

Ideology of Patriarchy and the Concept of Money for Iranian Women in the Family

Vahid Kashafi Nia *

Ph.D. Student in Sociology,
Shahid Beheshti University,
Tehran, Iran

Email: v_kashafinia@sbu.ac.ir

Fatemeh Elmi Soola

M.A in Cultural Studies,
University of Science and Culture,
Tehran, Iran

Email: elmi_fateme@yahoo.com

***Corresponding author**

Abstract:

The main purpose of this research is studying the effects of patriarchy as a social and cultural factor on the concept of money for Iranian women in the family. The study has been done upon 400 married women in Tabriz, Iran. In doing so, we have used Viviana Zelizer's "Special Monies" approach as the theoretical framework. In order to gather data we have used the survey technique. The findings of research show that the concept of money for 61/1 percent of women is family-oriented, for 33/9 percent is average, and for 5 percent of women is self-oriented. Also results show that variables such as income, duration of marriage, number of children, public patriarchy and private patriarchy have significant relationships with concept of money for women in the family, but there are no significant relationships between age of woman and age differences with husband and concept of money for women in the family. The result of stepwise regression showed that among the whole variables which their relation with dependent variable have been proved. three factors explained the variance of the total by 59/6 percent, respectively.

Key words: Ideology of Patriarchy, Special Monies Approach, Women, Money, Family, Iran

Introduction

Developments in Western societies after industrial revolution, made barter system, involving a simple exchange of goods or services, impractical and created the need for a formally defined financial infrastructure, standards, and regulations. The consequence of this need was born of modern money and transition of Western societies from barter system to a new financial system based on money. This new medium- money- has some important characteristics that made it unique; these include (1) divisibility, (2) portability, (3) durability, (4) stability, and (5) difficulty of duplication or counterfeiting (Dobeck and Elliot, 2007:2). The phenomenon of money presupposes an economic order in which production is based on division of labor and in which private property consists not only in goods of the first order (consumption goods), but also in goods of higher orders (production goods) (Mises, 1953:29). The consequences of division of labor and private property were dominance of instrumental rationalism, and rise of capitalism. Although initially money was limited to the economic realm, but over time the sphere of its influence spread far beyond the realm of economics, and included all aspects of social life, ranging from relations between states to the most personal relationships between human beings.

The birth of modern money, and its limitless power, made most thinkers worry about its influences in societies. Economics analysis usually begins with the list of money's functions which was drawn up in the late 19th century, and, generally speaking, it remains true to say that for economics, money is what money does. In the conventional analysis, money functions as a "medium of exchange", "means of payment", "store of value", "unit of account" and "standard for deferred payment" (Ingham, 1998:3). In other words, economics could not provide a satisfactory account of money, its social or psychological aspects.

Even though classic sociologists agreed with economists about money's economic functions, but their sociological perspective impelled them to go beyond these simple analysis, and consider money's social aspects, too. Marx's arguments about money were part of his massive study about capitalism. In fact, he claimed that money is a social relation of production; therefore under capitalism, it is part of the capitalist system of relations of production (Brunhoff, 1976:19) and intimately tied up with labor and a concept of value based on labor and, therefore, labor products. For Marx, money is itself a commodity but one that in abstract form also represents the value of other commodities. As such, money is not just a medium of exchange, but also means of domination. For, as a universal measure for value (and the labor it entails, money symbolizes the capitalist mode of production and its social relations of exploitation (Deflem, 2003:76). He argues that money represents the abstract relationships of private property that have become detached from human relations of exchange (ibid). Finally, in Marx's sociological interpretation of money, it was an irresistible and radical leveler, invading all areas of social life. By homogenizing all qualitative distinctions into an abstract quantity, money allowed the equation of the incompatible (Zelizer, 1989: 346).

For Simmel, no item of society can be understood in isolation, but only in terms of its interrelatedness with totality. Thus, money as a social institution cannot be understood separated from the total social framework within which it is embedded (Turner, 1986:95). There is a paradox in Simmel's thought about money; money is an important medium in the creation of social ties between people, but at the same time, however, these relations are reified into impersonal cost-benefit alliances that are able to transgress social and physical boundaries (Deflem, 2003:73). In Simmel's words, money "produces both a previously unknown impersonality in all economic ownership and an equally enhanced independence and autonomy of the personality" (Simmel, 1991:18).

Weber's idea about money was similar to Marx and Simmel's. His treatment of the role of money in society forms part of his sociological discussions on the rationalization processes in industrial society. Weber writes: "From a purely technical point of view, money is the most "perfect" means of economic calculation. That is, it is formally the most rational means of orienting economic activity. Calculation in

terms of money, and not its actual use, is thus the specific means of rational economic provision” (Weber, 1978 [1922]: 86).

Even though classical sociologists’ approach was much more comprehensive than economists, but still was imperfect. Ingham believes that the reason was that classical sociologist and even most of contemporary sociologists do believe in “legacy of division of intellectual labor between economics and sociology” (Ingham, 1998:4). Despite of this fact that there has been renewal of interest in the subject– Hart (1986), Baker and Jimerson (1992), Dodd (2007), Ingham (1998, 2006), Belk and Wallendorf (1990), Giddens (1990) and so on– but Zelizer (1989) believes that most of these approaches are “reductionist”, because they portray money as a key instrument in the rationalization of social life, and reductively define it as the ultimate objectifier, homogenizing all qualitative distinctions into an abstract quantity. She criticize this approach, which she calls it “utilitarian approach”, and tries to offer an alternative approach, named “special monies approach”, to the study of money.

Special monies approach

Zelizer (1989) believes that a link, an interdependence, is missing from the traditional approach to money. Impressed by the fungible, impersonal characteristic of money, traditional social thinkers emphasized its instrumental rationality and apparently unlimited capacity to transform products, relationships, and sometimes even emotions into an abstract and objective numerical equivalent (1989: 347).

The model of special monies thus challenges the traditional utilitarian model of market money by introducing different fundamental assumptions in the understanding of money: 1- while money does serve as a key rational tool of the modern economic market, it also exist outside the sphere of the market and is profoundly shaped by cultural and social structural factors. 2- There is a plurality of different kinds of monies, each special money is shaped by a particular set of cultural and social factors and is thus qualitatively distinct. 3- Certain monies can be indivisible, nonfungible, nonportable, deeply subjective, and therefore qualitatively heterogeneous. 4- The assumed dichotomy between a utilitarian money and non-pecuniary value is false. 5- Extraeconomic factors systematically constrain and shape the uses of money, the users of money, the allocation system of each particular money, the control and source of money.

After proposing the “special monies” approach, Zelizer argues that in order to study a special money, we must explore how various structures of social relations and cultural values shape and constrain the qualitative life of the “special money” by: earmarking specified uses of money, the regulating modes of allocation, users, and its symbolic meanings (371). Based upon Zelizer’s special monies approach, domestic money is one type of special monies consist of husband’s money, wife’s money and children’s money. The main aim of this study is to study the wife’s money in nuclear families as one kind of special monies.

Money and Family relations

After foundation of the new financial system, this system like others, established the new institutions which were essential for its durability or in some cases made the old institutions compatible with itself. The family institution was one of the old institution which undergone drastic changes in the result of industrial revolution and raise of capitalism. Indeed “industrialism demanded masses of workers ready and able to move off the land in pursuit of jobs, and to move again whenever necessary. Thus the “extended” family gradually shed its excess weight and the so-called "nuclear" family emerged” (Toffler, 1970:241). The impact of industrial revolution and raise of capitalism was not limited to changes in structure of family institution; the collaboration of new system -capitalism- with an ancient oppressive structure -patriarchy- formed a new “double-oppressive” structure called “capitalist patriarchy”. This new system “broke through the dichotomies of class and sex, private and public spheres, domestic and wage labor, family and economy,

personal and political, and ideology and material conditions” (Eisenstein, 1979:23). The notion of nuclear family was nominated as the ideal type of family in new system, shown that only this “scared” type of family meets the needs of peoples. In fact, Ideology of gender was a key instrument for capitalist patriarchy. In such order, the definition of family was re-conceptualized ideologically, so that as Barrett puts it “a particular household organization and an “ideology of familialism” are central dimensions of woman’s oppression in capitalism” (Barrett, 1997:125). All cultural institutions in capitalistic system, try to portray a common and popular image of ‘the nuclear family’ as a young, similarly aged, White, married heterosexual couple with a small number of healthy children living in an adequate home. There is a clear division of responsibilities in which the male is primarily the full-time breadwinner and the female primarily the caregiver and perhaps a part-time or occasional income earner (Bernardes, 1997:3).

This ideological image of family was not limited to capitalist institutions; however this image was dominant in sociology, even until late decades. Parsons as one of key features of American sociology in 1960s and 1970s argues that for the family to function effectively there must be a sexual division of labor in which adult males and females play very different roles. Men who tie the family unit into the wider social system must be instrumental in orientation, manifesting qualities of drive, ambition, and self-control. Women, whose task is the internal functioning of the family, supportive of both children and adult males, must be expressive, that is gentle, nurturant, loving, and emotionally open. If men and women become too similar in family function and orientation, competition between them will disrupt family life, weakening the family’s vital role in upholding social stability (Ritzer, 1992:317).

This image of family is reflected in economic, too. In classic economy, the dominant tendency to study the nonmonetary parts of society like family, was studying it with the same presuppositions of monetary sectors. These presuppositions consist of economic human, scarce resources, rational choice, self-interested actors, and cost-benefit actions and so on. In early 1960s, economists started using economic theory to explain behavior outside the monetary market sector. The result was foundation of New Home Economics, mainly by Gary S. Becker. Also the new approaches in economic are better able to explain people’s behavior in family, but there are some weaknesses. First, these approaches are anti-feminist, subscribing male-oriented family. For example Becker writes: “Since married women have been specialized to childbearing and other domestic activities, they have demanded long-term “contracts” from their husbands to protect them against abandonment and other adversities”. (Becker, 1991:30). A second assumption that follows on the first is that the household is an economic unit within which resources are shared equitably. In short the New Home economics’ view of the household is that, “although there are differences in the roles men and women play in marriage, these differences represent an efficient division of labor, and both equally enjoy the rewards from cooperation. To put it another way, it is assumed that income received during marriage is “pooled” in a common pot (Woolly, 2003:105).

As Bernardes puts it, all these ideological images of nuclear family are unrealistic. “This [Ideological] image of ‘the family’ omits the rich detail of everyday living and certainly ignores any possible ‘negative’ side of family living” (1997:3). One of these omitted parts of family in this image is money struggles in families.

A significant upswing in the study of money in couples took place in the 1980s in part as an effect of an increased interest in issues of gender equality and in (a post-Parsonian view of) the family in general. This increased interest in marriage money was accompanied by a shift in the theoretical approaches to the topic. Economists and sociologists interested in money in marriage increasingly began to reject the assumption of equal sharing in marriage (Nyman and Dema, 2007:7).

Sylvia Walby: From Private to Public Patriarchy

Walby defines patriarchy as “a system of social structure and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women” (Walby, 1991:20). She argues that at the most abstract level patriarchy exists as a system of social relations, and at a less abstract level it is composed of six structures: the patriarchal mode of production, and the patriarchal relations in paid work, patriarchal relations in state, male violence, patriarchal relations in sexuality and patriarchal relations in cultural institutions. The six structures have causal effects upon each other, both reinforcing and blocking, but are relatively autonomous. (ibid).

Also Walby distinguishes two main forms of patriarchy, private and public. Private patriarchy is based upon household production as the main site of women’s oppression. Public patriarchy is based principally in public sites such as employment, and the states. In private patriarchy the expropriation of women’s labour take place primarily by individual patriarchs within the household, while in the public form it is more collective appropriation (ibid:24). Walby argues that in each type of patriarchy the six structures are present, but the relationship between them, and their relative significance, is different (ibid, 178).

Methodology

A quantitative research design was used to investigate the impact of patriarchy, as a social and cultural factor, on the concept of money for women in the family. This study has been done upon 400 married women in Tabriz, Iran. In order to gather data we have used the survey technique. Stratified sampling method was used, so that we divided the city to ten sub-groups or strata. In doing so, we have used Viviana Zelizer’s special monies approach and Sylvia Walby’s theory of patriarchy as the framework of research. Data were analyzed using SPSS 22. Pearson correlation and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to investigate the relations between independent variables and dependent variable, and also the multiple regression analysis (stepwise method) was used to predict the value of dependent variable based on the value of independent variables.

Dependent variable

As Zelizer argues domestic money consists of husband’s money, wife’s money and children’s money. In this research we have concentrated on women’s money as one kind of special money. Inspired from Zelizer’s special monies approach, we have defined the dependent variable, concept of money for women in the family, by four factors of allocation of money, the quantity of money, the uses of money, and meaning of money. To measure the variable concept of money, we have considered this variable as a continuum between family-oriented and self-oriented. In fact every dimension is measuring the amount of family or self-orientation.

1-Allocation of money: this dimension is measuring the ways in which women obtain their money in the family. There are four conditions: at the most self-oriented condition the woman gets her domestic money completely from her own income. In the second condition woman gets only some portion of her income for herself and gives the rest of it to her wife (or other members of family). At third condition in addition to her income, woman obtain some money as allowance or else from her husband. The forth condition (the most family oriented) is that woman does not have any personal income, so she is completely depend on her wife or family in obtaining her domestic money.

2- The quantity of money: in this dimension, we have equate increasing amount of domestic money, with self-orientation of concept of money for women in the family.

3-The uses of money: this dimension measures the ways in which woman’s money spend. As her money spend for her personal expenses, we consider it as moving toward self-oriented concept of money for woman.

4-Meaning of money: in this dimension we measure the meaning of money for woman in the family. Whether it's self-oriented or family-oriented.

Independent variables

The research's independent variables consist of Income, Age differences between couple, Duration of marriage, Number of children Private patriarchy, and Public patriarchy. Following Walby's (1991) theory of patriarchy, we have divided patriarchy into public and private spheres, and each of these spheres make up of six structure as Walby have explained: the patriarchal mode of production, and the patriarchal relations in paid work, patriarchal relations in state, male violence, patriarchal relations in sexuality and patriarchal relations in cultural institutions.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Crosstabs of Demographic Variables and Dependent Variable

	Family-oriented		Average		self-oriented		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Age							
Less than 20	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
20-29	44	57/9%	29	38/2%	3	3/9%	76
30-39	90	58/8%	54	35/3%	9	5/9%	153
40-49	60	59/4%	36	35/6%	5	5%	101
50-59	35	74/5%	10	21/3%	2	4/3%	47
More than 60	7	87/5%	1	12/5%	0	0%	8
Age differences with husband							
Older than husband	5	33/3%	10	66/7%	0	0%	15
The same age	8	44/4%	9	50%	1	5/6%	18
Younger than husband	223	63/2%	112	31/7%	18	5/1%	353
Duration of marriage							
Less than 5 years	35	47/3%	34	45/9%	5	6/8%	74
6-15	80	57/6%	51	36/7%	8	5/8%	139
16-25	69	67%	30	29/1%	4	3/9%	103
26-35	38	70/4%	14	25/9%	2	3/7%	54
Number of children							
Childless	21	36/8%	33	57/9%	3	5/3%	57
One or two	177	63/7	86	30/9	15	5/4%	278
Three or four	37	74%	12	24%	1	2%	50
More than four	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Income							
Zero	188	81/7%	42	18/3%	0	0%	230
Low	19	52/8%	17	47/2%	0	0%	36
Average	9	26/5%	21	61/8%	4	11/8%	34
High	2	9/5%	10	47/6%	9	42/9%	21

Table 2: Crosstab of Cultural Factor, Patriarchy in Private and Public Spheres

	Family-oriented		Average		Self-oriented		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Patriarchy in public							
Week	5	41/7%	6	50%	1	8/3%	12
Average	147	59/3%	93	37/5%	8	3/2%	248
Strong	83	66/9%	31	25%	10	8/1%	124
Patriarchy in private							
Week	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	3
Average	113	53/3%	92	34/4%	7	3/3%	212
Strong	119	71/7%	130	34/1%	19	5%	166

The dependent variable, concept of money for women in the family, is an interval scale, but to make it measurable we have assorted it in three major groups, and by this we have made this variable an ordinal one.

Table 3. Assorting dependent variables

Concept of money for women in the family	Score
Family-oriented	-3/80 to 0/36
Average	0/37 to 4/52
Self-oriented	4/53 to 8/70

The research have six independent variable. By using Pearson and ANOVA tests, we investigate these variables relationships with dependent variable. The results show that there is no significance relation between age and age difference with husband variables and concept of money for women in the family. But other variables (duration of marriage, number of children, income, and public and private patriarchy) have relationship with concept of money for women in the family.

Inferential Statistics

Table 4. Hypothesis tests

Variable	Test	Result
Age	Pearson	Rejected
Age differences with husband	Pearson	Rejected
Duration of marriage	Pearson	As the years of marriage increases, the concept of money of women in family becomes family-oriented
Number of children	Pearson	As the number of children increase, the concept of money for women in the family becomes family-oriented
Income	F-test	As income increase, the concept of money for women in the family becomes self-oriented
Private patriarchy	Pearson	the extent the ideology of patriarchy in private sphere become stronger, the concept of money for women in the family becomes self-oriented
Public patriarchy	Pearson	the extent the ideology of patriarchy in public sphere become stronger, the concept of money for women in the family becomes self-oriented

Stepwise regression of dependent variable and independent variables which their relation with dependent variable have been proved.

Table 5. Stepwise regression

Model	Entered variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate	B	Beta	T	Sig.
1	Income	0/567	0/321	0/319	2/05192	2/622	0/518	11/988	0/000
2	Private patriarchy	0/590	0/345	0/345	2/01298	-0/087	-0/157	-3/691	0/000
3	Number of children	0/596	0/350	0/350	2/00525	-0/226	-0/085	-1/973	0/049

Discussion and conclusion

Although most of us consider intimate relationships far beyond Dollars and Pennies, and it may well be that the official ideology of most of our societies is religion spirituality, but “its actual foundation is none the less the idolatry of the Golden Calf, money” (Zizek, 1994:20). So in a world in which money has leaned on the throne of God, and we, as human beings, are in worship of it, the one who own it, is the winner. In spite of what ideology of family dictates, money has invaded all sphere of society, as family. So decisive presence of money, have influenced family relation, if not reduce them to a mere money relation. Considering family as an environment full of love and affection, empathy and intimacy, ignores most of the bitter truths. Also for a social research, there’s other side of coin about family, that’s family’s hostile side. As Nyman and Dema put it exactly: “The focus on the family unit is in one sense quite logical since it is one of the major institutions upon which contemporary societies are structured. However, this focus conceals the fact that income is earned and spent by individuals and ignores the inner workings and structure of families” (Nyman and Dema 2007:7).

Who earns money, who controls it, who manages it, how decisions about it get made, who has access to it and under what conditions, how money allocates in family, who does it, how, what is the differences between family members domestic money, what is the relationship between all these factors with gender equality in family, impact of social and cultural on these processes, these are part of important questions which researcher have been confronted with them, lately. Some of them have focused on the systems of allocation of money in family (Pahl 1983), social meaning of money in family (Zelizer 1989, Nyman 2003), Money, power and inequality within marriage (Vogler and Pahl 1994), money and intimacy (Zelizer 2005).

This study tried to study the effects of ideology of patriarchy as a social and cultural factor on the concept of money for women in the family. The research has done in a society in which there is still conflict about rightfulness of gender equality. So as expected, results of research show that ideology of patriarchy in Iran’s society is strong. According to the result of this research, 260 of participants do not have income, only 12 of women have reported ideology of patriarchy in their public sphere week, and only 3 women have reported it week in the private sphere of their life. also the findings of research show that the concept of money for 61/1 percent of women is family-oriented, for 33/9 percent self/family-oriented (average), and for 5 percent of women is self-oriented.

According to the results of hypothesis tests, by increasing of duration of marriage, concept of money for women in the family become family-oriented. It seems that as covenant of marriage become olden, all those

dreamy democratic arrangements about handling home economic, be forgotten, so that male dominance gradually takes place in family. Of course there is an alternative interpretation for this result that is the main reason is matter of age not duration of marriage. But we have to add that based on the results of this research there is not any relationship between age of woman and concept of money for her in the family.

In addition to duration of marriage, the results revealed that as the number of children increase the concept of money for women become family-oriented. This result is endorsing this fact that wife's domestic money mostly spend not for herself, but also for family expenditure, such as children's education, clothes, families (Zelizer, 1989) and as Pahl's research have showed, women are actually more "family-focused" than men in their spending: they are more willing to make sacrifices when money is short, they claim less for their own personal spending, and they devote a higher proportion of their earnings to spending on the children (Pahl, 1995:375).

REFERENCES

- Baker, Wayne E, & Jimerson, Jason B. (1992). The Sociology of Money. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 35, 678-693.
- Barrett, Michele (1997). Capitalism and Women's Liberation. In Linda J. Nicholson (Ed.), *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Bernardes, Jon (1997). *Family Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Brunhoff, Suzanne De. (1937). *Marx on Money*. Translated by Maurice J. Goldbloom, New York: Urizen Books.
- Burgoyne, Carole B. (1990). Money in Marriage: How Patterns of Allocation both Reflect and Conceal Power. *The Sociological Review*, 38 (4), 634-665.
- Deflem, Mathieu (2003). The Sociology of the Sociology of Money. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 3, 67-96.
- Dobeck, Mark F. & Elliott, Euel (2007). *Money*, London: Greenwood Press.
- Dodd, Nigel (2007). *The Sociology of Money: Economics, Reason and Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Eisenstein, Zillah A. (1979). Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism. In Zillah R. Eisenstein (Ed.), *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The Consequences of the Modernity*. London: Polity Press.
- Goldman, Emma (1911). *Marriage and Love*. New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association.
- Grossbard, Shoshana A. (2003). Marriage and the Economy. In *marriage and Economy: Theory and Evidence from Advanced Industrial Societies*. (Ed.) by Shoshana A. Grossbard, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hart, Keith (1986). Heads or Tails? Two Sides of the Coin. *Man*, New Series, 21 (4), 637-656.
- Ingham, Geoffrey (1998). On the Underdevelopment of the Sociology of Money. *Acta Sociologica*, 41, 3-18.
- Ingham, Geoffrey (2006). Money. In *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maurer, Bill (2006). The Anthropology of Money. *The Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35, 15-36.
- Mises, Ludwig V. (1953). *The Theory of Money and Credit*. Translated by H. E. Batson, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nyman, Charlott (2003). The Social Nature of Money: Meanings of Money in Swedish Families. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26 (1), 79 – 94.
- Nyman, Charlott & Dema, Sandra (2007). An Overview: Research on Couples and Money. In Janet Stocks, Capitolina Díaz and Björn Halleröd (Eds.), *Modern Couples Sharing Money, Sharing Life*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pahl, Jan (1983). The Allocation of Money and the Structuring of Inequality within Marriage. *The Sociological Review*, 31 (2), 237–262.
- Pahl, Jan (1990). Household Spending, Personal Spending and the Control of Money in Marriage. *Sociology*, 24(1), 119-138.
- Pahl, Jan (1995). His Money, Her money: Recent Research on Financial Organization in Marriage. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16, 361-376.
- Ritzer, George (1992). *Contemporary sociological theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, Third Edition.
- Turner, Bryan S. (1986). Simmel, Rationalisation and the Sociology of Money. *The sociological Review*, 34, 93-114.
- Vogler, Carolyn & Lyonette, Clare & Wiggins, Richard D. (2008). Money, Power and Spending Decisions in Intimate Relationships. *The Sociological Review*, 56 (1), 117-143.
- Walby, Sylvia (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Weber, Max (1922). 1978 *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. (Eds.) by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittch, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana (1989). The Social Meaning of Money: Special Monies. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95 (2), 342-377.
- Zelizer, Viviana (2005). *The Purchase of Intimacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Zizek, Slavoj (1994). The Specter of Ideology. In Slavoj Zizek (Ed.), *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso.