

Social Value of Parents and Children in Joint and Nuclear Families

Anshubhi Bahadur and Nisha Dhawan

University of Allahabad, Allahabad

The importance of the family in making and molding an individual on the one hand, and influencing social groups and patterns on the other, has been recognized by social scientists. The present study focuses on individual level changes affected by the modifications that are taking place in the family under rapid on-going socio-cultural changes in contemporary Indian society. A sample was taken from the Allahabad City. Total 360 participants (240 parents and 120 children) were included in this study. The age of the parents was ranging 35-45 years with mean age of (44.62) and minimum graduation level of education and children of age group from 15-17 years. The results show the family structure does not effect on parents and children social value in the family. There is no significant differences were found between parents and children social value in joint families. There is significant differences were found between parents and children social value in nuclear families. By identifying salient factors in the family structures and its influence on social values, the study hopes to provide significant implications for human development in changing social contexts.

Keywords: Family Structure, Social Values, Cultural dimensions.

Family is the basic and universal social structure of human society. It fulfils needs and performs functions, which are indispensable for the continuity, integration and change in the social system. The forms and functions of family have undergone adaptive changes in the technological and economic superstructure of present society. The family may be broadly perceived as a unit of two or more persons united by the ties of marriage, blood, adoption or consensual unions. It is considered the basic unit of the society, to meet the needs of individuals and those of other societal institutions. It determines the development of individuals, in that; it is a major source of nurturance, emotional bonding and socialization. In contemporary urban society, families present a peculiar combination of traditional and modern values.

The new identities and changing value patterns also affect the attitude of the individual members of the family.

Family Structure

Family structure is conceptualized as the configuration of role, power and status, and relationships in the family .In India the structure of family can be seen broadly as of three types. The traditional family is the one living jointly and inclusive of members from different generations. The extended family is one, where married sons and brothers live separately, but they continue to have joint property and share income. The nuclear type of family is the one, in which the group consists of a male, his wife and their children.

In nuclear families the concept is 'me my wife and my children' with no place for others

is alarming. This disappearance of emotional ethos has affected the socio-psychological environment of the individuals. A person feels alienation. The community has disappeared. Modern progress brings individualistic way of thinking; this cause increasing frustration and low tolerance level among the younger generation. These are some common features seen in contemporary urban society in India.

Family joint ness still continues to be major sociological phenomena. Kapadia.K.M (1966) has defined a joint family as;” they should dwell in the same house, take their meals and perform their worship together and enjoy property in common”. Common residence and joint preparation of food as well as eating together were the external symbols of homogeneity of the family. There is a gradual change in the family structure of urban India towards a nuclear pattern in which, it can be assumed, that the conjugal pair is the critical unit.

Many scholars (Gore, 1968; Gupta, 1978, p.73) have observed that the Indian joint family is changing rather than breaking down. Indeed, even where the traditional joint family system has broken into nuclear units, it has given rise to a modified or new type of joint family system. It merely breaks structurally, whereas functionally and sentimentally, individual units continue to form part of the joint family and all members maintain joint ness in terms of family loyalty. In other words, under the same canopy many units co-exist (Kapadia, 1966, p.320

Modernization implies some typical forms of changes in the social structure of societies. These changes in the system of social relationships contribute to the growth and institutionalization of new roles and group structures based on concomitant norms of modernization. This process cumulatively leads to structural modernization of society. These processes offer us an example of what is meant by structural changes in society. It

implies changes in a whole system of social relationships. Traditional joint family not only function as an agency of procreation and socialization of new members for the society, but also performs duties in other spheres such as occupation, education, leisure and recreation, etc; which have now been taken over by specialized agencies. Structural changes involve similar role differtiations in almost all aspects of social life. Growth in science and technology adds impetus to process and finally accelerates the momentum of change. Change cease to be exceptional phenomena, as in the traditional societies, it becomes a day-to- day fact of life to live with it is not merely tolerated, it is glorified. Under these circumstances there is often a log between cultural and social structural forms of modernizing in these societies.

Social Values

Values have been defined as the conception of the desirable Kluckhohn, (1951) influencing selective behavior. Social scientists also agree that values are very important and serve as guiding principles in people's lives. Values are important for understanding various social-psychological phenomena (Schwartz&Bardi, 2001). There is a clear link between values and behavior, and Sinha (1990) observes that operative values are close to social norms and that the desirable ideal and important values one perhaps the 'cherished' values and may have universal structure. Values are a motivational construct that represent broad goals which apply across context and time. (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1997, Schwartz&Bilsky1987, 1990). They defined human values as desirable goals that varied in importance and served as guiding principle in people's lives. For example, giving importance to power values implies striving for power at work, at home, with friends, as so forth. People may act in accordance with their values even when they do not consciously think about them.

Schwartz (1992) interprets five found features of values –as beliefs concepts, pertaining to desirable and states or behaviors, guided selection or evaluation of behaviors and events and is ordered by relative importance.

Values are embodied in social activities relationships, and institutions. However, the latter are subject to change and adjustment while values have a relative permanence and universality. Studies that report relations of values to behavioral intentions in hypothetical situation (Feather, 1995; Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995) demonstrate that people want to act according to their values. Value priorities prevalent in a society are a key element, perhaps the priorities of individuals represent central goal that relate to all aspects of behavior. Mukerjee (1949): Values are believed to be important for social equilibrium and maintenance of the system. Values play crucial role in determining human behavior and social relationships as well as maintaining and regulating social structure and interactions on the one hand and giving them cohesion and stability on the other (Verma, 2004). Values are viewed as differential preferences, which are derived from a range of actual behaviors. (Triandis,1972). Values are relatively stable motivational characteristics of person that change little during adulthood (e.g., Feather, 1971; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1997).

Differences in family pattern may bring about differences in social values and ideologies. Ganguli, (1989): In traditional societies like India, the spiritual values as embodied in its religion and philosophy can claim to be the primary and original source of all derived social values. In the Indian situation, these seem to have been accompanied by social change processes such as urbanization and industrialization. The nuclear family structure is assumed to favor sharing of roles rather than a hierarchical structuring of roles, liberal rather than conservative attitudes, role diffusion an

overall egalitarian outlook rather than a traditional out look. (Rokeach, 1973, Schwartz, 1992, Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990, Triandis, 1994).

It has been seen that social values are drastically affected by urban influence and subsequent assimilation of western ideas due to the effect of modernization. Traditional values have declined considerably. Even the teaching of civic virtues of love, co-operation, obedience, tolerance, discipline and renouncement, which a child used to learn at home in a joint family and which enabled the child to grow up as a good citizen, has been taken over by other social institutions. Sagiv and Schwartz (2002) found that values predict whether counselees exhibit independent verses dependent behavior throughout a number of career counseling sessions.

It may be stated that values and ideals maintain and regulate the visible social structures and interactions on the one hand, and impact cohesion and stability to them on the other. Despite being subjective and invisible they are significant aspects of society and underlie all relationships. In any definition with fundamental norms shared by the members of a group, values guide and channel the organized activities of the members.

Objectives

The primary objective of the present study was to investigate the relationship of family structure and social values as they relate to family structure in contemporary Indian society. Specifically the study attempts to look at the relationship of social values of Parents and their Children in joint and nuclear families.

Method

Sample

120 Urban middle class families of which 60 nuclear and 60 joint families, with at least

one child were taken. The age range of parents was 35-45 years with mean age of (44.62) minimum graduation level of education. The child was a student of class 10 or 12 with mean age of (15.70) in the age range 15-17 years.

Tools:

Schwartz Value Survey (1990) for Children: In order to understand children's values a scale consisting of 16 items to measure was the 10 value. Social value consists of individualistic values and collectivist values of conformity, universalism, tradition and benevolence. The basic format of items was adopted from Schwartz (1990) value survey. This scale consists of 16 items with four response/choices for each item i.e. 1.Strongly disagree, 2. Partial agree, 3. Agree, 4.Strongly agree .The alpha reliability coefficient of the test is .82.

Schwartz Value Survey for Adult (1990) to measure the value of adults. This scale also consists of 16 items; with 4-point

scale responses for each item, ranging from 1.Strongly Disagree 2.Partial Agree, 3. Agree 4. Strongly agree. The reliability alpha of the test is .77. Rating of Social value of Parents and children was done using Schwartz Value Survey (1990) respectively.

Results & Discussion

Means and Standard deviations for the different scores are shown in the table 1. Parents and children social value were examined on all the test variables using t-ratio. Table 1 indicative of the difference between Parents & Children Social Value in joint and nuclear families. Results indicate family structure does not affect the social value in the joint and nuclear families. Table 2 shows there is no significant differences in Social Value of Parents and Children in joint families. Table 3 indicates there is significant differences were found between Parents and their Children Social Value in nuclear families. Father& Children ($t = 2.28, P < 0.05$), Mother& Children ($t = 2.62, P < 0.01$).

Table 1 Mean, SD, t-ratio on Children, Father and Mother Social Value and Type of Family N=360

Scales	Joint (58)		Nuclear (59)		t-Value
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
Children Social Value	50.67	6.17	52.39	9.61	-1.15
FatherSocialValue	48.97	5.50	48.44	9.20	.37
MotherSocialValue	48.60	5.79	48.63	5.42	-.023

To see the effect of type of family & social value of parents and children t test was calculated. Family structure doesn't affect the social value of Parents and their children. Whatever type of family (joint and nuclear) but social values remain same because value is fundamental concept in early socialization of children. Parents taught good habits and give importance for cherished social value to teach their children's. Mukerjee (1949) contend as was expected, the child and parental value are highly correlated. Since,

family is base of socialization process and parents are the first teacher's, it can be said that the values are transferred through verbal or non-verbal interaction and thus the relations is very significant one. Roland (1988), and Garg and Parikh (1993) made meticulous observations about family dynamics, family values, and the role of family relationships in the development of the value system of the individual .He also noticed that mainly the elderly women of the family transmit the cultural value system to the

young. Parents show high social value in achievement & stimulation and low in power. Children show similar value pattern according to her or his parents. This value system emphasizes solidarity and cooperation, affection and understanding, following the traditional norms and customs of the family. Garg and Parikh (1993), the upper middle class, namely, the educated urban elite (MBAs) are the crossroads as along with familial values such as obedience to parents, conformity, self denial, and fulfillment of parental expectations, Western values such as having a meaningful and creative life space, quest for more knowledge, achievement and no complacency are also imbibed.

Table 2 Mean, SD and t-ratio on Father and Mother and Children Social Value in Joint Family.

Gender of Parents Joint Family (58)			
	Mean	S.D	t value
Father	48.97	5.50	1.57
Children	50.67	6.17	
Mother	48.60	5.79	1.86
Children	50.67	6.17	

There is no significant difference between Parents Social Value & Children value in Joint Families. In the Joint family parents & children social value are the same because family is the basic cultural unit in which socialization of the child is accomplished. The child internalizes the values, norms and ideals of the cultural group in which he grows and there by becomes a functioning member of the society. These values and norms of the society are largely internalized on the basis of early parent-child interaction. The basic personality structure emerges with in the framework of family relationships. The foundation of the child's capabilities, skills, attitudes and interests is laid in the family. In this study the child has similar value according their parents. In Indian traditional family there have several changes

in structural and functional but still children's have more respect to their elders. Thus, there is strong emotional involvement with the family of origin even after separation. Children behave according to their parents. We can say values are believed to be important for social equilibrium and maintenance of the system. Religious and social values were, therefore, seen as detrimental to the stability of the social structure. In modern society, where boys and girls are considered to be at par and the fairer sex is now expected to play, though sometimes, to a bread earner for families, same values are being taught or transferred to the girls as to the boys. Also, girls show a tendency of having similar values as of their mothers and boys to that of father. This can be attributed to the closeness of these to each other. Girls are generally said to be close to mothers and boys take father to be a model in joint family system. The values inculcated by the socializing agencies have their source in region and tradition. Both the family and educational institutions may make efforts to inculcate cherished values in their wards as far as possible. Parents behave same socialization patterns to their children. Girls became more independent to take decision, and to move outside the home. In present days parents give them same opportunities and freedom of their children. Family is viewed as the primary context in which children's values are developed. Parents directly or indirectly influence children to behave same manner.

Table 3 Mean, SD and t-ratio on Father and Mother and Children Social Value in Nuclear Family.

Gender of Parents Nuclear Family (59)			
	Mean	SD	t-Value
Father	48.44	9.20	2.28*
Children	52.39	9.61	
Mother	48.63	5.42	2.62**
Children	52.39	9.61	

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

There are significant differences between Parents & Children Social value patterns in nuclear families. In the nuclear families parents gave more freedom to their children and they have no control on them. Both parents are dual earners couples so they have no time for their children. Children are alone in their house. Parents not considered what they want to do. They spend more time outside the house. They thought that money can makes all needs of their children. There is no other family member to look at the children. There is lot of influence of media & a television in the family .Children learns all the negative things from the television and copies in the behavior. Family is viewed as the primary context in which children's values are developed. Parents directly or indirectly influence children to behave same manner but differences was found in nuclear families of parents & children. Nuclear families parents gave more freedom to their children for education and go outside the house. Children of nuclear families show high orientation towards achievement. They think life is full of exciting thinks. Children are full of ambitious, more capable, intellectual and competent in nuclear families. Children does not obey the parents, their communication skills are very poor. They can't honor and respect for family members. They have not self discipline in family.

Conclusion

Due to the western impact over contemporary Indian social system, tremendous changes affected every walk of life. These changes have influenced the society not only overtly but also have provided alternatives to the existing values and ideas towards the different aspect of society and human behavior. But on the other hand, it is also equally true that Indian traditions are so deeply rooted that these alternatives have been succeeded in total transformation of the society.

This finding suggests that value play a vital role in development of the human beings. All the human functions are governed by the individual & collective values. This study provides for an understanding of the changing conditions of Indian family and the social and family values that exist in contemporary Indian society. However, further research is needed to study the relationships of several changes and attitudes that are taking place in society and its impact on family structure and development.

References

- Aileen Ross (1961). *The Hindu Joint Family in its Urban Setting*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Ames, M.M. (1969). Modernization and Social Structure: Family, Caste, and Class in Jamshedpur, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 4, 1217-1224.
- Bhushan, A.& Ahuja, M.(1987). Value difference among adolescence, youth and adults belonging to different levels of educational institutions. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 31, 53-62
- Caldwell, J.C, Reddy, P.H, & Caldwell (1984). The determinants of family structure in rural South India. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 46, 215-229.
- Desai, I.P. (1956). Joint Family in India: An Analysis. *Sociological Bulletin*, 5, 144-156.
- Gore, M.S (1968) *Urbanization and family change*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Goode William J. (1987). *The Family Second Edition*. Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Gore, M.S (1978). *Changes in India*. In E.J Anthony & C.G Chiland (Eds).*The child in his family: children and their parents in a changing world* (pp365-374) New York: wiley.
- Hoch,E (1966). *The Changing Patterns of Family in India*, Bangalore: Christian Institute for the study of Religion and Society.
- Hales, S (1989). *Valueing the self: understanding the nature and dynamics of self-esteem*. In perspectives: Saybrook Institute, and Francisco.

- Kapadia, K.M. (1966). *Marriage and Family in India* (3rd ed.), Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996): *Family and human development across cultures* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nimkoff, M.F. (1959) Some Problems concerning research on the changing family in India in *Sociological Bulletin*, 7, 2.
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The nature of human values*, New York Free Press.
- Sing, J.G., and Thapar, G (1984) Impact of parental values on children. *Indian Journal of clinical Psychology*, 11, 105-109.
- Sinha, J.B.P (1990). The salient Indian Values and their social ecological roots. *Indian Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 477-488.
- Schonpflug, Ute (2001) Intergenerational transmission of values. The role of transmission belts, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 174-185.
- Singh, Y (1973). *Modernization of Indian Tradition*, Thompson Press, New Delhi.
- Schwartz, S.H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Towards a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.
- Sinha, D. (1977). Ambiguity of role models and values among Indian Youth, *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 38, 241-247.
- Sinha, D (1982). Some Recent changes in the Family and their Implications for Socialization. Paper presented to the conference on "Changing Family in a changing World; organized by The German Commission for UNESCO, Munich.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 19-45.
- Schwartz, S.H., Sagiv, I., & Boehnke, K, (2000). Worries and values. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 309-346.
- Schwartz, S.H., & Boehnke, K. (2002). *Evaluating the structure of human values with confirmatory factor analysis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Verma, J. (2004). Social values. In J.Pandey (Ed.), *Psychology in India revisited: Developments in the discipline*. (pp.69-117) New Delhi: Sage.

Received: October 22, 2007

Revision received: March 21, 2008

Accepted: April 02, 2008

Anshubhi Bahadur, ICSSR Fellow, Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad

Nisha Dhawan, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad, Allahabad