattern contrasts with Japanese (Burdelski 2012), Korean (Park 2006), Thai (Howard 2012), and Vietnamese (Shohet 2013) families, in which children routinely greet family members with respect or affect terms.

The built environment organizes face-to-face communication among family members. In some societies extended families communicate in open spaces with visual and aural access (de León 2012, Schieffelin 1990). This environment situates children in multiparty arrangements as overhearers of conversations. Alternatively, middle-class homes in Western Europe and North America have walled-off rooms, which afford isolation and privacy. In middle-class Los Angeles homes, for example, family members were observed to be frequently alone and rarely all together in the same room (Graesch 2013). When fathers were together with children, they engaged primarily in leisure activities. Mothers and children instead spent time together talking primarily about homework, hygiene, and other practical concerns (Arnold et al. 2012). Sustained communication between postindustrial middle-class parents and children is further challenged by the time squeeze experienced when mothers return home from work. Arriving before their spouses and faced with housework and child care tasks, mothers’ interactions with children are often fragmented as they

multitask to get things done (Good 2009, Offer & Schneider 2010). Mothers may juggle helping a child with a homework problem, soothing a toddler, and monitoring dinner.

In many societies families do not eat together, as taboos or contingencies constrain who shares a meal, yet family members intermittently engage in face-to-face communication throughout the day (Farb & Armelagos 1980, Ochs & Shohet 2006, Schieffelin 1990). In postindustrial societies, where parents and children spend the day apart, meal sharing provides an opportunity to communicate as a family unit (Sterponi 2003, 2014). US middle-class families who gather for dinner recount experiences, plan, problem solve, and argue (Aukrust & Snow 1998, Blum-Kulka 1997, Bohanek et al. 2009, Ochs et al. 1992). It is challenging, however, for families to assemble for a common meal because of work and extracurricular activity schedules (Ochs et al. 2010). Even when everyone is at home, eating dinner all together is relatively infrequent; or dinner is very short, as other activities pull them away; or children are uncomfortable being scrutinized by their parents around the table. Los Angeles middle-class parents at times have to lure recalcitrant children to the table (“You ready to eat? Come here. Sit. Please”). Upon arriving at the dinner table children often complain they are not hungry, reject the food (“I told you I don’t want spaghetti sauce!”), or ask to eat in another room (Campos et al. 2013). Eating apart is facilitated by children’s access to an abundant supply of individual-sized snacks (that replace dinner) and meals stockpiled in refrigerators ready to be microwaved whenever desired (Ochs & Beck 2013).

In a comparison of middle-class Italian and middle-class American dinnertimes, Italian parents easily enticed children to the table with talk of delicious dishes cooked especially for them, and dinners were filled with affect-laced talk about the pleasures of particular foods (Ochs et al. 1996). American dinner talk instead dwelled on food as nutrition, leading to conflicts over eating vegetables and protein and children bolting from the table. Notable as well is the striking contrast between American middle-class parents cajoling children to eat and their children refusing food and ethnographic accounts of Kaluli and Samoan children begging, appealing, and demanding food be given to them (Ochs 1988, Schieffelin 1990), Marshall Island children hiding food from nonfamily members (Berman 2012), and Sinhalese parents’ lament that “We have to give” food to appease young children’s seemingly limitless desires (Chapin 2010).

FREEDOM AND AUTONOMY IN CHILDHOOD

Individualism flourishes across societies with diverse political economies, and children are socialized through talk into local ideologies of individualism. Thus, Muang parents (Thailand) are mindful of not interfering with a child’s individual karma (Howard 2010), and a Kaluli (Papua New Guinea) infant is encouraged to become a “hard” independent person who can speak proper language to assertively ask for foods and other goods (Schieffelin 1990). The Kaluli disposition bears some resemblance to US working-class children’s socialization into “hard individualism,” which values toughness, persistence, independence, and resilience in adverse circumstances (Kuserow 2004).

Middle-class American children’s individualism is feted: Children often have their own room bulging with toys, clothes, and trophies engraved with their names. Self-esteem is promoted through invisibilizing parents’ contributions and assigning individual credit to a child’s accomplishments (Ochs & Schieffelin 1984). Parents also minimize failures and compliment unsuccessful efforts, e.g., “You almost scored? How excellent!” (Kremer-Sadlik & Kim 2007). Above all, middle-class American parents intensely attend to a child’s will and freedom to choose how to act, think, and feel (Hoffman 2013, Ochs & Izquierdo 2009). These qualities have long been linked to the innovative genius of American society and liberal confidence that markets flourish when rational, ethical, and entrepreneurial individuals pursue their own interests without restrictions

(Jones 2012). A child's verbal creativity is continually encouraged by middle-class parents: Children and parents narrate and interpret events (Heath 1983) and engage in verbal play and "knowledge exploration" (M.H. Goodwin 2007). Some parents enroll children in startup camps, where they learn entrepreneurial skills from brainstorming to pitching a marketable product to venture capitalists.

Accommodation to middle-class children's individual desires is ubiquitous (Lareau 2003, Zelizer 1994). US dinnertime conversation, for example, is flooded with the verb "want": e.g., "Isaiah honey, do you want some more of your cereal?," "Dad, I want my chocolate milk now," "I don't like the rice. I want applesauce," "Momma, I told you I don't want—I don't want that" (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013). Children's will is amplified through extended parent-child negotiations over desires (C. Goodwin 2007, Goodwin & Goodwin 2013). Children's desires, however, sometimes slip into the moral category of "spoiled child," with parents bemoaning their child's sense of entitlement (Kolbert 2012).

In postindustrial societies autonomy is deemed central to developing individual entrepreneurial acumen. US middle-class children often display considerable autonomy in performing academic tasks at school, using digital technologies for their own ends and developing personal sports and arts talents. These activities are closely linked to long-term goals of admission to a prestigious university and becoming a player in the knowledge economy. Yet, inside the home, many children display far less autonomy in self-care and household chores. These tasks are manual, practical, cooperative, easy to learn, and can be completed in the here-and-now. Most school-age children are capable of maintaining personal hygiene and doing basic chores. This facet of autonomy is not at issue. Rather, it is a child's failure to initiate and complete tasks that often vexes parents. Across 30 Los Angeles middle-class families, for example, no child routinely initiated a task at home without being asked. Parental directives often took the form of polite requests or appeals, e.g., "Can you take this [trash bag] out for me please?" In 22 of these families, children frequently ignored, resisted, or refused to help (Ochs & Izquierdo 2009). Parents ended up intensely assisting children in tasks. These interventions had the self-canceling effect of augmenting parental control and children's chronic dependence on parental intervention, e.g., (father to seven-year-old daughter) "I'll tie your shoes. Does your other shoe need to be tied too? When are you going to learn to do this? When you're fifteen?" (Klein & Goodwin 2013, Ochs & Izquierdo 2009). In contrast, British middle-class children shoulder some housework and sibling care responsibilities (Such & Walker 2005). And Swedish middle-class parents persist beyond children's initial resistance to work out "activity contracts," wherein children are held morally accountable for cleaning up after themselves, e.g., (father to daughter) "You must clean here today if you will have guests you know" (Aronsson & Cekaite 2011).

In many societies children help out in a wide range of domestic tasks without prompting (Garcia-Sánchez 2014; Paradise & de Haan 2009; Rogoff et al. 1993, 2003, 2014; Whiting & Edwards 1988). Yet, many middle-class parents in the United States view this kind of child's work as impossible. Some lament that it is too exasperating to extract help from their children and prefer to do the task for them. Others emphasize the need for children to dedicate time to entrepreneurial pursuits that promote their own and the nation's ability to compete in the world markets. Still others comment that children are simply too busy with schoolwork and extracurricular activities to spend time on housework.

Demonstrating self-reliance in self-care and housework seems inconsequential in the context of middle-class long-term ambitions for a child's entrepreneurial future. Yet, American middle-class children's diminished autonomy at home boomerangs to overwhelm exhausted working mothers, who assume the bulk of child care and housework with little hands-on family assistance (Hochschild 1989). Decades after the feminist declaration that the personal is political, postindustrial women

struggle to manage exigencies of career and family and wonder how to cope (Hochschild & Ehrenreich 2002). Public debate focuses on gender asymmetry in the working couple's division of domestic tasks (Sandberg 2013, Slaughter 2012). Few raise the possibility that an American middle-class child could also mitigate the work–family crisis by demonstrating practical autonomy at home. And even fewer link children's diminished autonomy at home to fallout from a political economy that orients children's autonomy toward future aspirations over here-and-now practical exigencies and the pursuit of self-interests outside the family over domestic responsibilities and social interdependence (Such & Walker 2005). Family talk propels a new generation into liberal principles of freedom of choice and the possibility of enterprisingly pursuing those choices. At the same time, discursive accommodations to these principles contribute to the atomization of family life and place the burden of household labor on working parents, especially mothers.

INTIMACY

Intimacy is culturally and historically configured. Perhaps the most basic and widespread form of intimacy is the sense of closeness and trust across persons achieved through routine cooperative activities. A related form of intimacy is the sense of closeness and trust that arises from membership in a “with” (Goffman 1972), wherein a person is given the latitude to enter the personal space (corporeal, material, and psychological) of another. An extension of this notion is the sense of closeness and trust achieved through mutual disclosure and ratification of an authentic inner self, including emotions and private thoughts. This form of intimacy, more culturally circumscribed, depends on a modernist discourse of openness (Solomon et al. 2002), ipso facto imbricated in and actualized through language. Family relationships in many postindustrial societies are built through all these notions of intimacy but are distinguished by the value of authenticity and disclosure in family communication (Jamieson 1998, Yan 2003).

Ratified mutual disclosure between family members has been tied to the progressive democratization of the family and modern notions of the self as a project (Giddens 1992). In this idealization, each family member has a voice that should be validated as part of a broader detraditionalization and progressive equality in the couple and parent–child relationship (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Integral to such intimacy is the framing of the couple, and even parent and child, as best friends who listen to and support one other's psychological states regarding the minutiae of their lives (Jamieson 1998). Not only mothers but also increasingly fathers invest dialogic time in immersing themselves in children's experiences, acknowledging their perspectives and sentiments (Gottzén & Kremer-Sadlik 2012, Langford et al. 2001). Rather than preserving the image of mother or father as omnipotent, democratization of the family positions children as ratified overhearers and addressees who can respond to parents' disclosures of vulnerabilities, self-doubts, and challenges to one another's judgment.

Children's exposure to parental frailties is commonplace across social groups, but their treatment as a legitimate addressee with the right to pass judgment is not (Fong 2007, Howard 2012, Loyd 2012). In postindustrial middle-class families, democratic mutual openness can pose a dilemma when children's equal right to express opinions challenges parental control, which in turn is a social reality integral to family structure (Gordon 2007, Hoffman 2013, Tannen 2007, Tannen et al. 2007). Getting a task accomplished can entail lengthy negotiation (Klein & Goodwin 2013). In addition, a child can reprimand a parent for exerting social control (“You're acting like a control freak”) or order the parent to perform a task (Ochs & Izquierdo 2009).

Verbal and corporeal disclosures of affection between family members can vary across gender, age, household, and community lines and are subject to global influences (Bjornberg 1991, Kleinman et al. 2011). In China, for example, expressed emotion in families parallels the rise in

individual desire fulfillment and privacy that accompanied the transition from socialist to market economies (Rofel 2007, Yan 2003). In the United States, the language of love (“Love you!”) pervades face-to-face and mobile phone exchanges between family members. Ubiquitous corporeal displays of affection (e.g., touching, hugging) also characterize family intimacy (Goodwin 2015, Goodwin & Goodwin 2013, Hirsch & Wardlow 2006). Affective disclosure and solicitations extend to daily phone texts (“Hope you’re having fun”) when family members are apart (Devitt & Roker 2009). Such affective reassurances may be linked to a more overarching fragility wherein lasting couple and even parent–child relationships cannot be taken for granted as legal or moral commitments or a guarantee of financial security (Gillies 2003, Hochschild 2012). Indeed, constant displays of affection index to family members that their relationship is motivated by sincere individual feelings rather than mere duty dictated by family structure. In this sense, the language of love clings to the Heideggerian high ground of authenticity to achieve familial connectivity in the face of disaggregated identities and possible worlds one can inhabit (Dreyfus & Spinosa 1997).

As a coda to postindustrial intimacy, we note the current concern that new media pull children away from sustained face-to-face family conversation and into an intimate telegraphic relationship with their electronic devices and virtual communities (Jones & Schieffelin 2009, Pigeron 2009, Shankar & Cavanaugh 2012, Turkle 2011). Yet, American families with the most media technology are more likely to share screen time and electronically communicate with each other (Wellman et al. 2008). Moreover, mobile phones and other media tether family members while apart (Palen & Hughes 2007). Couples rely on calls and text messages to coordinate domestic schedules; parents monitor children’s whereabouts, keeping mobile phones close at hand (Christensen 2009).

CONCLUSION

Caregivers and children are verbally entwined in socially and historically preferred possibilities of giving and receiving care and the experience of being in a world shared with others. Caregiving is generally associated with care for children, which entails degrees and kinds of relational accommodation. Alternatively, caregiving is morally entangled with rousing children to recognize, identify with, and care for others. Indeed, the viability of interpersonal relationships, family, and community depends on children’s routine expression of compassion for others. This process in turn exacts a growing awareness by the child that being with others requires a quotidian existence of uneasy reconciliations of individuated and typified selves.

This review ponders how the experiences of care for children and care from children are entangled in late capitalist and modern conditions, such as unfettered self-interest, ascension of a knowledge class, self-reflexivity, uncertainty, and preoccupation with authenticity. It considers how a postindustrial economy favoring a workforce with high-level creative language and problem-solving skills is fostered through an avalanche of middle-class family talk that nurtures the entrepreneurial child. An important facet of parent–child communication is pedagogicalized, with dedication to vocabulary input, homework talk, verbal play, and reflective discussions of children’s experiences, including their participation in extracurricular programs that develop skills and talents.

The postindustrial era has also furthered the detraditionalization and reshuffling of couple and parent–child relationships; family talk ratifies each family member’s (including children’s) freedom to pursue self-interests at will. Moreover, the democratization of the family, combined with the modern virtue of authenticity, prioritizes reciprocal voicing of one’s inner states as a keystone of genuine family connectedness. In this late modern genre of family intimacy, parents and children are rendered friends who share inner selves.

The flip side of the far-in-the-future, democratic, cognitive, and emotionally authentic thrust of postindustrial middle-class family discourse is a diminution of authoritative language that routinely directs children to help with practical, here-and-now exigencies. Authority is ever-present but masked behind a veil of tentative politeness and negotiation. The veil ostensibly builds children's sense of self-worth and assertiveness but at a cost of prolonged verbiage about the minutiae of daily tasks. In these and other ways, language makes evident how the postindustrial middle-class family continuously redefines itself as an entrepreneurial, ambitious, information-seeking, schedule-packed, multitasking, uncertain, and emotionally open constellation of family members, bringing along some unintended consequences.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anagnost A, Arai A, Ren H, eds. 2013. *Global Futures in East Asia: Youth, Nation and the New Economy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Arai A. 2013. Notes to the heart: new lessons in national sentiment. See Anagnost et al. 2013, pp. 174–96
- Ariès P. 1960. *L'Enfant et la Vie Familiale sous l'Ancien Régime*. Paris: Plon
- Arnold J, Graesch AP, Ochs E, Ragazzini E. 2012. *Life at Home in the 21st Century: 32 Families Open Their Doors*. Los Angeles, CA: Cotsen Inst. Archaeol. Press
- Aronsson K, Cekaite A. 2011. Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics. *Discourse Soc.* 22(2):137–54
- Aukrust VG, Snow CE. 1998. Narratives and explanations during mealtime conversations in Norway and the U.S. *Lang. Soc.* 27(2):221–46
- Beck U, Beck-Gernsheim E. 2002. *Individualization*. London: Sage
- Bell D. 1974. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Harper Colophon
- Bell D. 1993. *Communitarianism and Its Critics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Bereiter C, Engelmann S. 1966. *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Berman EC. 2012. *Children Have Nothing to Hide: Deception, Age, and Avoiding Giving in the Marshall Islands*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Bernstein B. 1964. Elaborated and restricted codes: their social origins and some consequences. In Special Issue: *The Ethnography of Communication*, ed. JJ Gumperz, D Hymes. *Am. Anthropol.* 66(6):II:55–69
- Bianchi SM, Robinson JP, Milkie MA. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Bjornberg U, ed. 1991. *European Parents in the 1990s: Contradictions and Comparisons*. New Brunswick, NJ: Translation
- Blum-Kulka S. 1997. *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Bohanek JG, Fivush R, Zaman W, Lepore CE, Merchant S, Duke MP. 2009. Narrative interaction in family dinnertime conversations. *Merrill-Palmer Q.* 55(4):488–515
- Brown P. 2012. The cultural organization of attention. See Duranti et al. 2012, pp. 29–55
- Brown R, Gilman A. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In *Style in Language*, ed. TA Sebeok, pp. 253–76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Burdelski M. 2006. *Language socialization of two-year old children in Kansai, Japan: the family and beyond*. PhD Thesis, Univ. Calif., Los Angeles
- Burdelski M. 2012. Language socialization and politeness routines. See Duranti et al. 2012, pp. 275–95
- Calvert SL, Wilson BJ, eds. 2008. *The Handbook of Children, Media and Development*. Malden, MA: Blackwell

- Campos B, Graesch A, Repetti R, Bradbury T, Ochs E. 2009. Opportunity for interaction? A naturalistic observation study of dual-earner families after work and school. *J. Fam. Psychol.* 23:798–807
- Campos B, Wang S, Plaksina T, Repetti RL, Schoebi D, et al. 2013. Positive and negative emotion in the daily life of dual-earner couples with children. *J. Fam. Psychol.* 27:76–85
- Castells M. 1998. *End of Millennium: The Information Age, Society, Economics and Culture*, Vol. 3. Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Chapin BL. 2010. “We have to give”: Sinhala mothers’ responses to children’s expression of desire. *Ethos* 38(4):354–68
- Christensen K, Schneider B, eds. 2010. *Workplace Flexibility: Realigning 20th Century Jobs to 21st Century Workers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
- Christensen TH. 2009. “Connected presence” in distributed family life. *New Media Soc.* 11(3):433–51
- Darrah C, Freeman JM, English-Lueck JA. 2007. *Busier than Ever! Why American Families Can’t Slow Down*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- de León L. 1998. The emergent participant: interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) infants. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 8(2):131–61
- de León L. 2012. Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. See Duranti et al. 2012, pp. 81–111
- Demos J. 1970. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Devitt K, Roker D. 2009. The role of mobile phones in family communication. *Child. Soc.* 23:189–202
- Dewey J. 1999 (1930). *Individualism Old and New*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books
- Donzelo J. 1979. *The Policing of Families*. New York: Pantheon
- Dreyfus HL, Spinosa C. 1997. Highway bridges and feasts: Heidegger and Borgmann on how to affirm technology. *Man World* 30:159–77
- Drucker P. 1967. *The Effective Executive*. New York: Harper & Row
- Duranti A, Ochs E, Schieffelin B, eds. 2012. *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell
- Durkheim E. 1933. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press
- Fader A. 2009. *Mitzvah Girls: Bringing Up the Next Generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Farb P, Armelagos G. 1980. *Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Faubion JD, ed. 2001. *The Ethics of Kinship: Ethnographic Inquiries*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield
- Fong VL. 2007. Parent-child communication problems and the perceived inadequacies of Chinese only children. *Ethos* 35(1):85–127
- Forsberg L. 2009. Managing time and childcare in dual-earner families: unforeseen consequences of household strategies. *Acta Sociol.* 52(2):162–75
- García-Sánchez I. 2014. *Language and Muslim Immigrant Childhoods: The Politics of Belonging*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell
- Giddens A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Giddens A. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Gillies V. 2003. *Family and intimate relationships: a review of the sociological research*. Work. Pap. 2, Fam. Soc. Capital ESRC Res. Group, London South Bank Univ.
- Gillis JR. 2001. Never enough time: some paradoxes of modern family time(s). In *Minding the Time in Family Experience: Emerging Perspectives and Issues*, ed. KJ Daly, pp. 19–37. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Goffman E. 1972. *Relations in Public*. New York: Harper & Row
- Good J. 2009. *Multitasking and attention in interaction: negotiating multiple tasks in everyday family life*. PhD Thesis, Univ. Calif., Los Angeles
- Goodwin C. 2007. Participation, stance, and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse Soc.* 18(1):53–73
- Goodwin MH. 2007. Occasioned knowledge exploration in family interaction. *Discourse Soc.* 18(1):93–110
- Goodwin MH. 2015. Care-full look at language, gender, and embodied intimacy. In *Shifting Visions: Gender, Sexuality, Discourse, and Language*, ed. A Jule, pp. 27–48. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Sch. Press

- Goodwin MH, Cekaite A. 2013. Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *J. Pragmat.* 46:122–38
- Goodwin MH, Goodwin C. 2013. Nurturing. See Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, pp. 151–73
- Gordon C. 2007. “I just feel horribly embarrassed when she does that”: constituting a mother’s identity. See Tannen et al. 2007, pp. 72–102
- Gottzén L, Kremer-Sadlik T. 2012. Fatherhood and youth sports: a balancing act between care and expectations. *Gender Soc.* 26(4):639–64
- Graesch A. 2013. At home. See Ochs et al. 2013, pp. 27–47
- Hareven T. 2000. *Families, History, and Social Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Harkness S, Super CM, Pai S. 2000. Individualism and the “Western mind” reconsidered: American and Dutch parents’ ethnotheories of children and family. In *The Social Construction of the Child: Understanding Variability Within and Across Contexts, New Directions in Child Development*, Vol. 87, ed. S Harkness, C Raeff, CM Super, pp. 23–39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Heath SB. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Hirsch J, Wardlow H, eds. 2006. *Modern Loves: The Anthropology of Romantic Courtship and Companionate Marriage*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Hochschild A. 2012. *The Outsourced Self: Intimate Life in Market Times*. New York: Metropolitan Books
- Hochschild A, Ehrenreich B, eds. 2002. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books
- Hochschild A. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution in the Home*. New York: Viking Penguin
- Hoff-Ginsberg E. 1991. Mother-child conversation in different social classes and communicative settings. *Child Dev.* 62(4):782–96
- Hofferth SL, Sandberg JF. 2001. How American children spend their time. *J. Marriage Fam.* 63(2):295–308
- Hoffman DM. 2013. Power struggles: the paradoxes of emotion and control among child-centered mothers in the privileged United States. *Ethos* 41(1):75–97
- Howard K. 2010. Social relationships and language shift in Northern Thailand. *J. Socioling.* 14(3):313–40
- Howard K. 2012. Language socialization and hierarchy. See Duranti et al. 2012, pp. 341–64
- James A, Jenks C, Prout A. 1998. *Theorizing Childhood*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press
- Jamieson L. 1998. *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press
- Jones DS. 2012. *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman, and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- Jones GM, Schieffelin BB. 2009. Talking text and talking back: “My BFF Jill” from boob tube to Youtube. *J. Comp.-Mediat. Comm.* 14:1050–79
- Kendall S. 2007. Father as breadwinner, mother as worker: gendered positions in feminist and traditional discourses of work and family. See Tannen et al. 2007, pp. 123–63
- Klein W, Goodwin MH. 2013. Chores. See Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, pp. 111–29
- Kleinman A, Yan Y, Jun J, Lee S, Zhang E, et al. 2011. *Deep China: The Moral Life of the Person*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Kolbert E. 2012. Spoiled rotten: Why do kids rule the roost? *The New Yorker*, July 2, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2012/07/02/spoiled-rotten>
- Kremer-Sadlik T. 2013. Time for family. See Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, pp. 217–31
- Kremer-Sadlik T, Fatigante M. 2015. Investing in children’s future: cross-cultural perspectives and ideologies on parental involvement in education. *Childhood* 22:67–84
- Kremer-Sadlik T, Fatigante M, Fasulo A. 2008. Discourse on family time: the cultural interpretation of family togetherness in Los Angeles and Rome. *Ethos* 36(3):283–309
- Kremer-Sadlik T, Izquierdo C, Fatigante M. 2010. Making meaning of everyday practices: parents’ attitudes toward children’s extracurricular activities in the United States and in Italy. *Anthropol. Educ. Q.* 41:35–54
- Kremer-Sadlik T, Kim JL. 2007. Lessons from sports: children’s socialization to values through family interaction during sports activities. *Discourse Soc.* 18(1):35–52
- Kremer-Sadlik T, Paugh A. 2007. Everyday moments: finding “quality time” in American working families. *Time Soc.* 16(2/3):287–308

- Kuan T. 2011. "The heart says one thing but the hand does another": a story about emotion-work, ambivalence, and popular advice for parents. *Cbina J.* 65:77–100
- Kuserow A. 2004. *American Individualisms: Child Rearing and Social Class in Three Neighborhoods*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Langford W, Lewis C, Solomon Y, Warin J. 2001. *Family Understandings*. London: Family Policy Stud. Cent.
- Lareau A. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Levey H. 2009. Pageant princesses and math whizzes: understanding children's activities as a form of children's work. *Childhood* 16(2):195–212
- LeVine RA, Miller P, West M, eds. 1988. *Parental Behavior in Diverse Societies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Loyd H. 2012. The logic of conflict: practices of social control among inner city Neapolitan girls. In *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth*, Vol. 15: *Disputes in Everyday Life: Social and Moral Orders of Children and Young People*, ed. S Danby, M Theobald, pp. 325–53. Bingley, UK: Emerald
- Lynd R, Lynd HM. 1929. *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace
- Macfarlane A. 1978. *The Origins of English Individualism: The Family Property and Social Transition*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley
- Ochs E. 1988. *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Ochs E, Beck M. 2013. Dinner. See Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, pp. 48–66
- Ochs E, Campos B. 2013. Coming home. See Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik 2013, pp. 13–26
- Ochs E, Izquierdo C. 2009. Responsibility in childhood: three developmental trajectories. *Ethos* 37(4):391–413
- Ochs E, Kremer-Sadlik T, eds. 2013. *Fast-Forward Family: Home, Work, and Relationships in Middle Class America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Ochs E, Pontecorvo C, Fasulo A. 1996. Socializing taste. *Ethnos* 6(1):7–46
- Ochs E, Schieffelin BB. 1984. Language acquisition and socialization: three developmental stories. In *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, ed. RA Shweder, RA LeVine, pp. 276–320. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Ochs E, Shohet M. 2006. The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. *New Dir. Child Adolesc. Dev.* 11:35–49
- Ochs E, Shohet M, Campos B, Beck M. 2010. Coming together at dinner: a study of working families. See Christensen & Schneider 2010, pp. 57–70
- Ochs E, Taylor C, Rudolph D, Smith R. 1992. Story-telling as a theory-building activity. *Discourse Proc.* 15(1):37–72
- Offer S, Schneider B. 2010. Multitasking among working families: a strategy for dealing with the time squeeze. See Christensen & Schneider 2010, pp. 43–56
- Palen L, Hughes A. 2007. When home base is not a place: parents' use of mobile telephones. *Pers. Ubiquit. Comput.* 11:339–48
- Paradise R, de Haan M. 2009. Responsibility and reciprocity: social organization of Mazahua learning practices. *Anthropol. Educ. Q.* 40(2):187–204
- Park E. 2006. Grandparents, grandchildren, and heritage language use in Korean. In *Heritage Language Development: Focus on East Asian Immigrants*, ed. K Kondo-Brown, pp. 57–86. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Peletz MG. 1995. Kinship studies in late twentieth-century anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:343–72
- Pigeron E. 2009. *The technology-mediated worlds of American families*. PhD Thesis. Univ. Calif., Los Angeles
- Popkewitz TS. 2003. Governing the child and pedagogicalization of the parent: historical excursus into the present. In *Governing Children, Families, and Education: Restructuring the Welfare State*, ed. MN Bloch, K Holmlund, I Moqvist, TS Popkewitz, pp. 35–61. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Popper KR. 1945. *Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge
- Qvortrup J. 2005. Varieties of childhood. In *Studies in Modern Childhood: Society, Agency, and Culture*, ed. J Qvortrup, pp. 1–20. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Rawls J. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
- Robinson JP, Godbey G. 1997. *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use their Time*. University Park: Pa. State Univ. Press

- Rofel L. 2007. *Desiring China: Experiments in Neoliberalism, Sexuality, and Public Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Rogoff B, Alcalá L, Coppens AD, et al. 2014. Special Issue: Learning by Observing and Pitching in to Family and Community Endeavors. *Hum. Dev.* 57(2–3):65–171
- Rogoff B, Jayanti M, Göncü A, Mosier C. 1993. Guided participation in cultural activity by toddlers and caregivers. In *Contexts for Learning: Sociocultural Dynamics in Children's Development*, ed. EA Forman, N Minick, C Addison Stone, pp. 230–53. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Rogoff B, Paradise R, Arauz RM, Correa-Chavez M, Angelillo C. 2003. Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 54:175–203
- Sandberg S. 2013. *Lean In: Women, Work and the Will to Lead*. New York: Knopf
- Schieffelin BB. 1990. *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Shankar S, Cavanaugh J. 2012. Language and materiality in global capitalism. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 41:355–69
- Shohet M. 2013. Everyday sacrifice and language socialization in Vietnam: the power of a respect particle. *Am. Anthropol.* 115(2):203–17
- Slaughter AM. 2012. Why women still can't have it all. *The Atlantic*, June 13
- Snow CE, Ferguson CA, eds. 1977. *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Solomon Y, Warin J, Lewis C, Langford W. 2002. Intimate talk between parents and their teenage children: democratic openness or covert control? *Sociology* 36(4):965–83
- Spiro ME. 1993. Is the western conception of the self “peculiar” within the context of the world cultures? *Ethos* 21(2):107–53
- Stacey J. 1998. *Brave New Families: Stories of Domestic Upheaval in Late Twentieth-Century America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Sterponi L. 2003. Account episodes in family discourse: the making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Stud.* 5(1):79–100
- Sterponi L. 2014. Caught red-handed: how Italian parents engage children in moral discourse and action. In *Talking about Right and Wrong: Parent-Child Conversations as Contexts for Moral Development*, ed. C Wainryb, HE Recchia, pp. 122–42. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Suárez-Orozco C, Suárez-Orozco M, Todorova I. 2008. *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Such E, Walker R. 2005. Young citizens or policy objects? Children in the “rights and responsibilities” debate. *J. Soc. Policy* 34(1):39–57
- Takada A. 2012. Pre-verbal infant-caregiver interaction. See Duranti et al. 2012, pp. 56–80
- Tannen D. 1990. Rethinking power and solidarity in gender dominance. *Proc. 16th Annu. Meet. Berkeley Linguist. Soc.* 16:519–29
- Tannen D. 2007. Power maneuvers and connection maneuvers in family interaction. See Tannen et al. 2007, pp. 27–48
- Tannen D, Kendall S, Gordon C, eds. 2007. *Family Talk: Discourse and Identity in Four American Families*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Tomasello M, Carpenter M, Call J, Behne T, Moll H. 2005. Understanding and sharing intentions: the origins of cultural cognition. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 28:675–735
- Tulbert E, Goodwin MH. 2011. Choreographies of attention: multimodality in a routine family activity. In *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*, ed. J Streeck, C Goodwin, C LeBaron, pp. 79–92. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Turkle S. 2011. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic Books
- Weisleder A, Fernald A. 2013. Talking to children matters: Early language experience strengthens processing and builds vocabulary. *Psychol. Sci.* 24(11):2143–52
- Wellman B, Smith A, Wells A, Kennedy T. 2008. *Networked families*. Rep., Oct. 19, Pew Res. Cent. Internet Am. Life Proj. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2008/10/19/networked-families/>
- Whiting B, Edwards CP. 1988. *Children of Different Worlds: The Formation of Social Behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

- Wingard L. 2007. Constructing time and prioritizing activities in parent-child interaction. *Discourse Soc.* 18(1):75–91
- Wingard L, Forsberg L. 2009. Parent involvement in children's homework in American and Swedish dual-earner families. *J. Pragmat.* 41(8):1576–95
- Yan Y. 2003. *Private Life under Socialism: Love, Intimacy, and Family Change in a Chinese Village, 1949–1999*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Zelizer VA. 1994. *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press



Contents

Perspective

Some Things I Hope You Will Find Useful Even if Statistics Isn't Your Thing <i>George L. Cowgill</i>	1
--	---

Archaeology

Pleistocene Overkill and North American Mammalian Extinctions <i>David J. Meltzer</i>	33
The Archaeology of Ritual <i>Edward Swenson</i>	329
Recent Developments in High-Density Survey and Measurement (HDSM) for Archaeology: Implications for Practice and Theory <i>Rachel Opitz and W. Fred Limp</i>	347

Biological Anthropology

The Evolution of Difficult Childbirth and Helpless Hominin Infants <i>Holly Dunsworth and Leah Eccleston</i>	55
Health of Indigenous Peoples <i>Claudia R. Valeggia and J. Josh Snodgrass</i>	117
Energy Expenditure in Humans and Other Primates: A New Synthesis <i>Herman Pontzer</i>	169
An Evolutionary and Life-History Perspective on Osteoporosis <i>Felicia C. Madimeno</i>	189
Disturbance, Complexity, Scale: New Approaches to the Study of Human-Environment Interactions <i>Rebecca Bliege Bird</i>	241
Fallback Foods, Optimal Diets, and Nutritional Targets: Primate Responses to Varying Food Availability and Quality <i>Joanna E. Lambert and Jessica M. Rothman</i>	493

Resource Transfers and Human Life-History Evolution <i>James Holland Jones</i>	513
An Evolutionary Anthropological Perspective on Modern Human Origins <i>Curtis W. Marean</i>	533
Anthropology of Language and Communicative Practices	
How Postindustrial Families Talk <i>Elinor Ochs and Tamar Kremer-Sadlik</i>	87
Chronotopes, Scales, and Complexity in the Study of Language in Society <i>Jan Blommaert</i>	105
Linguistic Relativity from Reference to Agency <i>N. J. Enfield</i>	207
Politics of Translation <i>Susan Gal</i>	225
Breached Initiations: Sociopolitical Resources and Conflicts in Emergent Adulthood <i>Norma Mendoza-Denton and Aomar Boum</i>	295
Embodiment in Human Communication <i>Jürgen Streeck</i>	419
The Pragmatics of Qualia in Practice <i>Nicholas Harkness</i>	573
Sociocultural Anthropology	
Virtuality <i>Bonnie Nardi</i>	15
Anthropology and Heritage Regimes <i>Haidy Geismar</i>	71
Urban Political Ecology <i>Anne Rademacher</i>	137
Environmental Anthropology: Systemic Perspectives <i>Yancey Orr, J. Stephen Lansing, and Michael R. Dove</i>	153
The Anthropology of Life After AIDS: Epistemological Continuities in the Age of Antiretroviral Treatment <i>Eileen Moyer</i>	259
Anthropology of Aging and Care <i>Elana D. Buch</i>	277

Anthropology of Ontologies <i>Eduardo Kohn</i>	311
Oil and Anthropology <i>Douglas Rogers</i>	365
The Post–Cold War Anthropology of Central America <i>Jennifer L. Burrell and Ellen Moodie</i>	381
Risks of Citizenship and Fault Lines of Survival <i>Adriana Petryna and Karolina Follis</i>	401
Siberia <i>Piers Vitebsky and Anatoly Alekseyev</i>	439
Of What Does Self-Knowing Consist? Perspectives from Bangladesh and Pakistan <i>Naveeda Khan</i>	457
Addiction in the Making <i>William Garriott and Eugene Raikbel</i>	477
Waste and Waste Management <i>Joshua Reno</i>	557
Theme: Resources	
Virtuality <i>Bonnie Nardi</i>	15
Pleistocene Overkill and North American Mammalian Extinctions <i>David J. Meltzer</i>	33
Urban Political Ecology <i>Anne Rademacher</i>	137
Environmental Anthropology: Systemic Perspectives <i>Yancey Orr, J. Stephen Lansing, and Michael R. Dove</i>	153
Energy Expenditure in Humans and Other Primates: A New Synthesis <i>Herman Pontzer</i>	169
Disturbance, Complexity, Scale: New Approaches to the Study of Human–Environment Interactions <i>Rebecca Bliege Bird</i>	241
Anthropology of Aging and Care <i>Elana D. Buch</i>	277
Breached Initiations: Sociopolitical Resources and Conflicts in Emergent Adulthood <i>Norma Mendoza-Denton and Aomar Boum</i>	295

Recent Developments in High-Density Survey and Measurement (HDSM) for Archaeology: Implications for Practice and Theory <i>Rachel Opitz and W. Fred Limp</i>	347
Oil and Anthropology <i>Douglas Rogers</i>	365
Resource Transfers and Human Life-History Evolution <i>James Holland Jones</i>	513
Waste and Waste Management <i>Josbua Reno</i>	557

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 35–44	591
Cumulative Index of Chapter Titles, Volumes 35–44	595

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at <http://www.annualreviews.org/errata/anthro>