CHANGING FAMILY IN URBAN INDIA: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

K. MANORANJAN NAYAK

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110 067
INDIA
2007

20th July 2007

C E R T I F I C A T E

Certified that the Dissertation entitled **"Changing Family in Urban India: A Sociological Study"** submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY** has not been previously submitted for any other degree of this or any other university and is my original work.

K.Manoranjan Nayak
K.Manoranjan Nayak

We recommend that this Dissertation may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof. Avijit Pathak
Chairperson

Chairperson
CSSS/SSS
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067

Prof. Tiplut Nongbri
Supervisor

Associate Professor
Centre for the Study
of Social Systems
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi

Dedicated to my dearest Grand Father
Shree Dinabandhu Khora
who though himself was extremely poor and illiterate
yet had the grit to educate his children and who
has taught me the meaning of the life.

Contents

'A dissertation on changing Indian family!' I cannot remember exactly how long I went around with this thought in my head. Growing up in tumultuous times, it seemed the one constant was the family. And then, somewhere along the line, it seemed that even that was not the same any more. As the World was changing, so was the great Indian family. Indeed perhaps it was the family that was changing even more than the World outside. What exactly was happening? And why? Would it be possible to understand the dynamics of the changing Indian family? It was a difficult research but I must confess that I had no idea how difficult till I was well and truly neck deep! I praise God for enabling me to overcome all these difficulties and helping me to complete the research in time.

A dissertation so ambitious in scope could never have happened without help from scores of wonderful people – too many, in fact, to thank here. I extend grateful thanks to all. However, I do wish to express my appreciation to those whose help has been most valuable.

First and foremost I offer sincere thanks to my supervisor Prof. Tiplut Nongbri who gave me ample freedom to pursue the research work in my own way. It is no exaggeration to say that her help has been invaluable and I rank it as precious commodities indeed! At every stage of this work, she made valuable suggestions, clarified certain points and encouraged me. Her constructive comments, healthy criticisms, rich experience in the topic and academic guidance have been quite enlightening and useful and have enabled me in bringing this dissertation to the present shape. I take this opportunity to express my immense heart-felt gratitude to her.

I am grateful to Dr. Nilika Mehrotra, who reviewed the final draft of this dissertation in a quick time and made appropriate comments and suggestions which have played a constructive role in the making of this dissertation.

My special thanks go to Luna bhaina, Anita, Madhu bhaina, and Jaga who have extended their continuous support and generous help for this work despite

their own busy work schedule. Here, I take this opportunity to acknowledge their contributions to this research work.

I also extend my thanks to several friends and brother-like seniors and juniors for their outstanding cooperation and moral and emotional support for this work. To all these truly excellent people I offer my warm regards. They are Xelloo bhaina, Raj bhaina, Kapil bhaina, Birendra bhaina, James bhaina, Iswar bhaina, Hemanta bhaina, Sankar bhaina, Muna bhaina, Sanjay bhaina, Banamali bhainam, Sarbaswera bhaina, Nagendra Sir, Apu, Asis, Reddy, Biranchi, Subash, Muna, Sunil, Nata, Lipsa, Sujit, Iswar, Krushna, Tushar, Anil, Raju, Sanjay and Chandra.

It is also with gratitude, I remember the assistance furnished by staff members of JNU central library and DSA library at the center for the study of social system, JNU.

Finally no words are adequate to express my gratitude to my family members; father, mother, uncles, aunties, siblings and cousins who have helped me in a variety of ways and remain as constant sources of inspiration and encouragement. Without their constant support, this work could not have been possible.

With all these help, the responsibility for any lapses and errors is solely mine, the views and interpretations of events are also personal.

Jawaharlal Nehru University   K. Manoranjan Nayak
New Delhi
20th July 27, 2007

List of Tables

Introduction

"There may be no families in utopia and none in paradise but the planet we know the best will probably always contain them."

-Robert Bierstedt

Introduction

In this World, society is made up of a complex set of relationships, among which the family is one. In fact, it should be conceived as a very special relationship based on biology, law, custom or choice, and often upon economics. Deriving from an etymology common to all cultures and traditions, the family knows no frontiers. The family is universally recognized as a basic unit of society. It is the most permanent and the most pervasive of all social institutions. All societies, large and small, primitive and civilized, ancient and modern, have some form of family or the other.[1] Further, of all the groups that affect the lives of individuals in society none touches them so intimately or as continuously as does the family. From the moment of birth to the moment of death the family exerts a constant influence. The family is the first group in which we find ourselves. It provides for the most enduring relationship in one from or other. It is always with us. Or rather more precisely, we are with it.

Changes in Family:

The family, like the rest of society, has undergone a process of continuous change. In this process, the family has been both the purveyor and the recipient of change; sometimes acting as its agent or, alternatively, being transformed by external forces. In some cases, the process has been adaptive, in others, destructive, threatening the survival of the family. Whatever the specific causes, many of the things nostalgically understood to constitute a family, for better or worse, are now lost to history. In addition, many of the stereotypes or conventions used to describe family life are often anachronistic and no longer borne out to be a reality.

---

[1] G.P.Murdock, *Social Structure*, (New York: 1949), ch-1.

Forces of change have brought immense transformation in society and have brought about equally profound changes in families themselves. The pace of change families are subjected to, both internally and externally, has never been so rapid. Families are undergoing constant change because of numerous factors. These include demographic trends; socio-cultural changes; economic recessions and depressions; wars; famine; unemployment; migration; technological innovation; the processes of industrialization and urbanization; the quest for equality between men and women; and widening opportunities for women. Change incessantly pounding on their consciousness taxes the ability of people to understand, adapt or act thoughtfully in the world about them. Their capacity to cope with change through meaningful and productive action is constantly being challenged. Families everywhere are in need to support to increase their capacity to adapt to and meet the demands of change.

Environmental issues, the shrinking world of commerce and communication, massive political transformation and technological innovation all have profound impacts on families around the world. Foremost among the changes, particularly in the developing world, are the growing accomplishments by and on behalf of women. Although this work is far from complete and much more is to be achieved, nothing can diminish the remarkable reforms that have already taken place, in families and human society, in response to the rising tide of feminist thought and collective action. The ability of medical technology to control or even to stimulate conception, the increasing numbers of elderly persons in families, the increased sensitivity to the rights and needs of children and persons with disabilities and the rising rates of crime and substance abuse are additional factors generating internal change in families. Each is the subject of mediation through families, and reappear in the various stresses, changes and negotiations that surface in contemporary family life. As with rapid external change, changes internal to the family bring opportunities and problems, benefits and costs, and certainties and risks. What is most astounding is not so much the breadth and depth as the rate of this change. Perhaps the most glaring example of change is in the case of rural and urban families. In many parts of the world, urban centers increasingly consist of the extended family units, drawn together

2

as a survival strategy in the face of deteriorating economies and the lack of individual opportunity. Paradoxically, rural settings, once believed to be the province of extended families, are becoming increasingly nuclear, as the productive limits of subdivided land reduce the capacity of large families to support themselves. One reason why the family is an important area of study is because increasingly less is known about what the family is in reality.

Traditionally, family is an institution ranking with such organizations such as the church, the school, or the political system. The family supported basic values related not only to personal needs but to society in general. In pre-industrial period, it performed the functions of maintenance of population, socialization of children, development of individual personality, and a host of other functions related to societal needs. In addition, it catered to the physical, psychological, emotional and security needs of individuals. In the sociological research changes in the family structure, is basically being viewed as family losing these functions to other alternative institutions, brought about by industrialization, urbanization and modernization. Most of Western sociologists subscribe to the view that modern family unable to mountain old values and functions under present urbanized conditions. In the same vein, changes in the family system in India, is also projected as following the same pattern, as in the West. The traditional Indian family which is also viewed as joint family is a type of extended family. The joint family along with the caste, linguistic group and the village formed the core of traditional Hindu society.[2] The traditional joint family system of India, since then has undergone vast changes.

Issues in Family Research

Investigation into changes in the family system involves many difficulties. Goode is of the opinion that, since most family events do not ordinarily leave traces in the form of laws, documents or treaties, analysis of the family behavior in the past,

---

[2] Irawati Karve, *Kinship Organization in India*, (Poona; 1953), p.1.

3

poses formidable technical problem.[3] Formal events such as births, deaths, marriges, divorces, and adaptation and law suits about inheritance are likely to be recorded, but these yield only few insights into family pattern. Again, the comments of literary or philosophical figures about their times are at best the guesses of wise but untrained amateurs.[4]Moreover both records and comments tend to focus on the top social strata only, leaving in obscurity the family behavior of the majority of the population.

Another crucial problem emanates from "couse-effect"dualism in family change. Many research works available on family change conceive family to be a passive agent of social change, adapting to the changes in other areas of society rather than causes change in other institutions.[5] In other words, family is seen primarily as being affected by and responding to the change requirements of other institutions.Neverthless, there have been few attempts to analyze changes in family by taking family as an independent variable. During the second half of eighteenth century, many researchers and sociologists started a new trend in family research. They see family as both cause and effect of changes in other institutional structures. To be more precise, the "cause-effect" dichotomy does not constitute a dualism, rather according to them a duality. In this connection, Nimkoff and Middleton (1966), point out that nuclear family systems are found in primitive non-industrial societies as well as in modern societies. Thus it is clear that "cause-effect" duality cannot be taken for granted always in family research.

Yet another staking problem is that almost all theories on family change have ignored cross cultural variation in family structure and functions. No doubt, sufficient sociological literatures do exist on variations in family organization across cultures, yet hardly there is any theory that relates those variations to family change. Almost all the available theories on family change based on the proposition that "families across the world would change or respond in same manner when exposed to same

---

[3] Goode.J.Willama, *The Family*, (New Delhi; 1965). pp 105-106
[4] *Ibid* pp 106-107
[5] Leslie, Reginald, *The Family in social context,* (New York; 1973), pp.22-24

phenomena." Only Goode (1963) recognize this problem implicitly when he casts doubt on the ability of industrialization to effect same change on different societies.

There are scores of other problems associated with family research. But these three problems are basic problems that are must likely to affect validity, reliability, utility and outcome of research.[6] For example, if research is undertaken on the basis of prevailing theories, the result is quite predictable. There are three possibilities: Family is being replaced by conjugal family, extended family gone adopting change and extended family remains unaffected. This is precisely due to inadequacy of varied theories. These three problems must be considered when a research on family change is undertaken.

Review of Literature

There are many theories relating to family change, that predicate direction of family transition and causes of such transition.

Carle Zimmerman's[7] theory of family change is one of the oldest theories. He bases his theory on past records. He finds that there have been three recurring family types; the trustee family, the domestic family and the atomistic family. Change, he finds, has occurred in giant historic cycles. As each great society emerges out of primordial darkness, its institution is actively undifferentiated and the trustee prevails. In this type of family but only the living trustees of its name, its property, and its blood. The trustee family completely subordinates individuals to the collectivity. And gradually outside power develops to restrict its (trustee families) abuses, as members in trustee family have to conform to family norms and they have no individual rights.

---

[6] These are three problems related to identification of source, construction of ideal type of family, use of proper date, analysis of date, direction of research and final results.

[7] Carle Zimmerman and, T.K.N.Unnithan. *Family and Civilization in the East and the West*, (Bombay; 1975), pp.5-10.

The domestic family, associated with society's greatest achievements, is an intermediate type of family in which familism and individualism are in balance. This type of family emerges when state comes into existence. The state takes over some functions of family, associated with trustee family. The force of change, once set in motion, however, continue and the atomistic family is stripped of its functions and familial norms and mores loss their significance. In other words family losses its control over individuals. Individuals make their own choice independent of familial obligations or influences. This unsuitable demand of rampant individuation leads to societal decay and the civilization gives way to another in which the trustee family is likely to be found and this cycle of recurrence goes on.

Zimmerman's theory of cyclic change seems problematic. The theory does not specify the functions that family gradually losses as civilization marches. Nor does this theory throw any light on change in structure of the family. Thus this theory is less fruitful in sociological research.

The structural functional perspective to family change is given by Talcott Parsons.[8] He argues that the "isolated nuclear family" is the typical family from in modern industrial society. It is structurally isolated because it does not form a integral part of wider system of kinship relationships between members of nuclear families and their kin, but these relationships are more a matter of choice than binding obligations where they exist. In his view the evolution of society involves a process of 'structural differentiations'. This means that instititutions evolve which specialize in fewer functions. In this sense, no longer do the kinship groups perform a wide range of functions. Instead specialist institutions such as business firms, school, hospitals, police forces and churches take over many of their functions. This process of differentiation and specialization involves the 'transfer of variety of functions from the family to other structures of the society'. Thus in industrial society, with the transfer of the production of goods to factories, specialized economic institutions

---

[8] Talcott Parsons and R.F.Bales, *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, (New York; 1955), pp.16-20.

becomes separated from the family. The family ceases to be an economic unit of production.

Parsons further argues that there is a functional relationship between the isolated nuclear family and the economic system in industrial society. In particular, the isolated nuclear family is shaped to meet the requirements of the economic system. In industrial society, people are judged and required for work on the basis of their achieved status. Such judgments are based on what Parsons terms 'universalistic values.[9]A modern industrial system with a specialized division of labour demands considerable geographical mobility from its labour force. Individuals with specialized skills are required to move to places where those skills are in demand. And the isolated family is suited to the need of geographical mobility.

Family, in industrial societies, Parsons says, looses its many functions to other alternative institutions which weaken the family structure. Family in industrial society performs two basic functions, i.e., primary socialization of the children and stabilizations of adult personalities of the population.[10] Parsons' theory seems fit well to India situation. The joint family in addition to socialization and personality stabilization performed many other functions. As the industrialization process set in, the joint family not only lost of its many functions but also ceased to be the main unit of production. The reduction in functions also affected the structure of joint family. As a result kinship tie, family obligation, dependence on each other, authority structure, etc got affected. These strains and stresses resulting from individualization have effected physical breakdown in joint family. However it is to be noted that Parsons does not view them as breakdown or weakening of family mechanism. His contention is that as society got differentiated family has to go adaptive changes and specialized to do the same basic functions, as it has done before.

---

[9] Parsons Talcott, *The Social system*, (Glencoe; 1951), pp. 408-14.
[10] M.Haralombos *sociology: Themes and perspectives*, (New York; 1980), p.332.

Another important theory, similar to Parsons, was given by E.Burgess and H.J Locke (1953). They have constructed two ideal types of family, namely, the institutional family and the companionship family.[11]The first type is typical of small isolated societies with a simple economy, where conditions have been stability system. In this type of society, family is the main unit of production. Since there are simple division of labour, members of family engaged in similar activities. Production and productivity depends upon co-operation among individual members. Thus interdependence, authority structure, kinship ties and familial obligations were strong. And thus family exercised considerable influences on every aspect of individual's life.

As against the above, the companionship type is found in large complex medium cities in the American continent where the process of industrialization and urbanization have presumably exerted their greatest influence. The process of industrialization and urbanization give rise to many alternative institutions which take away some of the functions of family. These specialized alternative institutions are preferred to family because they perform those functions more efficiently than family does. .However, family does not completely disappear because it still performs and meets the crucial needs of individual such as sexual and emotional needs.

The Indian joint family and the nuclear family represent Burgess and Lock's institutional and companionship family respectively. The joint family in pre-industrial period performed many functions akin to institutional family. The nuclear family is nearer to Burgess and Locke's companionship family.

Burgess and Lock's theory too consider family as a passive institution It changes when other institutions change. Nimkoff (1955) finds out the reason. He says family is less dynamic than other institutions. This view still prevails as there is scarce literature on dynamism of family.

---

[11] Burgess, E.W. and H.S. Locke, *The Family*. (New York; 1953), pp. 26-27.

. Another widely known theory on family change is given by William J.Goode.[12] In his book "World Revolution and Family Patterns", he surveys the relationship between family structure and industrialization in various parts of the world. Like Parsons, he argues that industrialization tends to undermine extended family and larger kinship groupings. The high rate of geographical mobility in industrial society decreases 'the frequency and intimacy of contact' among members of the kin network. The relatively high level of social mobility also tends to weaken kinship ties. The importance of achieved status in industrial society means that the family and kinship group have less to offer to their members. The family cannot guarantee its members a job or directly provide necessary education and training to obtain one.

Goode concluded from his analysis that the change is in the direction of conjugal family pattern that it faced fewer kinship ties with distant relations and a greater emphasis on the nuclear family unit of couple and children.[13]Goode, however, does not regard the pressures of industrialization as the only reason for breakdown of extended family ties. He argues that the move to nuclear families has been far more rapid than could be supposed or predicted from the degree of industrialization alone. Goode also sees the role of ideological changes – changes in values – that are helping to transform non-western family system.[14] For example the ideology of nuclear family has encouraged its growth, particularly in non-western societies. This is due partly to the prestige of western ideals and life styles. Goode recognizes the independent power of ideological variables. Economic progress, individualism and equalitarianism are three important types of ideologies. When taken together these emerging values may be seen as instrumental in producing changes in family, as are the effects of industrialization.[15] The applicability of Goode's theory to Indian context is problematic. Enormous regional, ethnic and class variations in India present a confusing array of changes which make it impossible to support linear

---

[12] W.J.Goode, *World Revolution and Family patterns,* (New York; 1963).
[13] *ibid.*pp.1-2.
[14] *Ibid.*pp.19-21
[15] *Ibid.pp.20-22.*

transformation of family from joint to nuclear. One does not know about the future trend but the studies on family in India say in the present context Goode's theory does not commensurate with Indian situation.

William F.Ogburn (1955) has given a very interesting theory. He made technology a powerful factor of social change. He viewed, the family not as an active agent in social change but as being acted upon the outside, as passively adapting itself to changes in the larger society.[16] Looking outside the family for a primacy source of change, Ogburn found it in the increasing rate of invention in a technologically oriented society. He further mentions that prior to modern time family performed seven functions in the society, namely economic, status giving, educational, religious, recreational, procreative and affectional[17]. Among these, procreative and affectional functions are core functions while the rest is periphery. Under the impact of technological inventions, family lost many of its functions (periphery functions). In modern technocratic society family continue to provide the natural framework for the procreation, emotional and material support essential to the growth and well-being of their members.

Thus the transition from joint to nuclear type of family in India can be attributed to growing technology invention and technology impact. Technology innovation has taken away the periphery functions of joint family. But the two basic functions, namely, procreative and affectional needs, can not be met by technological means. And thus nuclear family is suitable to perform these irreducible needs of human beings.

A somewhat altogether different theory on family change was given by Peter Laslett.[18] His theory was contextual and emerged from his study of pre-industrial England. He studied family size and composition in pre-industrial England from 1821 to 1864 A.D. He found that only about 10 per cent of households contained kin

---

[16] W.F.Ogburn and Nimkoff, M.F, *Technology and Changing Family,* (Boston:1955), Chapter 1 and 4.
[17] *ibid*
[18] Peter Laslett (Ed), *Household and Family in Past Time,* (Cambridge: 1971).

beyond the nuclear family. This surprisingly low figure may be due in part to the fact that people in pre-industrial England married relatively late in life and life expectancy was short. Laslett found no evidence to support the formerly accepted view that classical extended family was wide spread in pre-industrial England. He states: *"There is no sign of the large extended coresidential family group of the traditional peasant world giving way to the small, nuclear conjugal household of modern industrial society."*[19]

Neil Smelser, in concluding his detailed and impressive study "Social change in the Industrial Revolution", discusses the impact of industrialization on the functions of the family. Whereas in pre-industrial times and in the first few decades of the Industrial Revolution families generally formed a cohesive residential and economic unit – such that children frequently worked side by side with their parents – the pressures of industrialization gradually led to a situation in which family members were separated for long periods during the day. If the worker refused to accept isolation from his family he could not properly support them. If, on the other hand, one or both parents accepted industrial employment, such non economic functions as child-rearing suffered.[20] In time, the effects of industrialization helped lead to a thorough reorganization of the family as a "more specialized agency" than it had been in preindustrial time.

Taken together, (1) the assumed decline of the importance of traditional extended kinship networks in favor of the isolated conjugal family and (2) the shift of the family's role away from a productive economic, affective, and socialization unit to one concentrating on "emotional gratification and socialization" – the latter function partly usurped by formal educational systems common to modern societies – have been seen by many as either a crucial precondition or a direct result of the industrialization of society. Both extended kinship system and family patterns that insist upon unity of familial functions rather than division of the family's roles are assumed by many to retard the development and functioning of modern societies. The progress of such societies is best aided by the presence of isolated human units free to

---

[19] Peter Laslett cited in M.Harolambos, *op.cit.*p.347.

[20] Neil.J. Smelser, *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution*, (Chicago; 1959), p.406.

develop skills and exercise geographic and social mobility without the hindrance or concern for extended kin. In essence, these theories assume that the presence of strong emotional ties to an all-encompassing kin group prevents an individual from maximizing his economic potential by making him reluctant to move to another region for better employment or higher education. These arguments seem to have a compelling logic. Progress in modern society does seem to emphasize the importance of nonfamilial socialization in systems of formal education and in occupational advancement, and to place a premium on friends rather than kin in meeting our needs for companionship. The assumption, too, that the isolated nuclear family – relieved of many of its earlier functions – is a necessary concomitant of advanced societies seems logical enough.

Broad Aims of the Study

The dissertation analyses changes in the family system in urban India with empirical support. It focuses on various factors, especially on industrialization, westernization and modernization as main causative factors in the process of change. It seeks to answer three basic questions: (1) Has the joint family actually undergone change, or is the assumption that familial patterns have shifted an incorrect reading of the past? (2) Assuming that there has been historical shift in the character of the joint family, what evidence do we have to conclude that this is the result of urbanization, industrialization, or modernization? (3) If, needed, industrialization, urbanization, or modernization do lead to the alteration in the family structure and functions, is this universal phenomena or merely one that is subject to the character of particular cultural traditions? So, the study is based on the following objectives:

- To study the origin and growth of joint family from a holistic perspective.
- To find out the characteristics of joint family.
- To analyze the changes that have occurred in the structure and functions of joint family, especially in urban area.
- To identify causative factors behind such changes.
- To critically examine available works on changes in the family in urban India.

Scope of the Study

This research is limited to the study of families in urban India. It appears that such a study on urban households is misleading because many migratory worker live temporarily separated from joint families in villages. Care has been taken to limit the inclusion of temporary migrant families from this study. The study does not discuss such studies related to migrant families. In few cases families in urban fringe areas have been included in the study.

Methodology

In a multidisciplinary research, no single method is suitable for study. This study recognizes this and adopts diverse methods according to situations. This study follows descriptive, analytical and comparative methods. It makes use of both quantitative and qualitative data. For this the Researcher has mainly relied on ethnographic work done by sociologists and taken the data from Census of India and National Sample Survey. The study has also made use of secondary sources and other publications related to family.

Limitations of the Study and Corrective Measures

The study has several limitations and few corrective measures have been adopted accordingly. This piece of research has been written by a researcher who is

fully aware of his own limitations. The assumption here is that being aware of one's own limitation helps a lot in minimizing such errors. Second, studies on changes in family, especially on urban India, is extremely limited. One alternative here is to investigate many general books and records and interpret them sociologically. And finally there is dearth of data on family study in India To overcome this limitation, data has been collected from many independent sources. Due attention has been paid so that criteria, definitions and methods adopted in these sources do not differ widely and affect the final outcomes negatively.

Structure of the Dissertation

The first chapter entitled **"Joint Family: Nature, Growth and Features"** gives an account of the origin and growth of joint family, looks at its characteristics and nature as distinct from the other family types and explores rationale behind it. The chapter discusses the nature and features of joint family by taking up two questions that seem to have dominated the contemporary debate: what is the essence of joint family? And what are the ideas behind such type of family formation?

The second chapter entitled **"Urbanization, Industrialization and Joint Family"** analyses the changes in the joint family structure and functions in urban India in the context of growing urbanization and industrialization. The chapter discusses the history of urbanization process in India in a precise manner. The study takes the family as both dependent and independent variable and suggests that the wide regional variations found in India are reflection of this. After critical analyze of available works, the chapter concludes that joint family is changing and changes in the family structure is not uniform across regions and classes.

The third chapter **"Modernization and its Impact on Joint Family"** explores the distinctive aspects of westernization and modernization and examines their impact on urban joint family. Various components of modernization have been identified and their interactions with the family have been discussed sectionwise. The chapter also

discusses studies concerned with interactions of modernity with traditional joint family.

In conclusion the researcher, having an insight into the broader relationship between joint family and various agents of change, argues how joint family is changing, and clears misconceptions prevailing on confusing patterns of family found in different regions across the country. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher has made some appropriate and useful comments on family studies in India.

Chapter One
The Hindu Joint Family: Nature, Growth and Feature

The concept of family is so much a part of one's psychological and cultural inheritance that the very word evokes intense emotions. Feelings of love and pain, memories of good time and bad, a sense of loyalty and obligations tend to blur one's vision. Every one of us born in the family, most of us grow up in one, and somehow one's own experience of family life is always more real than anything we may read or hear which contradicts our own perceptions and assessments of family life. People's perceptions of the family usually reflect their racial, ethnic and class backgrounds, their personal experiences of family and homing.

In the past, it was believed that family is a divine creation for survival and continuation of society. Obviously it was assumed that it performs some essential functions, which no other institution can perform. Thus family was regarded as universal in time and place. Some early writers of family, as presumed by divine school of thought, have challenged the supremacy of family. Prominent among them are Lewis Henry Morgan, McLennan and John Lubbock[1]. They evolved a parallel theory of family and marriage based on the evolutionary process in nature, and more specifically in the biological world. The evolutionary theories of family soon received a big blow when Westermark's book "The History of Human Marriage" was published in 1891. He maintained strongly that the human family has existed since the very dawn of men's life on earth. He was the first to have claimed universality and priority of family over other social institutions.

Since the publication of Westermark's monumental work, the concept of family has been getting utmost concerns of the modern sociologists and social anthropologists. The family sociology has now become almost an independent discipline. Now family is regarded as a human invention, a social creation, a set of relationships that change over time with economic, political, and social development. Family neither follows 'naturally' from the ties of blood nor a

---

[1] Lewis Henry Morgam, McLennan and John Lubbock are three prominent evolutionary theorists and their ideas are found in their books, i.e. *Ancient Society* (1877) and *The Origin of Civilization* (1870).

divine creation, but involves a cultural construction. An extreme form of 'familism' is found among some family sociologists. To them, society is nothing but consists of clusters of families. It is the family on which the edifice of the whole society is built. So whatever be the case, family is an important institution whose importance cannot be undermined either.

Family: Characteristics and Types

Ideas of the family tend to vary not only from society to society, but also from perspective to perspective. The use of word 'family' has thus always been ambiguous. The family seems to have many overlapping meanings. The common layman and even social scientists often use it indiscriminately to refer to several groups, which, despite functional and structural similarities, exhibit important point of differences. The word 'family', comes from the Latin word *familia* meaning household, and *famulus* meaning servant.[2] In this conception, family constituted of a man, woman with a child or children and servants. Often the terms 'household' and 'family' are used interchangeably. But the two terms are not same. Household always implies the notion of co-residence, while the family is usually viewed in term of relatedness. Household is the residential aspect of the family which is an institution and not bound by locality. It is only one of the dimensions among dimensions of family.[3] To put it simply, the husband and son working in London are not part of the household for many months in a year, yet they are members of the family. Household is a very important dimension of the family and without it family is nothing.

It is very difficult indeed to give a definition of family that includes all its aspect such as physical, biological, and psychological dimensions. There are some definitions which use composition or membership as criteria while other functions. But those definitions that combine the two are likely to be more useful.

---

[2] C.N.R.Rao, *Sociology* (New Delhi, 2005), p.349.
[3] A.M. Shah, *The Household Dimension of Family in India,* (New Delhi, 1973), p.3.

One such definition was given by George Peter Murdock. Murdock[4] defines the family as follows, *"The family is a social group characterized by common residence, economic co-operation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and one or more children, own or adopted of the sexually co-habiting adults. "* Indian sociologist Raghuvir Sinha[5] has defined family as *"a group of persons who live under the same roof, are connected by blood, and a common consciousness on the basis of locality, interest and mutuality of obligations. "* The family is an universal institution that is present in all cultures. Members of the family usually live together, share a common bond, pool their resources, work and rear children together. But exceptions to these characteristics of family have been found by many sociologists. Levy (1949), Spiro (1954), and E.Kathleen Gough (1959) have offered counterexamples from China, Israel, and the Malabar Coast of India. In each case, though the family performs one or more of the Murdockian functions, at least one of them is performed by some other social groups. For examples, in Israeli Kibbutz, the husband-wife unit neither raises nor instructs its children nor is it the basic economic unit in the Murdockian sense. Again if it is fatherhood, as it is generally believed, with which the family is concerned, it is social and not biological fatherhood that matters. This makes it necessary to distinguish the biological from social father. The biological father of a child may be called its *genitor.* In a number of societies in Australia and Africa the genitor is distinguished from the *Pater,* the person through whom a child's jural rights and obligations are transmitted, and who is recognized as responsible for his conduct until he is mature. Nevertheless the importance of family as an institution *par excellence* is universally recognized. There are exceptions to every rule and family is no different either.

---

[4] G.P. Murdock, *Social Structure* (New York, 1965), p.1.
[5] Raghuvir Sinha, *Family to Religion: A Theoretical Exposition of Basic Social Institutions* (New Delhi, 1980), p.4.

Although the organization of family can vary greatly, there are certain general principles concerning its composition, descent patterns, residence patterns and authority patterns.

Compositionally, a family can be nuclear or extended type. The nuclear family generally serves as the nucleus, or core, upon which large family groups are built. It includes a married couple and their unmarried children living together. It has been argued that the nuclear family is better adapted to modern economic conditions than the joint family. A family in which relatives in addition to parents and children – such as grandparents, uncles, or aunts live in the same home is known as an extended family. It is often believed that the structure of extended family offers certain advantages over that of the nuclear family. Crisis such as death, divorce, and illness involve less strain for family members, since there are more people who can provide assistance and emotional support. In addition, the extended family constitutes a larger economic unit than the nuclear family. It may be noted that family has been divided into numerous groupings on various criteria. But the division of family into nuclear and extended has been most widely used in sociological literature.

When a family is formed through marriage, it forms a kind of relationship that of reckoning descent by having some system of nomenclature. The principle of descent assigns people to kinship groups according to their relationship to an individual's mother or father. Broadly, there are three primary ways of determining descent. Descent can either be traced through the male or female line or both. When descent is traced through the male line only, it is known as patrilineal descent and matrilineal if descent is traced through female line. There is a third way of nomenclature of tracing descent know as bilateral descent, where a person can define his/her social identity through both parents. Irrespective of the kind of descent principle adopted, authority within the family usually rests in the hands of men – in the hands of the father in the case of patrilineal descent groups, in the hands of the mother's brother in the context of matrilineal descent.

Societies, however, vary in the way power within the family is distributed. Ideally, a family may be male headed or female headed. In the former case, it is known as patriarchal family and matriarchal in the case of later. If a society expects male members to dominate in all family decision-making, it is termed a patriarchy. Frequently, in patriarchal societies, the eldest male wields the greatest power. Women hold low status in such societies and rarely granted full and equal rights within the legal system, it may be more difficult, for example, for a woman to obtain a divorce than it is for a man. By contrast, in a matriarchy, women have greater authority than men. But while men wild power, the position of women in matrilineal societies is relatively better off than their counterpart in patrilineal societies. In matrilineal societies women not only have right over children but also over property and space.

In every society, there are social norms concerning the appropriate residence of a newly married family. Under the neolocal pattern of residence, a married couple is expected to establish a separate household. However, if we take a cross-cultural view, it becomes clear that the ideal type of neolocal residence was relatively uncommon. In many societies, the bride and groom live either with his parents or her parents. The former pattern is known as patrilocal or virilocal pattern of residence, and in the case of later it is known as matrilocal or uxorilocal pattern. In such system, it is felt that the new couples need the emotional support and especially the economic support of kinfolk. Economic advantage of living together might be another reason for such patterns of residence. Although joint residence with parents is the norm in most societies, neolocal residences are equally common. Particularly, in modern day industrial society, neo-local type of residence has achieved greater popularity.

The continuation of family as an institution with no other alternative, has led to many speculations whether it performs some vital functions that cannot be performed by any other institution. Even with the proliferation of asylums,

hospitals, orphanages, old age homes etc. the family continue to be important. It is thus obvious that family performs some vital functions and has a structure that is irreplaceable. For example, a marriage gives rise to two kinds of kin relationships, consangunial, i.e. blood relations, and affinal or relationship through marriage. Such kind of relationship evokes intense emotions and a sense of attachment that is simply irreplaceable by other kind of relationship. McIver and Page[6] have classified the functions of family into two types: primary and secondary. Functions of family such as educational functions, religious functions, etc. have taken over by other institutions. But it is the essential functions such as stable satisfaction of sex need, procreation, rearing of children and provision of home that family performs are basic to its continued existence. For a society to maintain itself, it must replace the dying members. In this sense, the family contributes to human survival through its function of reproduction. Because human infants need constant care and economic security. Infants and children experience an extremely long period of dependency, which places special demands on older members. And it is the family that assumes ultimate responsibility for the protection and upbringing of children. Parents and other kin in family monitor a child's behavior and transmit the norms, values, language and culture to the child. Sexual behaviors are most clearly defined within the family circle. The structure of society influences these standards so that, characteristically in male-dominated societies, formal and informal norms permit men to express and enjoy their sexual desires more freely than women may. Unlike other institutions, family is obliged to serve emotional needs of its members. Thus, the family provides members with warm and intimate relationships and helps them feel satisfied and secure.

The above discussion projects the family as an important institution that performs vital functions that contribute to the overall stability of the society. This however does not mean that the family is a homogenous unit free from conflict and tension. The family is not only internally differentiated along the axes of age,

---

[6] MacIver, R.M and Charles H Page, *Society: An Introductory Analysis* (New York, 1986), pp.254-258.

21

generation and gender but also mirrors the inequality that exists in the wider society. Conflict theorists view the family, like all social institutions, as a reflection of the inequality of the larger society in terms of wealth and power. Conflict theorists also view family as an economic unit that contributed to societal injustice. The family is the basis for the transforming power, property, and privilege from one generation to the next. In a similar vein, feminist theorists note that the family has traditionally legitimized and perpetuated male dominance. Throughout human history and in a very wide range of societies husbands have exercised overwhelming power and authority within the family.

Family in India

The joint family, the caste system and the village system are often regarded as he tripartite pillars on which the whole Hindu social edifice is built. The family in India has provided the link of continuity in the evolution of Indian culture from Indus valley civilization through British India to the present day. As such, it has been subjected to countless attack and pressures, both from within and without. But it has managed to survive to this day. The question, however arises, what is the representative or typical Indian family? Is it nuclear or extended type?

The answer is not easy. Any investigation into this matter must make two preliminary disclaimers. First, India is so large in area and her people so varied in cultural evolution that no generalized statement can be sociologically valid. Even a statement of inductive nature must be subjected to a number of important qualifications of regional, religious, linguistic and cultural detail that it may become largely meaningless.[7] The diversity in India is enormous, in regional-cum-linguistic background; there are the Andhra, Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Oriya etc.; in religious affiliation, India have the Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Buddhists, etc. Then there is the great difference between the rural and urban, orthodox and modern type of Indian family. And in cultural pattern considerable differences

---

[7] S.Chandrasekhar, :"The Family in India", *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol-16, p.336.

exist between a typical Brahmin, non-Brahmin, Harijan and aboriginal family. Secondly, at present, there are no proper historical demographic studies of India, which provide a conclusive answer to the question whether the joint family was really as widely spread as is commonly supposed.[8] While researches in statistical theory of a fairly high order are carried out, statistical facts and trends about even the basic social phenomena are almost not obtainable. Recognizing these two limitations is quite important in any discussion on family in India.

Then what family can be taken as the representative of India? Since the majority of the populations are Hindus, can the Hindu family be taken as representative family of India? Sociological investigation into this has not revealed any satisfactory outcome. Sociologists do not agree as to what constitute representative family. Karve[9] suggests that it is the larger or small joint family that is typical of India. She illustrates her claim by saying that in the north at least, the joint family divides at the time of the founder's death, and divides not into nuclear families but into smaller joint families. S.C.Dube[10], on the other hand, suggests that it is the nuclear or smaller joint family that is typical of India. Kolenda[11], after interpreting census data, finds, it was nuclear family, which was more prevalent than joint families. Whatever be the case, there is a perceptible difference between ancient and modern family. Early Sanskritic literature provides evidences of the existence of joint family in the past. The early tradition always emphasized joint family. Right from Manu the ideal of the joint family was eulogized[12]. Though several changes have taken place, the joint family is still found in almost all parts of India, both among Hindus and non-Hindus.[13]

---

[8] Margarit Pernau, "Family: A Gendering and Gendered Space", p.20. in Margarit Pernau, Imitiaz Ahmad,, Helmut Reifield (ed), *Family and Gender: Changing Values in Germany and India* (New Delhi, 2003)
[9] Irawati Karve, *Kinship Organization in India* (Deccan College, 1953), pp.10-12.
[10] S.C.Dube, "Social Structure and Change in Indian Peasant Community", p.213. In A.R.Desai (ed), *Rural Sociology In India* (Bombay, 1959).
[11] Pauline Kolenda, *Regional Differences in Family Structure* (New Delhi,1987), p.5.
[12] Raghuvir Sinha, *op.cit.* p.48.
[13] C.N.R Rao, *op cite.* p.358.

For a long time, ancient Indian literature was used as source to sustain the belief that the joint family was the rule in Indian society. The information it provided was of two kinds; (a) pertaining to property in Hindu law and (b) pertaining to certain family rituals such as death rituals for ancestors. But the Hindu law was not traditionally uniform and varied widely from one part to another. The Mitakshara system, the Dayabhaga system and the Malabar system were three predominant systems in ancient India. In the *mitakshara* system, the son acquires the right to ancestral property at birth and can demand partition at any time, if he so chooses. This system prevailed in North India. The Dayabhaga law where the son acquires the property only on the death of his father was peculiar to Bengal. There is a third type of system, which is a Malabar system. In this system, the son can demand partition and his share in the family property with the consent of all so-sharers. It requires unanimous verdict on the parts of all co-sharers and not majority vote. This being almost impossible to secure, some joint families on the south west coast of Malabar have come down undivided through the centuries. The second information that suggests the predominance of joint family is the numerous rites, which were performed during different occasion such as birth rites, death rites and *upanayan* (wearing sacred thread) rites. Information derived from these two sources has been used to validate the predominance of joint family in India.

Origin and Growth of the Joint Family

It is still a mystery how joint family originated. The existing literatures on its origin and growth suffer from the lack of evidence. The data available are grossly inadequate. Its growth at least can be accounted for by the then economic and social conditions of earlier centuries. In a way its origin, too, perhaps can be explained, though it can be nothing more than a rough hypothesis.

According to the noted Indian historian, Romila Thapar[14], the joint family is an ancient institution whose origin dates back to around 1000 B.C. In her view, the institution of joint family came into existence when the semi-nomadic type of Aryan economy was transformed into settled agricultural communities. By the time of Manu, joint family was fully institutionalized in Indian society and continues to exist. At one time, India was a land of vast and rich alluvial plains with a thin population. When the Aryans first came to India they were divided into three social classes, the warriors or aristocracy, the priests, and the common people. Professions were not hereditary, nor were there any rules limiting marriages within these classes, or taboos on whom one could eat with. The three divisions merely facilitated social and economic organization. Earlier land was owned in common by the village, but with the decline of tribal units land was divided between families in the village.[15] Vast stretches of unoccupied and uncolonized land could be had for the mere asking; these conditions led to the larger family as the best-suited unit to own and till the land. This early experiment of jointly owning the land, ploughing it, and sharing its abundant produce, proved so successful, especially in view of the absence of competition and population pressure, that the system forced itself into permanent adoption by the early inhabitants. Mandelbaum (1957: 247) shares a similar view and says that joint family is the characteristic of wealthier strata of society. In the pre-Vedic period, people were wealthier and had their own land. The large family led to no economic friction, for there was enough for all. Since the population was sparse, there was no pressure on the soil and no scarcity of food was in sight, it led to no fragmentation or subdivision of the holdings. Agricultural production involved the whole family group. The joint family with married sons remaining in the household of their father had obvious advantages in agricultural community. The access to the results of labor of more than one adult member, whether in the form of agricultural production or wages, contributed to joint living.

---

[14] Romila Thapar, *A History of India*, (New Delhi, 1992), p.37.
[15] *ibid.* p.35.

Vedic literature gives us account of family life during Vedic period. During this period things began to change. Occupation diversification started to occur. This diversification of occupations may not be due to pressure on the land. Rather it was due to opening of new avenues. With the transition from nomadic pastoralism to a settled agrarian economy, specialization of labor gradually became a marked feature of Aryan society. The clearing of forests and the existence of new settlements led to the emergence of a trading community engaged in the supply and exchange of goods. There was thus a natural separation between the agriculturalists, those who cleared and colonized the land, and the traders, those who established the economic links between the settlements, the latter coming from the class of wealthier landowners who could afford economic speculation. The priests were any case a group by themselves. The warriors, led by the king, believed their function to be solely that of protection, on which function the entire well-being o each community depended. The king emerged as the dominant power and the warriors were therefore of the first rank in the caste. The priests (Brahmins) came next, followed by the more prosperous landowners and traders, and finally the cultivators. But one cannot argue that joint family started to get weakened during this period. It was just the beginning of a very long process (often stretched to centuries) of strain in joint family. By that time joint family already had been an integral part of people's social and religious life. People, who owed their prosperity and happiness to their forefathers, already started worshiping ancestor.[16] The common religious times coupled with the economic bond of mutual helplessness, had placed the joint family in a secure foundation. And in the favorable atmosphere of the prosperous years of few subsequent centuries the joint family exhibited no weakness that would recommend its rejection from the Hindu social economy.[17]

During post-Vedic period, all social institutions including family became very rigid. The rudimentary division of labor that existed during Vedic period

---

[16] S. Chandrasekhar, "The Hindu Joint Family", *Social Forces*, Vol-21, p.329
[17] *ibid.*

became more rigid. A kind of specialization of occupation began to grow. The caste system plagued whole Indian society. People observed caste system with a religious fervor. Owing to exploitation through religious means, some castes were pauperized into a class. The joint family, though not necessarily weakened, started to differ on caste and class lines. No wonder then, Dube and Beteille (1964, 239), through their field studies, claim that joint family is found among the land owning class rather than landless class. Mandelbaum explain the same view, saying that joint family is the characteristic of wealthier strata of society.

During medieval period, India had to face a series of foreign invasions. And finally Mughal rule was established in India. There was no major change in the institution of the family during this period. However minor alteration in occupation might have occurred, as Mughal rulers recruited indigenous people both for military and other petty and high grade jobs cutting across caste line. For example, during Akabar's rule, the sultan Akbar made frequent army recruitment drives through his *mansabdari* system. Religious conversion also began in considerable scale during this period. People were converted to Islam cutting across caste and class lines.

The establishment of British rule had a profound impact on the institution of the family. This is not to argue that joint family got weakened during British rule. Rather the diverse pattern one sees today is mainly because of British rule. The concept of 'culture clash' is very significant here. The British tried to impose their culture on indigenous people. The period of renaissance witnessed the rise of westernized Indian reformers. No doubt their activities were not directed against joint family but against social evils like sati system, unsociability, repression of women and many others. British also established many educational institutions both for educating masses and recruitment to petty jobs. Through legislation they had brought laws for abolishing social evils. And the much talked 'industrialization' and 'urbanization' got further push during their rule. Many cities and towns grew in large scale, resulting in massive inter-region and intra-

region migration. During this period, differences between rural and urban life became visible. All these changes had profound impact on joint family. A question that can be raised here is, if profound changes had taken place, why then joint family exists in large scale even today? The traditional family was actually joint both structurally and functionally.[18] During British rule, it was the functional aspect of joint family that underwent major change. The structure of joint family too got affected a bit but not as much as the functional aspect. The attainment of independence has further accelerated the rate of change both within and outside the family.

In the post independence period family again underwent change. Government policies, rapid population growth, and process of industrialization, initiated by first prime minister of India Jawaharlal Nehru, have affected family more than any other factors. The process of globalization too might have impacted in family some extent. Globalization facilitates spread of popular culture. Given the popularity of nuclear family in the West, its impact on Indian society can not be dismissed. Globalization, in a way, means spread of popular culture. The weakening of religion in the last century also has affected joint family because joint family was a religious corporate unit. Many of distinct and unique characteristics of joint family have been lost in the river of time.

Joint Family: The Problem of Definition

The joint family controversy is bedeviled by problems of definition and scarcity of studies that involves a significant time dimension. The few studies that involve a time period of more than a decade are usually based on governmental records. Such studies tend to be inconclusive because of the problems of interpreting the census and other archival data in terms of family structure. The problem is compounded by the absence of a precise definition of joint family.

---

[18] M.F.Nimkoff, "The Family in India: Some Problems Concerning Research on the Changing Family in India", p.74. in Tulsi Patel (ed), *Family in India; Structure and practice* (New Delhi, 2005).

Different scholars do not agree on the precise definition of joint family. These scholars have adopted different criteria to define joint family, resulting in striking dissimilarities in their definitions. The earliest British investigation into the nature of Hindu joint family were of a practical legal nature and aimed at establishing property rights and above all, the responsibility for the payment of revenue. Thus the legal definition of family was highly specialized and cannot serve as a basis for a sociological distinction between joint and nuclear families.[19] The sociological endeavor to define joint family began in 1950. However, even in sociology, sociologists widely differ in their view on joint family.

Irawati Karve[20], after investigating into indological source, defines the joint family as *"a group of people who live under one roof, who eat food cooked at one hearth, who hold property in common and who participate in common family worships and related to each other as some particular king of kindred"*. It is evident from her description that traditional joint family was joint in terms of residence, property and functions. She has given five characteristics of joint family: common residence, common kitchen, common property, common rituals and kin relations. But this seems to be an exhaustive definition and includes all its redeeming features. The above definition is 'onerly-specific' because in reality there are lots of variations. For example, sharing a common household is to be found frequently among the rural landowning castes but it is not always true of urban joint family. Further the degree of jointness varies from family to family. Thus the extent to which the members are ready to share activities in common varies. In some families the cooperation may be limited to economic and religious matter, but, otherwise, the members may eat and live separately. Similarly different families may have different arrangements and therefore not all the families at the existential level correspond to the idealized picture presented in the definition given by Karve. One of the important factors which influence the

---

[19] Ahmad Imitaz, "Between the Ideal and Real: Gender Relations within the Indian Joint Family", p.44.in Margarit Pernue, Imitaz Ahmad, Helmut Reifiedl (Eds.), *Family and Gender: Changing Values in Germany and India*, (New Delhi, 2003).

[20] Irawati Karve, *op cit.* P.vi.

29

degree of jointness and the length of time a joint family remains united is the economic base of the family. Thus families having substantial landholding capable of supporting large are more perfectly joint and remained together longer than those who do not have sizable landholdings. Another weakness of the definition is that it cannot be used for joint family of today.

Kapadia[21] states, *"...the basis of the Hindu joint family was that different members of it should dwell in the same house, take their meals and perform their worship together and enjoy property in common. "* It seems the definition of joint family given by Kapadia, is similar to that of Karve except the former stresses on intra-familial relationships.

I.P.Desai[22] suggests that the total number of persons living in different type of household is the better index of the strength of joint family. According to him co-residence and common kitchen are not as important dimensions of joint family as intra familial relationships are. Thus, joint family, according to him, *".... consists in the rights and obligations of the members of different units towards one another and in the feeling of oneness rather than in the size of unit"* But rights and obligation alone cannot be the sole criteria of joint family.[23] No doubt Desai has explored an unexplored area, but his definition too is not free from limitations. Desai has not answered how people live in different households, often separated demographically, can function under common authority?

M.S. Gore[24] holds that a joint family should be viewed as 'a family of coparceners and their dependents' because in nuclear family the emphasis is on the conjugal relationships while in a joint family emphasis is on filial and fraternal relationships. He describes joint family as follows: *"The term joint was applied to the families where generally there were at least two married couples living in*

---

[21] K.M.Kapadia, *Marriage and Family in India* (London, 1955), ch.10.

[22] I.P.Desai, *The Joint Family: An Analysis*, Sociological Bulletin, (September, 1956), p.144-55.

[23] Ranjit K. Bhadra, "Some Observations on the Study of Family Change in India", p.63-69. In P.K.Roy (ed), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence* (New Delhi, 2000).

[24] M.S.Gore, *Urbanization and Family* (Bombay, 1968), p.6-7, 87.

a common residence and where the males are related as father-son or brother-brother and in a few cases, as uncle-nephew. In other cases, a family was included in the joint stratum where there was only one married couple, but where the head of family was either the widowed father, father's brother of elder brother of the married male in the family, where the father, father's brother, or elder brother was economically active. "

Here Gore places emphasis on common property and authority pattern. But he confused the definition as he mentions 'families where widowed mother stayed with her married son was considered nuclear'. But one can argue that a widowed mother is not always regarded as dependent. In many cases, she holds authority in the son's family similar to that of her deceased husband.[25]

F.G.Bailey[26] views the joint family as a property group. He states that sons may establish new houses in their working place away from the father's place but they may remain in the joint family in respect of common property. Bhadra[27] has criticized Bailey on the ground that he has not specified the meaning of common property, whether it is landed property or cash (?). If it is lying in the bank in town for future use it is not regarded as common property. It is individual property of that particular person. She also expresses doubt over management of common earnings and sharing common expenses by two families located in two different places.

The forgoing discussion brings out the problems involved in definition. None of the definitions highlighted can be used for all-purpose of studies. Briefly, there are two sides to the definitional problem. First, what is shared by the family unit referred to? Second, who shares it, that is, who are the relatives that compose the various types of families? A definition should also be flexible enough so that it can be free from variation in time and space. Taking note of

---

[25] Ranjit K.Bhadra, *op cite.* P-64.
[26] F.G.Bailey, "The Joint Family in India", *Economic Weekly*, vol-20, p.345-52.
[27] Ranjit K.Bhadra, *op cite*, P-68.

these problems, Kolenda[28] defines joint family as, *"a comensal unit composed of two or more related married couples plus their unmarried children."* This definition seems to be a more suitable definition as it is not based on narrow criteria such as common hearth, property, and the like. Kolenda however has been criticized for using 'family' and 'household' interchangeably.[29] This objection involves principally the failure to make a consistent distinction between the property-owning group or coparceners family, and the residential unit or household. In fact, Kolenda has not ignored this problem. Commensual unit, according to her does not mean eating from same hearth alone but involves other relationships.[30] For example, speaking of the joint family as eating from same *chullah* (hearth), she says; this means sharing property and rights, pocket book, larder, debts, labor and usually one head. Kolenda's definition seems to suffer from lesser limitations and can fit well into different contexts.

The Traditional Joint Family

While the actual nature and character of the historical unit of the Hindu family system is lost in the mists of antiquity, with little concrete data available for verification, its features can be accounted for by the existing literatures and then prevalent social and economic conditions. The Hindu joint family is a type by itself. It is also known as *extended family* and sometimes as *undivided family*. The term 'joint family' was coined by Sir Henry Maine to describe the patrilineal type of extended family where all the male members of the family hold ownership rights in the family property. Another type of extended family found in India is the matrilineal family among the *Nayars* of Kerala which comprised brothers and the sisters and the sister's children, with the spouses excluded from the family.

---

[28] Pauline Kolenda, *op.cit*, p.11.
[29] Ramesh Sinha, "Indian Joint Family: An Attempt Towards Taxonomic Refinement", *Man In India*, 1977, pp. 61-68
[30] Kolenda Pauline, *op. cit.* p. 10.
26. Raghuvir Sinha, *op. cit.* p.49.

The conventional Hindu family, to which we have been familiar since long, has been a joint family. The concept of the traditional Hindu family is enjoined with the joint family though the two are not always used as synonymous.

The joint family is a kind of extended family. This can be extended vertically having a minimum depth of three generations. In this case, the extended family consists of a man, his wife, unmarried daughter(s) and son(s), and the latter's wife and children. This type of extended family is also known as patrilineal joint family. The extended family may also be extended horizontally with a depth of two generations consisting of two or more brothers, their wives and children. The horizontal extended family also called fraternal or collateral joint family. The family in India, whether extended vertically, horizontally or both, is often called joint family. But the traditional joint family had been a mix of these two types. Put differently, the traditional families were both lineally and as well laterally extended type of families.

According to Isharawn the traditional joint family may be characterized as a group of people related to each other and generally reside together in the same dwelling with a common hearth, common religion and worship, who own property in common and possess a set of reciprocal rights and obligations.[31] Viewed thus, the traditional joint family was a corporate religious, social and above all an economic unit. Agricultural production involved the whole family group. Apparently the joint family with married sons remaining in the household of their father has obvious advantages in agricultural community. Access to the product of labor of more than one adult member, whether in the form of agricultural production or wage, contributed to and helped to sustain joint living.

In the family, food and property are generally held in common. Throughout the ages, there have been considerable variation in the property right,

---

[31] K. Isharawn, "Independence of Elementary and Extended Family" in George Kurian (Ed.), *The Family in India: A Regional Approach* (The Houghe, 1974), p. 164.

yet it has remained the common bond of the family. Customarily property was divisible among joint family members, whether male or female, after the death of the head of the family. But the joint family always emphasized and preferred its joint ownership as a practical way out. The ancestral property and the income arising from it, along with the earnings of the individual members, constitute the common family fund, out of which the expenses of the whole family are met. The funds – money, land, houses, jewelry and cattle – like other family affairs are looked after by the father or the eldest son or some senior male relative. Every earning member contributes his share to the family fund. All earning members-mostly male-contribute in proportion to their income, and all members – men, women, married, widowed and children – whether earning or not, enjoy the common family resources. This traditional system in which all are entitled to be maintained from the family funds according to their needs is, in practice, a recognized socialist unit, though not necessarily secular in spirit.[32]

The traditional joint family was patrilocal in residence. The eldest male member is supposed to be the absolute head. Younges are supposed to obey his commands. His younger brother(s) and their families, his sons, their wives and children and his grand children must live under one roof. They are supposed to eat food cooked in one hearth and participated in family worship. Descent and inheritance were traced through males' line and encouraged sets of related men to reside together and bring wives in from the outside. The Indian joint family is male oriented in both its structure, and associated beliefs and values. Family worship constituted another important dimension of traditional joint family. The traditional form of worship has been ancestor worship. The worship may take the elaborate forms from using the help of priest, or the simple form of offering food to the cows and/or some uncooked fruits or food to priests. In the early stages of ancestor worship daughters were allowed to perform this duty. When the ancestor

---

[32] S. Chandrasekhar, *op cit*. pp.338-339.

worship ceremonies became more elaborate and complicated the sons alone were allowed to perform these ceremonies.[33]

The pattern of work distribution followed a generally well defined sex based division. Men were entrusted with the responsibility of managing the occupational sphere while women are allocated the household responsibilities. In a traditional joint family, besides the occupational role, men are also expected to assume responsibility for community affairs. While men spend their lives working forearming the livelihood, the women find their major responsibilities in managing the household, and in the care of the children and the aged. Organization of household activities is subject to the authority of the eldest women in the family. Other important determinants for allocation of work responsibility are age and generational status, which often converge. The adult had the responsibility for active physical work. The children had no independent work responsibility, but often did odd jobs at the behest of any of the elders. The elder men usually looked after the marriage negotiations and management of monetary and legal affairs. Similarly, age based system of distribution of work existed in household activities. Elder women performed the supervisory work and occasional ceremonial cooking while adult women did most of the physical work of household management. The younger girls occasionally helped in looking after young children and household choir.

Members in the joint families celebrated rites, rituals, festivals and ceremonies very frequently. The religious significance of these ceremonies compelled people to go through these rituals regularly. The joint family unit served as a unit of recreation and celebration for its members. The boys and girls of the same age group formed the peer group and also the members of the family joined together in celebrating festivals and other occasions. The practice

---

[33] Ben Schlesinger, "The Changing Patterns in the Hindu Joint Family System of India", *Marriage and Family Living, I* (May, 1961), p.171.

continues even today as we find that even married daughter go back to the parents house to celebrate various festivals.

The gender equation weighted heavily in favor of the male sex. The women of the joint family lived together, and very little independence was given to them. Nevertheless the womenfolk; the mother, the daughters-in-law, unmarried daughters, and granddaughters and sometimes great-granddaughters lived under the same roof. Male members were given absolute authority over family members. Ideally the Indian joint family was a family system that kept sets of related men together in multigenerational households through complex system of arranged marriage. Women were the moving pieces in the exchange system that creates extensive web of kinship.[34] For example, the daughters in the family, on getting married, leave their parental home and become members of the joint family to which their husbands belong. The sons in the family marry daughters of other joint families to help their family and hand down the torch of life to generations yet unborn to thus perpetuate the family line. The joint family bases family honor, in part, in sexual purity of women, usually through such institutions as early marriage and *purdah* to control female sexuality. Women were confined in the four walls of home. As the young man and especially woman do not marry to suit his or her fancy, the choice of the partner does not rest with the individual. The main purpose of marriage was to help the family, rather for sexual pleasure. Therefore, while early marriage did exist, physical consummation and living together is, by and large, a post-puberty affair. Nevertheless in case of widowhood, the widow finds refuge in her parental joint family. Widow remarriage did not exist. In contrast, male members were regarded as superior. The presence of son was considered essential for worship, performance of last rites of parents and above all continuation of the lineage. The polarization of gender characteristic within the joint family might be due to dissociation of family and professional life.

---

[34] Imitaz Ahmad, *op.cite.* . p.32.

.

The primacy of the needs of the family over the desires of the individual was an integral part of the make-up of traditional joint family. The joint family placed the welfare of collective extended family above the individual. Thus individuality was subordinate to collective solidarity, the younger generation, generally strictly, but not systematically controlled by the elders. Thus, Indian joint family system places the welfare of the collective above the interests of the individuals. The strong attachment to values and morals exert pressure on the younger generation. In other words, rights and duties, sentiments and authority constituted the basis of unity.

Family Relationship

Family relationship constituted an important aspect of joint family. Placing value upon interdependence, rather than upon independence and personal autonomy, had been integral to the successful functioning of the traditional Indian joint family. And this interdependence was mainly governed through hierarchical relationships. Within the joint family, structural hierarchy is primarily governed by the position and relationship of the individual in the family structure and gender. A hierarchical position is established for all members of the extended family. There are specific exceptions in the structural hierarchy for certain attitudes and behavior in both subordinate and superior. Deference, loyalty and subordination are deeply ingrained in the former. The latter expresses nurturance, concern and responsibility. However certain intimate relationships such as wife's relationship with younger brothers-in-law and a mother's relationship with her children, often duets the hard wall of hierarchy.

In the joint family many of the relationships are prescribed. In the joint family, the conjugal relationship is important but is always subordinate to the consanguinal bond to suit the requirement of the larger system. It would destroy the stability of the joint family if the conjugal relationship gained relative

37

primacy. Institutionalized mechanisms are designed to prevent this from happening. For instance, disapproval of 'romantic complex' of courtship before marriage and discouragement of open manifestation of affectivity between the spouses keep the conjugal bond subdued. Such institutionalized effort to suppress intimacy in the conjugal bond is meant to check to potential threat to fraternal relationship. An emotionally intimate relationship may lead to the break down of the joint family. In the husband-wife relationship the wife is supposed to look at the husband as her 'master' and should serve him faithfully. She cannot arguer with her husband as an equal and must not contradict her husband even if she knows that he is wrong. In this tradition the husband is expected to be the authority figure, whose will should prevail in all matters. In the traditional joint family, excessive intimacy between husband and wife viewed with suspension. In the household, husband and wife are not expected to spend much time together, rather they must not display affection or emotion towards each other in the presence of others. They must also not exhibit any favoritism or possessiveness towards their own children, but treat and rear them in same way as they do to their nieces and nephews. If a man was too deeply attached to his wife, it was feared he would be less committed to the larger family. However it would be wrong to argue that wife had no say in family affairs. The powerful forces of sexuality and procreation draw husband and wife into more intimate and more equal relationship, at least in private.

Respect for the seniors or age is another ideal of the Indian joint family. The father and mother have a place of honor in the joint family. The father, being the oldest and most experienced, is primarily the head of the family. The mother too generally has her say. Though grown-up sons live in the family with their wives, the respect and consideration shown by all members of the family to the old mother is very great. The family head (usually father) was usually the older male, unless this person is incompetent. An elderly woman has charge of the women's affairs in the home. Elders are greeted first, have special places to sit,

and are addressed by persons in respectful terms.[35] The father-son relationships are more of 'deferential type' while mother-child relationship is characterized by strong emotional intimacy. Father is the symbol of authority and interaction with the father is generally limited. Here, again the differential relation between father and son helps in the solidarity of joint family. An intimate relation between father and children may threaten the solidarity of fraternal relationship. On the other hand, close bond with the mother is mutually beneficial. Especially in case of mother-son relationship, mother seeks emotional security from her relationship with the son, which she misses in her relationship with the husband.

The fraternal relationship is usually a close one. But there are two sources of constraint that may influence it. One of these is structural. The structural source of constraint may rise from the age and therefore, status differentiation among brothers. This can be a potent source of jealousy and rivalry between brothers. The problems get aggravated when parents bestow special favoritism on a particular child at the expense of the other. Compared to it, the relation between brother and sister is especially significant. For the boys, sister is not a potential rival and she can become the source of feminine tenderness. The young girl on her part finds emotional gratification in the companionship of her brothers. Moreover, brothers are especially valuable because they become a source of strong support on any adversity that the sister may face in adult life, especially after marriage. While brother-brother relationship may be very close, yet it rarely approaches the tenderness and affection of brother-sister relationship. Brother continues to plan an important role in the later phase of life of his sister. As mother's brother to his sister's children, he enjoys a special relationship.

The wives in the family were expected to be distant and extremely circumspect in their behavior towards their husband's older brothers, father and uncles, as well as towards their husband when others are present. Men and women traditionally relied a great deal on same-sex relationships for their intimacy needs.

---

[35] Ben Schlesinger, *op cit*, p.17.

The relationship between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law constituted another important intra-familial relationship in traditional joint family. When early marriage was the custom in India, the young wife was nervous in her household choir and duties. She also lacked experiences. Though adjustment was primarily her duty, both in martial relationship and in-laws relationships, her anxiety was much more focused on her mother-in-law and sister-in-law who generally looked at her as an outsider.[36] Underlying the rivalry and jealousy of each other's power is the mother-in-law's authority over the distribution of the main functions of the joint family, especially relating to the management of the house. The young wife occupies the very bottom rung of the hierarchical ladder. She is expected to fit into her new family, learning and adhering to its customs and norms rather than to those of her natal family, and gradually learning to consider the family as her own. She is expected to be extremely submissive and deferent, expressing respect for the female in-laws and her husband in the first few years.

In sharp contrast to other familial relationships, the relationship between grandparents and grandchildren are extremely close and can be described as 'joking type' of relationship. The socialization of the young children in the joint family is not the sole responsibility of the parents. In fact, grandparents along with uncles, cousins and elder siblings also play their parts.

---

[36] Imitiaz Ahmad, *op cite.* p.41.

Chapter Two
Urbanization, Industrialization and Family

The division of the human habitat into 'urban' and 'rural' is based on a distinction of certain attributes of population of the habitat. Although, the two constructs are associated with dichotomies of 'modern' and 'traditional' or 'industrial' and 'agricultural', apparently one finds urban attributes in rural population and areas, and rural attributes in urban population and areas. Urbanization thus involves the transformation of rural attributes to urban areas. Victor D. Souza[1] opines that urbanization is essentially the redistribution of rural population in urban areas. The rate of movement determines the degree of urbanization. Heterogeneity of population, secondary relationships, maximum occupational choice and specialization are main characteristics of urban life. Individualism, breakdown of familial emotional relationships, freedom in decision making, and importance of secondary contract are the consequences of urbanization. Urbanization is a worldwide process and it has been considered not only as an index of economic development but also as an important factor of social change.

Urbanization is a process in which great impetus is given to the development of cities. In the urban areas, the ratio of population to land is high. By its very nature urbanization throws people into close contact with strangers, facilitates the rapid diffusion of news and fashions, permits a high degree of individualization, and stimulates inventions, social mobility, secularization and a complex economic system involving diversity and specialization of occupations. Urbanization is usually viewed from western perspective. It has been argued, on the basis of western experiences, that urbanization means a breakdown of traditional social institutions and values. Such an assumption ignores the existence of traditional urbanization on which modern urbanization had its impact. India has experienced both types of urbanization in the course of evolution of its civilization. Robert Redfield and Milton Singer[2] have suggested a useful distinction between primary and secondary urbanization as (a) the development of urban areas as a natural outgrowth of the cultural traditions of their

---

[1] Victor D. Souza, "Urbanization as a Perspective for Social and Historical Analysis in Developing Societies", *Sociological Bulletin.*Vol-33 (1954), p.91.

[2] Robert Redfield and Milton Singer, "The Cultural Role of Cities", *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* Vol. 3 (1954), pp.53-73.

surrounding hinterlands (primary urbanization) and (b) the growth of an urban tradition as the result of foreign influences (Secondary Urbanization). The urbanization process during ancient time in India can be classed as primary urbanization, and growth of urban centers during Muslim and British rule can be included in the later type. Urban areas in India have provided cultural links from Indus valley civilization through medieval period and British period to present day India. The causative factors behind urbanization vary from time to time leading to not one but several urbanizations at different points of time. Much has been written about the correlation between urbanization and industrialization and changes in family system. However mostly these studies are of western family.

In this chapter an attempt has been made to look at the correlation between urbo-industrial society and the family in India.

A Brief History of Urbanization and Industrialization in India

The emergence of early urban life in India is associated with the evolution of Indus valley civilization around 2500 B.C.[3]. Some temporal and spatial discontinuities in urban growth and spread notwithstanding, the urbanization process diffused to other parts of the country under the impact of varied forces operating during the ancient (from early time to 1206 A.D), Medieval (1206 to 1757 A.D) and Modern (1757 A.D. to till date) periods of Indian history.[4] The emergence of early urban life is associated with the evolution of Indus valley civilization around 2500 B.C. Cities existed in and around Indus Valley civilization. The noted ones were Harappa, Mahenjdaro and Lothal. This very early primary urbanization came to light following the excavations of Harappa and Mahenjadaro in the Indus valley. Both sites show clear evidences of large urban centers. They were carefully laid out cities with a grid pattern of streets intersecting at right angles; the houses, several storeys high, were built around country yards and were notable for their careful drainage linked to

---

[3] G. Dunbar, *India and Passing of Empire,* (London, 1951), p.2.
[4] Ravindra Singh Sandhu, "Introduction", in R.S. Sandhu (Ed.), *Urbanization in India,* (New Delhi, 2003), p.24.

a city wide sewer system.[5] This suggests urban areas in the ancient time were highly developed in terms of planning and other amenities.

There were different types of towns. The traditional Indian town has frequently been characterized as having served as fortress headquarters of a local or regional trade, often fostered by the rulers. These headquarter towns linked the village with the regional level of government in a predominantly agrarian society and were nexus of class flow with that society.[6] In addition to capital city, there were some other important categories of towns, viz. Rajadhaniya Nagar, Sthaniya Nagar, Kharavata, Kheta, Putabheana, Nigama, Pattana and Dranamukha.[7] The first four were administrative towns at four hierarchical levels. The last four types of cities refer to commercial cities. Of these, the Putabhedana was a large commercial center specializing in wholesale trading. The Pattana was coastal trading town. Dranamukha was also a market town lying on the delta of a river or sea shore, frequented by traders. Nigama, like previous two, was also a market town but mainly consisting of artisans. In addition to these types of town there were two other types of towns. The Matha was a type of town which was organized around education. The university towns of Nalanda and Taxila were these types of town. These towns were defended from external attack and food supplies were provided.[8] Temple town formed another category with their own characteristic features. They had several successive rings of circumbulatory paths to go around the ancestral plots where the temples were situated. Puri, Varanasi, Tirupati are some important examples of this type of town. These towns were also important pilgrimage centers and attracted pilgrims from far and wide.

The foregoing account shows the richness of old world urbanization. They represented the social organization of one or more world religious complexes. To this civilization complexes which was reflected in the urban centers, was added the

---

[5] M. Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, (London, 1960), pp.57-58.
[6] S.N.Eisenstadt and A. Sachar, *Society, Culture and Urbanization*, (New Delhi, 1982), p.231.
[7] R. Ramchandran, *Urbanization and Urban System in India*, (New Delhi, 1989), p.39.
[8] B.Puri, *Cities of Ancient India*, (Meerut, 1966), pp.52-55.

Islamic civilization. This, among other things, meant the introduction of a new and different style of urbanism. Urbanization during medieval period was mostly confined to North India. The early Muslim invasions were disastrous for Indian cities. For instance, the seventeen invasions of Mahmud of Ghazni ravaged the cities of north and western India including the cities of Gujarat. However, the 'new' Muslim rulers of India soon established themselves with their capital at Delhi. The slave ruler Qutab-ud-in built Lalkot. The city of 'Siri' was built by Allaudin Khilij. There are many other cities built by Muslim rulers. During their rules, many more provincial cities came into prominence. The chief of them were Ahmedabad, Lucknow and Hyderabad. The Mughal period stands out as a second high watermark of Urbanization in India, the first occurred during the Mauryan period. The Mughal period witnessed the revival of older established cities, in addition of new cities and the building an impressive array of monumental structures in almost every major city of northern India. Urbanization during the Mughal period covered the whole of northern India, from Assam to Gujarat including present day Pakistan and Bangladesh.[9]

The European phase of India's urban history has its beginning in the period during which Mughal supremacy was at its height. The Portuguese were the first to establish port towns in India – Panaji in Goa in 1510 and Bombay in 1532. They were followed by the Dutch – Machlipatnam in 1605 and Nagapattnam in 1668, and the French –Pondichery in 1673 and Chandranagure in 1690.[10] The consolidation of territorial power by the British in 1806 and the end of the period of political instability brought about, surprisingly a period of stagnation and decline of urban centers in India, which lasted well over a century. The main reasons for the decline of cities during this period are (a) the lack of the interest on the part of British in the prosperity and economic development of India, and (2) the ushering of Industrial revolution in England in the later half of 18th century, thus adhering the very

---

[9] R. Ramchandran, *op.cit.* P-53.
[10] *ibid.* p.59.

complexities of urbanization in England and in India at a later stage.[11] By 1872, when the first census was undertaken the urban population of India had declined from 11% to 8.7% in 1872. By 1901, after a century of British occupation of India, India's level of urbanization remained around 11%. The 19th century witnessed a period of decline of urban centers until about 1870, and there after a slow upward growth in the level of urbanization while urban stagnation or slow growth was a feature until about 1831, urbanization began to show signs of rapid growth thereafter.[12]

The European phase of urbanization was characterized by a new type of urbanization i.e. industry driven urbanization. The first coal mine was established in 1820, while the first cotton and jute mills were operated in 1854.[13] The iron and steel industry was started in 1830 when a steel industry was set up at Port-Novo in Tamil Nadu. Subsequently steel plants were located at Beypore (Kerala), Coimbator (Tamil Nadu), Birbhum (West Bengal), and Kaladhungi (U.P) between 1830-60. The development of these industries was fairly rapid but did not much affect the Indian economy until well into the twentieth century. Coal and jute have shown much the same kind of growth. One can take the growth of these industries as very likely indicating the general rate of industrialization of the country.

The introduction of the power bound industry introduced by the British had ushered a new type of urbanism in India which, unlike its classical proto-type, cannot be called indigenous. The conformity of the two facets – the rural and the urban – of Indian society, once displayed, was interrupted. Western ideals and education, which followed naturally in the wake of the Western industrial system, gave a severe jolt to the traditional social set-up. The large scale industrial urban system and its corollary of mass production made human relationships in the production system functionally specific, universalistic, rational and impersonal. It released the monopoly of certain groups or castes over certain occupations. It made human relations in the factory confined to the technical demands of the occupational role. Occupation and work

---

[11] *ibid.* p.60.
[12] *Ibid.* pp.60-62.
[13] D.R. Gadgil, *The Industrial Evolution of India in Recent Times*, (London, 1942), pp. 56-61.

place lost its effective and sentimental appeal which characterized them in the pre-industrial era.

The new urbo-industrial order greatly influenced the cultural continuity and ecological balance that existed between the urban centers and their hinterlands. They appear to symbolize multidimensional aspects of the same culture. The urbo-industrial centers today have become potent vehicles of social change. Although industrialization and urbanization go hand in hand, they are not necessarily the same processes. For, industries can be established in rural districts without considerably affecting, the density of the area and cities can grow up without massive industrial plants. The social relations associated with the modern factory system with its hierarchical relations, norms, wages, uncertainties and insecurities of the proletarian way of life, are not something peculiar to urban community.[14]

Industrialization refers to the mass production of goods in a factory system, which involves some degree of mechanized production technology.[15] Mines and plantations situated in areas that are typically rural present to our eyes general symptoms of the industrial order. But, industrialization does not merely refer to the use of large and complicated machinery, and urbanization does not only mean the great concentration of human beings in small areas; they both require certain types of socio-economic relationships and welfare measures which are in conflict with social system which obtained in pre-British period. Social contract in urban areas is different. Industrialization got a rapid push when India got its independence. In his eagerness to catch up with developed country, India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made rapid industrialization of the country as a part of five year plans and development process. Thereafter industrialization and urbanization have taken place in an unprecedented rate. Urbanization and industrialization in India since then have been essential parts of India's development towards more stable and productive economy.

---

[14] B.F.Hoselitz, "The City, the Factory, and Economic Growth", in P,K., Hatt and A.J. Reiss (Eds.), *Cities and Society*, (Glenco, 1957), p.538

[15] M. Harolombos, *Sociology: Themes and Perspective*, (New Delhi, 1977), p.342.

Effects on the Family

It needs to be emphasized that the processes of urbanization and industrialization do not follow the same course in every society. Industrialization is not a fixed thing but a developing process. As far as India is concerned, industrialization has not shown the same correlation between it and an increasing incidence of nuclear families. In fact, Indian studies present a wide array of apparently contradictory results. This may in part be due to the fact that a wide variety of different, imprecise, and even contradictory definitions of "family" and "industrialization" are employed in these studies. Again both urbanization and industrialization are not homogenous processes but rather ones which create a variety of opportunities which may be exploited by diverse strategies. Consequently life in joint family, either in the sense of a coparcenary family, comprised of those who share joint property, or a commensal family, one which budgets and eats together, also has variable economic advantages or disadvantages for particular individuals within particular economic context.

Another important problem involved in analyzing the changes in family system in India is that, the rate of urbanization exceeds the capacity of government to plan and organize this transformation. Consequently, new forms of urban poverty have emerged, manifested through poor housing conditions, insecure land tenure, and homelessness. This presents a deceiving picture of different type of families in India. For example, if urbanization occurs in a planned way then the proportion of joint family might have been greater in urban areas than the present one. Nevertheless poor housing conditions, insecure land tenure, poverty etc. should be considered as impacts of urbanization. Thus it is necessary not to blindly view urbanization as a positive process. In the following section a critical review is made of studies concerned with urbanization and industrialization and their impact on family system in urban area.

O'Malley cites the following factors which tend to disintegrate joint family.[16]. Foremost among them is the economic factor. He believes that the disintegration of the joint family is due to change in the economic condition. The second factor that contributes to family disintegration is psychological. Here he saw the various 'constant factors' showing the difficulty of adjusting the conflicting interest of members and the frequent clashes to which the system lent itself – such factors as the friction between different members of the family with different temperaments, the trouble caused by the working quarrel among women, maladjustments of property by the head of the family on his inability to control those under him and so on. These factors, according to O'Mally, become effective in the disintegration of the joint family with the onset of the spirit of individualism, encouraged by western influences.

M.S Gore[17], on the other hand, opines that close conjugal tie is a more serious threat to the stability of the joint family than the above mentioned factors in the preceding paragraph. This does not mean that join family has no advantages at all. Aileen Ross[18] has pointed out that there are various advantages in the joint family system that are not available in nuclear family system. Therefore joint family has its own advantages and disadvantages which may fit or misfit into different social realities according to its suitability or unsuitability.

The development and application of new technology affects the whole character and social significance of the family. The increasing numbers of industries take both the work and the worker out of his village home. The new family which has emerged in the process of this application of technology to industrial production is more dependent upon a number of other production units for the satisfaction of its many wants. With the introduction of larger-scale production, the family has changed from production to largely a consumption unit. Since the family is generally the basic social unit through which socialization of individual must be accomplished and mode

---

[16] O'Malley cited in A.M Shah, *The Household Dimension of Family*, (New Delhi, 1973), p.3.
[17] M.S.Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, (New Delhi, 1968), p.9.
[18] A.D.Ross, *The Hindu Family in Urban Setting*, (New Delhi, 1961), p.85, 88.

of thought and behavior shaped, special attention must be paid to finding out the manner in which the introduction of technological changes affects the family.

Whether the extended or joint family has undergone any change due to industrialization and urbanization, and whether the nuclear family is functional for urban industrial society, are the questions that have received both theoretical and research interest in recent years. Two alternative views are held in this regard. One school of thought argues that the nuclear family is functionally suited for urban industrial society. Many researchers affirm that the family system throughout the world are generally moving in the direction of conjugal pattern, and notes the lack of 'fit' between the extended family and urbo-industrial system. In mainstream sociology this school of thought is led by T.Parsons (1949), J.Goode (1963) and Stukert (1960). In India, Aileen D.Ross (1967), P.K.Roy (2000), and S.Kaldate are associated with this school.

The second school of thought argues that the family has not changed as radically as has been argued by the first school sociologists. E.W.Johnson (1961) and Litwak (1969) questioned the hypothesis that the small nuclear family is brought about by industrialization and urbanization. In India too, many sociologists are associated with this school. Some prominent scholars of this school are K.M. Kapadia (1959), I.P.Desai (1964) M.Singer (1968), G.N. Ramu (1977), A.M.Shah (1973) and M.S. Gore (1968).

Although many sociologists have noted that the process of industrialization, urbanization and westernization has seriously impacted the family life in India, there is no agreement that this has resulted in the destruction of the joint family. Many are of the view that joint family persists in the new economic environment. In the following section an attempt has been made to critically examine some of the studies of family change in urban India so as to better understand the impact of urbanization and industrialization on Joint family.

49

I.P.Desai,[19] in his study of Mahuva, a town in south Gujarat, shows that, except five per cent of a sample of 423 families, about 95 per cent of these families practice some kind of jointness, the percentage of various types being: 21 traditionally joint, 30 marginally joint, 17 joint in terms of property, and 27 joint by way of mutual obligations. The reasons for family separation are mainly due to occupational diversification and other circumstantial reasons rather than domestic quarrels. It is very difficult indeed to understand in his study, which criteria should be adopted to determine 'jointness' of a family. According to him co-residence and common kitchen are not important dimensions of joint family as intra-familial relationships are. He suggests that the total number of persons living in different types of households is the better index of strength of joint family.[20] However, elsewhere, Desai notes that the residential aspect should be the main criteria to determine whether a family is joint or not.[21] Thus Desai himself contradicts his own position on joint family system.

Navarasi town in Gujarat has been studied by K.M.Kapadia.[22] He found that joint family structure is not being nuclarized. He found that in the town Navarasi, the proportion of joint families is higher than that of nuclear families. It is mainly due to modification of the caste pattern by economic factor. Industrialization enhanced economic status of the residents. Kapadia observes that joint family has been affected by impact of various forces stemming from economic progress. But then Kapadia goes to the extent of predicating; "*...despite the clash between different generations...there is a strong feeling for the joint family in the generation that is coming up. He also suggests that the joint family will make adjustments to change and survive 'the strains and stresses'.*[23] This makes it clear that his assertion is a heavily value loaded one. Ross[24], on the other hand, argues in her study of the Hindu

[19] I.P.Desai, *Some Aspects of Family in Mahuva*, (Bombay, 1964), pp.68-69.

[20] I.P.Desai, "The Joint Family in India: An Analysis", in Tulsi Patel (Ed.), *The Family in India: Structure and Practice*, (New Delhi, 2005), p.85.

[21] I.P.Desai, "Symposium on Caste and Joint family; An Analysis*", Sociological Bulletin*, vol-4, pp.104-5.

[22] K.M.Kapadia, *Marriage and Family in India*, (Bombay, 1964), p.112.

[23] *Ibid*, P.264

[24] Aileen D.Ross, *The Hindu Family in Urban Setting*, (Toronto, 1961), p.297.

urban family that "if a full complement of technological change impinges on the family structure, it will survive."

Gore[25] attempts to determine whether an increase in industrialization and urbanization leads to a greater acceptance of nuclear family norms. His sample includes 499 Aggrawal families. To bring out the impact of urbanization on the joint family, he asserts that the urban joint family is larger than the rural joint family In respect of family preference most of the urban respondents prefer nuclear family than the rural respondents. Following his survey he concludes that the sample as a whole conform to the pattern of joint family living in behavior, role perception, and attitudes. According to him, his findings reveal limited change has taken place in the family system. Bhadra has criticized Gore on two counts. First, the size of urban household in his survey was larger because it includes many temporary members as they have come to city for either education of seeking jobs. Second, Gore's observation that *"...brothers always help each other in emergency and that an elder brother has an important role in the decision making process in the family of his younger brother, even after breakdown of families"*, does not indicate persistence of joint family. These may be considered as remnants of the traditional joint family customs, which they could not shake off immediately. Sometimes it is found that the maternal uncle also takes part in decision-making and helps to his sister's children from time to time, of course, if he resides close to them. But it does not mean that he is a member of the family of his sister's children.[26]

Aileen D. Ross[27] studied family in the Bangalore city in 1957. She found that the trend of family form is towards a breakaway from the traditional joint family form into nuclear family units. The small joint family became the most typical form of family. She also points out to changes in the roles of parents and children. Traditional authority structure broke down as father and father-in-law lost their power over married children, when they move out, especially if they are located far-away,

[25] M.S.Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, (Bombay, 1968), pp.77-91.
[26] *Ibid.* p.61.
[27] A.D.Ross, *op.cit.*, pp.28-31

for they have no longer financial control over them. Nor is the son likely to follow the same occupation of father. So father no longer can guide and advise him on the work. The sentiments and attitudes of respect, fear, obedience and avoidance as well as love are not found in a greater degree as it in joint families. Madan[28] has criticized Ross on the ground that she has taken the large complex households as typical of Hindu society in the past for granted. Madan also feels that theoretical preconceptions, terminological inexactitude also mar the work of Ross.[29]

Another much acclaimed study is undertaken by G.N. Ramu [30] in Kolar Gold Field area. .Kolar Gold Field is situated near Bangalore, south India. It is an industrialized urban area. People are 'family centrist' in this region. Family centrism occurs in a situation where the most significant attitudes and behaviors of an individual are related to the best interest of the family. Then it is not surprising that the more successful business firms in this region were those owned by coparceners. These business firms came into existence after collective decision of the coparceners to convert family property into capital for new family enterprises. The conformity to family norms is the result of the nature and significance of the rewards that brings conformity and the severity of the negative sanctions that deviance evokes on the other. Most youth of Kolar Gold field region reject high economic opportunity in the fear that they might get isolated from family because of separation from their family of orientation. Ramu also states that conformity to family norms does not imply that individuals have few or no self-concern. And this self concern has separated few of them from their family of orientation. Few of them have moved out for personal economic reason.

However, Ramu rest his case not on observations of the common residence group, which is the usual referent of the term "joint family", but on studies of attitudes toward family life or of the family group conceived as "a set of relations

---

[28] T.N.Madan, "The Hindu Family and Development", pp.269-270, in P.K.Roy (Ed.), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence,*(New Delhi, 2000)
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] G.N.Ramu, *Family and Caste in India: A Case Study,* (New Delhi, 1977), p.92, 97.

and as a functioning unit". He thus generally agrees that the common residence groups have declined but say that the kinship group persists in another form. But joint family is actually a residential unit. Even in the Indian law common residence has been used as the main criterion to ascertain whether a family is joint or not.[31] It is usually incorporated as an important characteristic of the extended family in the general literature of social science, for it is one of the features that distinguish it from a lineage segment.[32] Even if one insists that residence is not a part of the joint family, it seems difficult to deny that changes in the joint family will be reflected in changes in household size, especially where the household is defined as a commensal unit. It is therefore very clear that Ramu, by ignoring residential aspect of joint family, has created confusion. Secondly, any change in one aspect automatically induces changes in other aspects of that phenomenon For example, occupation diversification leads to physical separation of members which in turn lessen the authority of adult member over other members. Physical separation reduces the kin contacts and strengthen conjugal tie. And the process goes on. Therefore it is necessary to recognize this process.

Milton Singer[33] argues that many of the practices associated with traditional joint family system "...offer some distinct advantages for organizing an industrial enterprise". In his study of nineteen industrialists in Chennai city, he found that there were more nuclear households than joint households among industrial leaders in the city. Social obligations and interactions among these industrialists were more intense and frequent. However, the movement of the sons of industrial leaders from the parental home and establishment of neolocal residence do not indicate breakdown of joint family, because, contact is maintained between the 'family of orientation' and 'family of procreation' through rites of passage, festivals and ceremonies; and they maintain the joint family obligations and continue to subscribe to the norms of that system. In company or business matters, all major decisions are discussed at informal

---

[31] I.P.Desai, *op.cit.* pp.104-5.

[32] H.P.Fairchild (Ed.), *Dictionary of Sociology*, (New York, 1944), p.114.

[33] Milton Singer, "The Indian Joint Family in Modern Industry",pp. 441-442, 445. in M.Singer and B.Cohn (Eds.), *Structure and Change in Indian Society*, (Chicago, 1968).

meetings of brothers, which take place at least once a month. These decisions require complete consensus, on the assumption that if anyone has a reasonable proposal he should be able to persuade the others According to him structural change and structural persistence are both occurring simultaneously and the joint family is adapting itself functionally in the new urban-industrial environment. However Singer's study is inadequate as it is based only on nineteen industrialist families to test the hypothesis and excludes the industrial employees and laborers and various other workers in the city area. A generalized picture of societal norm is impossible to obtain from such a small sample of families of equal economic status. Industrialization, sometimes, might not bring about any change in the industrialist families but it, possibly, bring about changes in the families of other employees and neighbors living in its environment. Industrialization and urbanization bear several inter-related characteristics like compact urban areas, small houses, not traditional occupations, money and market economy, etc. which are enough for bringing divisions in the joint family.[34] Furthermore, social obligations among industrialists, as pointed out by Milton Singer, does not indicate strong prevalence of joint family norms, nor does it prove jointness of households. The brothers help each other simply because it is difficult to refuse to meet these obligations, since they may have to resort to the same dependency at some time or other.[35]

Michel Ames[36] conducted a survey in Jameshdpur to obtain data on family preference. Using the interview as the method in his study, he found that 71 percent of the 106 workers and foremen interviewed in the city showed a preference for patrilineal, patrilocal extended family residence with at least three generations of relatives and their spouses living together. Only 12 percent of the sample (mostly middle class) expressed a desire for conjugal family residence. Ames, however, states that preference for joint family was rarely achieved: 83 percent of workers and

---

[34] Ranjit.K.Bhadra, "Some Observations on the Study of Family Change in India", in P.K.Roy (Ed.), The Indian Family: Change and Persistence, (New Delhi, 2000), p.61.

[35] M.Ames, *Class, Caste and Kinship in an Industrial City of India*, (1969), p.67

[36] P.K.Roy, "Industrialization and the 'Fitness' of Nuclear Family: A Case Study", in P.K.Roy (Ed.), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence*, (New Delhi: 2000), p.24, 32.

foremen lived in conjugal households, while only one respondent resided in a joint family in the true sense. Ames study is noteworthy. One important implication from this study is that the process of urbanization and industrialization can act as external forces which are capable of controlling individual and his particular choice.

P.K.Roy[37], in his study of Ranchi town, has examined the impact of industrialization on rural and urban families in and around Ranchi. 68 percent of total sample he interviewed preferred nuclear family. He discovers that the reasons for choosing a nuclear unit is mainly because city residents find it more difficult to allow relatives to stay with them owing to the limited facilities for accommodating them in the city and the high rents demanded to get house large enough for an extended family. An overwhelmingly 50.5 total respondents cited this particular reason for preference of nuclear family. Thus whether joint family structure is disadvantageous in urban setting could not be confirmed.

Another important research was carried out by S.N. Sen. In his study of Calcutta city he found that one-fifth of the Calcutta city population lived in single households, and that between 52 and 62 percent of all Calcutta households were single member ones. A great number of these single residents are married men whose wives and children have stayed behind in villages. It is the need of village joint family for additional income that often propels its members outwards with the dual purpose of gaining individual livelihood and adding to the income of the family.[38] Although this study does not point out change in the family system in urban India, it should clear the confusion between household and family, the distinction of which has been misused by many Indian sociologists to suit their purpose.

---

[37] P.K.Roy, *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence*, (New Delhi;2000), pp.25-31.
[38] S.N.Sen, Cited in Richard Basham, *Urban Anthropology: The Cross-Cultural Study of complex Societies*, (California, 1978), p.109.

Raymond Owens[39], in his endeavor to understand the impact of industrialization on joint family system, has studied Howrah city. This study, unlike Ames' study of Jamshedpur which belongs to an earlier phase of industrialization, is an important piece of work as it deals with the later phase of industrialization which is more dynamic and thus helpful to analyze changes in the family system. Owens has studied 104 families in a ward of Howrah which has 500 engineering factory workshops. His sample includes both entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Owens finds that 77.84% of entrepreneur families live in joint households which are more than twice the percentage of joint families among non-entrepreneurs. Monthly incomes of most entrepreneurial families are much higher incomes than families which do not include entrepreneurs. Owens in his conclusion, conclude that coparcenaries joint family, in fact, provided an aid in modern business practices. Therefore mismatch between industrialization and joint family can not be true always. However one truth is quite apparent. Among the two occupational categories studied by Owens, the proportion of nuclear family is considerably high. Overall 59.62% of total sample lived in nuclear families while only 29.80% live in commensal joint family. The rest 10.58 % are sub nuclear families.

Despite the differences in the appraisal of future trends, all these authors agree that some change is taking place in the joint family system in India because of occupational diversification. It is evident from foregoing discussion that in many cases, joint families are more prevalent in urban areas than the rural areas. In some other cases, nuclear households are as prevalent in villages as in cities. Still in some cases, joint family has provided an aid to modern business practice while in other cases joint family got disintegrated under the impact of various forces of change. Therefore, as these ethnographic studies suggest, it is impossible to support linear transformation of joint family to nuclear family. These ethnographic studies done in the 1960's and 1970's can not be used to describe family types in recent times. In the absence of ethnographic studies on family in present times, drawing a generalized

---

[39] Raymond Owens, "Industrialization and Indian Joint Family", pp.163-165, in P.K.Roy (Eds.), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence*, (New Delhi, 2000).

conclusion is very difficult. Therefore in the following section an attempt has been made to examine growth and patterns of urbanization, and to observe the changes in the family structure by using quantitative data, obtained both from primary and secondary sources.

Urbanization and the Family

The process of urbanization finds its most visible expression in the growth of urban areas – or in other words, in the population shift from rural to urban. One of the simplest ways to measure urbanization is to calculate the historical trend of the proportion of the population residing in rural areas and in the urban centers. Census data for India for last five decades present a concrete picture of the increasing urbanization of society.

According to census convention, an urban area with a population of 100,000 or more is called a 'city'. The concept of 'town group' was first introduced in 1951 to include urban areas adjacent to cities with population of 100,000 or above. In the 1961 census, the categorization of places as town groups was extended to all urban areas. It may be noted that in the 1961 census, the eligibility test for determining whether or not a place was a town, were more rigorous than in the past censuses. Briefly, the test adopted in the 1961 census were; (a) a density of not less than 1,000 persons per square mile; (b) a population of 5000; (c) at least three fourth of working population dependent on non-agricultural activities; and (d) a few pronounced urban characteristics. In the Indian census, urban areas are classified in the following manners:

Table-1

Classification of Urban Areas in India

Class	Population Size
Class-1	1,00,000 and above
Class-2	50, 000 to 99,000
Class-3	20,000 to 49,999
Class-4	50000 to 9,999
Class-5	Less than 5000

Source-M.K.Premi; 1983 (p-3)

During the course of approximately 100 years India has been changing from predominantly agricultural society to predominantly urban area. In 1901, more than three fourth populations lived in rural areas. By 2001, a little less than three out of four persons of India's one billion inhabitants resided in rural area, and slightly more than one out of four persons in urban places. Total urban population in 2001 stood at 285 millions (27.78 %), which is more than the percentages of Asia (21.10) and World's (10.02) urban population. Another outstanding fact is the extent to which India's inhabitants are increasingly concentrating in and migrating to urban centers of 100, 000 inhabitants or more. Whereas only 10.84 per cent of the Indian population was living in cities of 100,000 or more in 1901, by 1991, the figure had increased to astonishingly 64.89 per cent. The reverse trend can be observed for places under 5000 inhabitants for which the percentages are 6.10 and 0.23 respectively. The figure presented in the table 2 and 3 are indicative of these trends.

TABLE-2

Percentage and Growth Rate of
Urban Population Since1901.

Census Year	Percentage of Urban Population to Total population	Annual Exponential Growth Rate of Urban Population
1901	10.84	-----
1911	10.29	0.03
1921	11.18	0.79
1931	11.99	1.75
1941	13.86	2.77
1951	17.29	3.47
1961	17.97	2.34
1971	19.91	3.21
1981	23.34	3.83
1991	25.72	3.09
2001	27.78	2.73

Source-Srinivasan, Kundu and Singh (2005)

Table –3

Classwise Distribution and Growth of Cities in India since 1901.

Census Year	Number of Towns						Percentage of Urban Population						Annual Exponential Growth Rate					
	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI
1901	24	43	130	391	744	479	26.00	11.29	15.64	20.83	20.14	6.10	-	-	-	-	-	-
1911	23	40	135	364	707	485	27.48	10.51	16.40	19.73	19.31	6.57	0.54	-0.73	0.46	-0.55	-0.43	0.72
1921	29	45	145	370	734	571	29.70	10.39	15.92	18.29	18.67	7.03	1.57	0.68	0.50	0.03	0.46	1.47
1931	35	56	183	434	800	509	31.20	11.65	16.80	18.00	17.14	5.21	2.24	2.89	2.28	1.59	0.89	-1.25
1941	49	74	242	498	920	407	38.23	11.42	16.35	15.78	15.08	3.14	4.81	2.59	2.51	1.47	1.50	-2.26
1951	76	91	327	608	1124	569	44.63	9.96	15.72	13.63	12.97	3.09	5.02	2.10	3.07	2.01	1.97	3.31
1961	102	129	437	719	711	172	51.42	11.23	16.94	12.77	6.87	0.77	3.72	3.50	3.05	1.65	-4.05	-11.6
1971	148	173	558	827	623	147	57.24	10.92	16.01	10.94	4.45	0.44	4.29	2.93	2.65	1.67	-1.14	-2.32
1981	218	270	743	1059	758	253	60.32	11.63	14.30	9.47	3.66	0.62	4.34	4.43	2.69	2.43	1.64	5.05
1991	300	345	947	1167	740	197	64.89	10.96	13.33	7.89	2.62	0.31	3.84	2.38	2.38	1.02	-0.13	-2.45
2001	393	401	1151	1344	888	191	68.67	9.67	12.23	6.84	2.36	0.23	3.42	1.76	1.76	1.64	1.93	0.80

Source: Srinivasan, Kundu and Singh (2005).
Notes: a. Size class-wise figures exclude Assam in 1981 and Jammu and Kashmir in 1991
b.All classes exclude six towns in 1941, four each in 1931 and 1921, and two each in 1911 and 1901 of Goa which could not be assigned to any size class as their population for these years is not available.

The Problem

The forgoing classification of the Indian population into different urban segments is one of the first steps in the analysis of the urbanization process. Such measures, however, are very limited indicators of urbanization. They cannot take into account the phenomena of social life associated with urban concentration. The concept of urbanization implies the spread of a certain mode of life called the "urban way of life". Urban sociologists argue that because of the spread of urban way of life in the industrial countries the social and cultural differences between the rural and the urban areas are rapidly disappearing. As far as family life is concerned, the statement of the vanishing rural-urban differentials is based more on general speculation than on empirical evidence. It is one of the objectives of this study to investigate the impact of urbanization on family structure. The popular belief that joint family has succumbed to modern force and giving way to nuclear family, may have its source in 1911 census where the theory of the disintegration of joint family system was advanced. This was concluded on the basis that the average size (4.9) of the Indian household was no greater than that of European countries. Desai [40] severely criticized the census data on family types. He expressed the view that the opinions about the joint family today were largely the subjective reflections of the individuals based on extremely limited and partial observations and largely conditioned by the socio-economic strata to which they belonged. To substantiate his point, he referred to the census publications. The Census Commissioner of India gave the following percentage of different types of households for whole of India:

---

[40] I.P.Desai, "The Joint Family in India: An Analysis", in Tulsi Patel (Ed.), *The Family in India: Structure and Practice*, (New Delhi, 2005), pp.81-83.

TABLE-4

Size and Number of Households in a Typical Village
and a Typical Town.

Types of household	Number of Households	
	Typical village	Typical Town
Small	33	38
Medium	44	41
Large	17	16
Very Large	6	5
Total	100	100

Source-P.K.Roy, (2000, 38)

Following observations can be made from the above table. Of the four types, medium households were the most numerous, which was what one would expect. That very large households with 10 or more members (numbering only about one in sixteen was) also not unexpected. But it seemed a little surprising that every third household in a village should be a small household with three members or less. Such a large proportion of small households was a prima facia indication that families did not continue to be 'joint' according to the traditional custom of the country and the habit of breaking away from the joint family and setting up separate households was quite strong. Again the proportion of small and medium households in a typical town is more than the rural small and medium households. Desai criticized this view on two counts. First, the statistics indicated that the joint family is still the major type of family structure in India. Secondly, the size of the household is not a valid indicator of whether it contained a nuclear or joint (1956: 144). According to Desai, it is not the number of individuals present in a household but the relationship between the members of

the household among themselves and with those of other households that determine the type of family of that household.

Therefore, the numerical size gives us no clue to the relational structure of the household group. Data on household size and structure has been subjected to severe criticisms by some Indian sociologists. Madan [41] feels that differences in household size over time and as between rural and urban should not assured conclusions regarding decline in the incidence of large households. He illustrates this by saying that the household size in 1911 was 4.6 which gradually rose to 5.2 in 1961 (Table-5). The trend is upward. Madan's covert assumption here is that if urbanization and industrialization is compatible with small family, then the trend should have been downward. But from those in Table-5 we find that the household size in India gradually increased uptill 1971 and then started to show the sign of decline and stood at 4.5 in 2004-05. It is very clear from the table that Madan could not foresee the future trend beyond 1961.

Table-5
Household Size

Years	Household Size
1911	4.6
1921	4.6
1931	4.8
1941	5.0
1951	5.0
1961	5.2
1971	5.49
1977-78*	5.0
1987-88*	4.9
1999-2000*	4.7
2004-05*	4.5

*Computed from sample survey 61st round.
Source: P.K.Roy (2000; p.262); NSS 61 Round (July04-June05)

---

[41] T.N.Madan, "The Hindu Family and Development", pp.270-271, in P.K Roy (Ed.), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence*, (New Delhi 2000).

The rise of household size from 4.6 in 1901 to 5.2 in 1961 was due to high birth rate. To understand this, population growth has to be placed in the context of the 'demographic transition' from high to low fertility and mortality rates. India was in the transitional stage of demography which was characterized by high rate birth but low death rate. After independence due to improved health services and strengthening of transport networks factors causing high death rate were brought under control while the birth rate continued to rise. The decline in death rate became sharper after independence in 1947, with the result that the population nearly doubled from an estimated 347.5 million in 1947 to 638.8 million in 1981[42]. Due to high birth rate a considerable number of child population added to total population during this second stage of demographic transition, which, in turn, contributed to increased size of household. Shah, on the other hand, feels that it is the older people rather the children who have contributed to the increasing average size of households because life expectancy at birth has been increasing.[43] As the figures in Table-6 reveal, Shah seems to have misinterpreted the trend in the average size of household. From Table-6, it is clear that the increase in the average size of households due to increase in the population in the age group 0-14 and 15-44. During the same period the proportion of population in the age groups 45-59 and 60+ remained almost the same or increased very little. The figures for 1981, 1991 and 2001 show another very interesting trend. From 1981 to 2001, the percentage of population in the age groups 15-44, 45-59 and 60+ started increasing while that of age group 0-14 started declining. Interestingly in the same period the average size of households declined and it was just 4.7 in 1999-2000 which is contrary to Shah's claim.

[42] M.K.Premi, *An Introduction to Social Demography,*p.35.
[43] A.M.Shah, "Is Joint Family Disintegrating?", Economic *and Political Weekly,* March , (March, 1996), pp.537-42.

TABLE-6

Percentage of population of various age groups since 1911.

Census years	Age Group			
	0-14	15-44	45-59	60+
1911	38.4	46.7	9.6	5.2
1921	39.2	45.7	9.8	5.2
1931	40.0	46.3	9.6	4.0
1941	38.2	46.1	10,1	4.4
1951	37.5	46.0	10.8	5.6
1961	41.0	43.1	10.1	5.6
1971	41.5	41.9	10.2	5.9
1981*	39.5	43.2	10.6	6.4
1991*	37.2	44.8	10.5	6.7
2001*	35.3	46.0	10.8	7.4

*Computed from statement-2.1, Report and Tables on Age, Census of India 2001

N.B-Figures in the table represent approximate values.
Sources-M.K.Premi (1999, Table 3.4); Census of India, 2001

Madan criticized census data because it does not give any clue about the relationship between size and structure of a household. For example a kin group of five in a household, Madan says, could turn out to be a simple household consisting of a couple and their three unmarried children, or a complex household of two brothers their wives and a child of one of the couples, or a complex household composed of a man, his wife, son, daughter-in-law and grandchild. Needless here to add that other possibilities also do exist.[44] But what are these other possibilities? Does it mean that the household comprises a person and his wife and their three grand children, or ego and his wife and his three sister-in-laws, or some other permutation and combinations? Such arguments can go on, but we cannot completely dismiss the importance of census data.

---

[44] T.N.Madan, *op.cit.* p.271.

Although there are inaccuracies involved in the Indian census counts, as there are in all censuses, yet this does not make the data unusable. Small and sporadic differences from year to year might be explained by inaccurate counting, but if there are any regular trends observable through the years, involving significant differences in the household size, we believe that these would reflect, in a general way, changes in the incidence and/or size of joint families. If census data is interpreted properly, it can definitely throw valuable light on the relationship between family size and family structure. Comparing size of household with fertility structure gives information about the composition of a household. For example total fertility rate in urban areas in 1971 was 3.1 while the average size of household in urban areas in the same year was 5.30. This means that households in urban areas are mainly composed of parents and their children. It is therefore evident that census data is definitely reliable for many purposes and can throw light on the composition of family.

Family in Urban India

The difference between household structures in urban and rural areas show substantial differences which simply can not be dismissed as minor one as Madan does.[45] Some important observations can be made from the Table-7.

Table-7 reveals that average size of household in urban places is more than its rural counterpart. Again it can be observed from the above table that the rate of decline in size of household in urban areas is more than that of rural areas. What explanation can we offer for these trends? It is obvious that the rural-urban difference in the size of households can not be dismissed as minor because this difference in the size is consistent over years. Obviously there is compatibility between urban system and conjugal family. This might be due to that joint family

---

[45] *Ibid.* pp.270-71.

is not advantageous in urban setting or it might be due to negative consequences of urbanization.

TABLE-7

Household Sized in Rural and Urban Places

Year/Period	Household Size	
	Rural	Urban
1961	5.20	4.97
1971	5.4	5.3
32nd Round (July 1977-june78)	5.2	4.9
38th Round (Jan.-Dec. 1983)	5.1	4.7
43rd Round (July 1987-June 88)	5.1	4.7.
50th Round (July 1993-June 94)	4.9	4.4
55th Round (July 99-June 2000)	5.0	4.5
61st Round (July 2004-June 05)	4.8	4.3

Source-Census of India 1961 and 1971 and National Sample Survey 61st Round.

Table-8 gives the percentages figures of joint and nuclear households. From the Table-8, it is clear that the percentage of joint families in urban areas is of course lower than that in rural areas. Although the difference is only about 6 per cent, it shows that change in the structure of family. The rural family too undergoing change As the table reveals the percentage of nuclear households in urban area has increased from 58.92 per cent in 1981 to an astonishingly 83.49 per cent in 2001. Significantly, even in rural area percentage of nuclear household has increased phenomenally from 52.72 in 1981 to 77.42 in 2001. What is more interesting is, contrary to popular belief, the percentage increase of nuclear households is more in rural areas than the urban areas. The figures are 31.9 and 29.42 per cent for rural and urban area respectively. Increasing fragmentation of

lands, high migration and spread of urban features in rural area might be the reasons. This also might be due to the fact that urban areas is fast reaching saturation point in term of high concentration of nuclear households.

Table-8

Proportion of Nuclear and Joint Households in
Rural and Urban India, 1981 &2001.

Place	1981			2001		
	Nuclear	Joint	Total	Nuclear	Joint	Total
Rural	52.72	47.48	100.00	77.42	22.58,	100.00
Urban	58.92	41.08	100.00	83.49	16.51	100.00
India	54.02	45.98	100.00	79.09	20.91	100.00

Source- 1991 & 2001 Census

N.B-Households with no couple have been omitted from calculation of percentage because such a household cant be categorized either joint or nuclear.

Table-9 gives the numbers and percentage of households in rural and urban areas by number of married couples in India in 2001. This table is particularly significant in that it throws light on composition of household. Census data has been criticized on the pretext that it does not give any clue about composition and thus meme number is not a sufficient criteria to know whether a household is joint or not (?). The censuses of 1981, 1991 and 2001 provide information regarding composition of household in term of married couples. These figures are very helpful in understanding change in the family system especially changes in the size and structure.

TABLE-9

Households in Rural and Urban Areas by Number of
Married Couples in India, 2001

Number of married Couples in a household	Total number of households		Percentage	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
None	14,496,830	6,753,528	10.5	12.6
1	95,830,848	39,191,901	69.3	73.0
2	20,184,109	5,773,011	14.6	10.7
3	5,466,151	1,437,983	4.0	2.7
4	1,569,172	383,379	1.1	0.7
5+	724,449	152,574	0.5	0.3
Total	138,271,559	53, 692,376	100	100

Source-Census of India (2001: Table H-7)

Notes: a. Percentages for rural and urban area have been calculated from Census of India, 2001, H Series.
b. The figures in percentage column refer to nearest approximate values.

From Table-9 it is clear that, the percentage of households with one couple (Nuclear Household) constitute 73.0 per cent which is more than double that the rest categories of households. Table-9 shows that 12.6 per cent of households in urban area are without a couple. This means this type of household can not be categorized either as joint or nuclear. If we exclude such figure from counting, then the percentage of nuclear household would further go up. In rural areas too nuclear household is predominant. Another important observation from this table is that the percentage of households with no couple is more in urban area than in the rural area. The figures are 12.6 and 10.5 per cent for urban and rural area

respectively. This might be due to two important facts. First, in the urban area the rate of divorce is higher than in the rural area. And this means proportion of single parent households in urban area is higher. Of course remarriage option does exist but divorcees at late age rarely remarry in India. Investigation into this aspect is beyond the scope of this study. Second many people migrate to urban area, especially to cities, to earn livelihood and support their families that stayed back in rural areas. Many studies reveal this trend which contributes to the higher number of couple less households.

Is Joint Family Disintegrating in Urban India?

Whether the extended or joint family has undergone any changes due to industrialization and urbanization and whether the nuclear family is functional for urban industrial society are questions which have divided Indian sociologists into two groups.

First group argues that the nuclear family is functionally suited for urban industrial society. A number of studies in India show that the extended family is very important in rural areas and that the nuclear or conjugal family stands as a relatively independent unit in urban localities. Burgess and Locke (1953) held that the disintegration of extended family proceeded further in the city than in the country. The second school holds that the family has not changed as radically as has been argued by first school of thought. Many researches carried on disintegration of joint family prove this point. These arguments have provided a continuing debate on the effects of industrialization and urbanization on the extended family in India and elsewhere. It is important to observe and examine the changes in different regions of India, and with the quantitative data collected to make a comparative study in order to find the general trend. For the purpose of analyzing change, it is necessary to classify contemporary Indian families into different categories. Unfortunately in India, structure and organization of families have been classified into several confusing family patterns. This practice was

adopted by scholars due to the difficulties involved in defining the joint or the nuclear family.

The 'joint' family has not been taken as the broad and single category for purposes of analysis but broken into several units. These units are (1) collateral joint family; (2)supplemental collateral joint family; (3)lineal joint family; (4)supplemental lineal joint family; (5) lineal collateral joint family; (6) supplemental lineal-collateral joint family; (7) small joint family; (8) intermediate size joint; (9) fraternal; (10) fraternal joint; (11) lineal-fraternal joint; (12) other joint. Similarly 'nuclear' category has been classified into several sub-categories, such as: (1) pure nuclear of the single-person-either 'male' or 'female' type; (2) nuclear; (3) supplemental nuclear; (4) sub-nuclear; (5) supplemental sub-nuclear; (6) incomplete; (7) conjugal; (8) sibling; (9) 'male' or 'female' single-person with kin; (10) conjugal with kin; (11) sibling with kin; (12) two-member type; (13) transitional; (14) surviving kin; (15) independent nuclear; (16) dependent nuclear; (17) widowed members and children; etc. Thus in India, once can get an idea about the India family system of today only in terms of varying and emerging patterns of family living. It will not be wise to prefer several types of family, because it creates complexity in the study of family types and also of its dynamic aspects. Many of these categories overlap and could be collapsed into a few broad sub-categories. Therefore if following types of families are adopted according to Indian context, such as, (1) Joint family, (2) Transitional family and (3) Nuclear family, it can be used anywhere in India, and through this it is possible to study family types as well as its changes under any impact.

Joint family is classical type of family described in sacred and secular literature. In this patriarchal joint family, the household is both structurally and functionally joint based on six criteria as its basis: kitchen; common residence; common purse; common social functions; common authority and common property. A clear psychological unit exists in the family. The members up to three generations comprise of near relatives who are connected through blood, as well

as near kin and agnates. This larger family group as a whole consists of several genealogically related simple families which as collaterally joined into a complex family.

Nuclear family is a family type which is either with or without unmarried children and with or without a widowed parent. It is a residential unit which centers around the spouses and their children, if any.

Transitional family comprised all patterns or forms of families which are in the process of transition from joint to nuclear. They are components of joint family, having certain of its criteria as the basis. They are viewed by variously named as 'extended', 'quasi-joint', 'marginal-joint', 'traditional-joint', or vaguely as 'potential-joint'. These are point in structure either lineally or collaterally.

Some sociologists have regarded transitional family as the modern joint family and on that questionable assumption concluded that though structurally different from the old one (read joint family), the notion of the disappearance of joint family is myth. They try to maintain that joint family is not disintegrating in order to function as independent units but adapting to new patterns which have the same degree of jointness. Kapadia has argued that the distinction in structure is insignificant in that sons in modern family are dearer to the head and that since the pattern imposes less strain on its members, the sentiment of jointness is found to be more intense. As it stated in the previous section, Desai feels that modern joint family has given up some of its basic criteria such as common residence, common kitchen, etc. Desai has regarded these as insignificant. To him, what matter most are the property, income, and right and obligation between persons.

A.M.Shah[46], in a similar vein, states that joint family is an institution with several dimensions, one of which-a basic one-is the household. According to him, if joint family has undergone any change, then it is the household aspect

---

[46] A.M.Shah, *op.cit.*p.537

which has been affected. But what must not be forgotten is that joint family is actually a common residence group.[47]Both Kapadia and Desai admit it. Furthermore, common residence has been the main criterion that has been used for the joint family in Indian law. Therefore residential aspect of joint family can not be ignored. According to these sociologists, structurally the traditional family appears to be breaking down, functionally it is not so. But the functions of the family go hand in hand with reduction in size and content.

For instance, in the process of urbanization, the housing problem in the towns limits the number of family members who can live together. Many non-material social functions of the family also disappear or at least shrink in importance. It follows that the change is the greatest wherever the family is most extensive in size and most inclusive in its functions. Again structural change bringing important functional changes would lead to a change in the relationship within the members of the family. For example, the relationship between husband and wife in a conjugal household in urban area may be significantly different from what it would be, if they live in the joint family residence. It is therefore follows that structural and functional changes go hand in hand. Again Desai feels co-residence and common kitchen are not as important dimensions as intra-familial relationships are. However the so-called intra-familial dimension is not peculiar to India alone. In every society some kind of relations between 'family of orientation' and 'family of procreation' is found and it is true to both east and west. Most research on whether the extended family is undergoing a breakdown in significance in the industrialized West has concluded that urban dwellers generally maintain non-nuclear and non-conjugal kin ties. Elizabeth Bott, Young and Willmott, and Raymond Firth emphasized the importance that extended families ties still remain the lives of many citizens of London. Morris Axelrod[48] has reported that over three-quarters of those he studied in Detroit see their

---

[47] K.M.Kapadia, *Marriage and Family in India*, (Bombay; 1961), p.249. See also A.R.Desai, "Symposium", pp.104-5.

[48] M. Axelrod, "Urban structure and Social Participation", *American Sociological Review*, Vol-21, pp.13-17.

relatives at least once a month. In spite of these realities, the dichotomy between nuclear-joint has been accepted in the West. The kin contact in India may be more intense, emotional and more frequent than in the west but these little dissimilarities should not be a basis to present the cases of India and West as two extreme cases. Rather it should be treated as just a matter of degree.

Nearly every study conducted in India on family change suggests that the traditional Hindu joint family changing. From a study conducted by Desai (1956) in the town Mahuwa, we find the percentage of residentially nuclear families to be 53 per cent whereas 32 per cent are real joint: and only 15 per cent are of transitional type. Even in Kapadia's (1951; 289-290) Navarasi data, the functional castes following multifarious occupation show a gradual increase of nuclear families, while the Patidars and Banias who are businessmen, show a gradual decrease in nuclear families. As has been examined earlier, the studies conducted by M.Ames, P.K.Roy, R.Ownes, and A.D. Ross, reveal that joint family is changing into other type of nuclear families. Then how do we explain the complex family patterns found in the different regions in the country? Here Ogburn's concept of 'cultural lag' is an excellent tool to explain the Indian reality. Principal family types, which are found in most societies, are nuclear and joint or extended which are two extreme family types, because there is no family smaller than nuclear and bigger than joint family.

But in India many authors have emphasized on different types of families that can not be categorized into these above two types. But all these family types fall in place between the nuclear and joint families which in our term are transitional families.

The concept of cultural lag states that change in material culture is faster than the non-material culture. Thus change in beliefs, ideas, customs and mentality take longer time than change in the material environment. Practices such as helping relatives, maintaining contact with family members, submitting

remittance etc. are reflection of cultural lag. These may be considered as remnants of the traditional joint family customs, which could not shake-off immediately. Social situation may be temporary or transitional and may in due time undergo further change, even radical transformation. Social disorganization is the first stage in family reorganization. In the process of this social transformation, new forms of thought and behavior emerge. This suggests the different family pattern one experiences in India is not fixed or rigid but temporary.

Summary

In this chapter an examination has been made of the impact of urbanization and industrialization on families in urban areas. In the discussion of change in the family system, both qualitative and quantitative data has been presented and the general trend as observed in the present study shows changes in the urban family structure. The relevance of the 'fitness' of the nuclear family and the 'narrower range of kin recognition' which have developed have also been considered. The weakening of extended family identification and the reshaping of the family form into nuclear type as the consequence of urbanization and industrialization are shown in the present investigation.

Much of the confusion surrounding the view that the urbanization and industrialization of a population eventually lead to the establishment of isolated nuclear families as the basis kin unit evidently results from use of different criteria to define "kin unit". If the term is used to refer to residential groups, then most available evidence from world urban patterns including one suggest there is indeed a tendency for co-residence groups to approximate nuclear or conjugal family patterns. This also appears to be the case if kin unit refers to corporate groups of relatively fixed membership. Movement to the city not only serves to remove individual from close proximity with their patrilineages and matrilineages, it also serves to diminish the ties of migrants and their descendants to ancestral lands that formerly provided the economic base for lineage cohesion.

However, if one extends the meaning of kin unit to extra residential, noncorporate, a socializing and aid unit, then it is evident that neither urbanization nor industrialization works to fully isolate nuclear families from the larger kin group. Such kin ties outside the conjugal family are habitually maintained by urbanites, although their character often appears to be more voluntary and restricted in scope than in rural are. Of course such group is not family group in the sense that residence and common kitchen are two major characteristics of any definition of family.

Chapter Three
Modernization and Its Impacts on Family

Within the past century, the people of India have been strongly affected by the worldwide tides of social change. Such change had occurred as a result of the establishment of the British rule in India, the impact of Christianity, social movements, modern education, western values, the impact of industrialization, a share in the new economic opportunities and the modern political ideas. Apart from industrialization and urbanization, many other factors such as education, occupational differentiation, do seem to correlate with an increasing proportion of nuclear families and many studies have emphasized the effects of these forces on the family structure and function.

Empirical research has not settled the question of whether the nuclear family is gaining ground at the expense of the joint family under the stimulus of economic development and modernization. Proponents of two basic positions in the "joint family controversy" argue from different perspectives, a circumstance which makes it difficult to evaluate the relative validity of the two points of view. Those researchers who hold that the incidence of the joint family has remained relatively unchanged frequently invoke the normal functioning of the domestic cycle as the variable that produces the illusion of change in a basically stable situation. On the other hand, those studies that support the hypothesis of a transition form joint to nuclear family generally establish a correlation between a family type and a specific variable; if the variable has increase or will increase, as often seems likely, so will the proportion of the associated family type.

This chapter has two objectives which are given below:

(1)   To analyze various factors, other than Industrialization and urbanization, which have effected changes in the joint family system.

(2)   To critically evaluate such sociological research concerned with modernization and changes in family. And

History and Changes in Joint Family System

Indian society, in the course of time, has been affected by many factors such as invasions, internal wars, famines, floods, epidemics etc. As a consequence of these forces Indian society has experiences some sort of change. These crises, in altering composition of the population, foray people to move from one part of India to another, and introducing many new cultural patterns, must necessarily have affected the structure of Hindu society. In this context Desai[1] points out that joint family system has, "always been changing" is evident from the history of changes in such matters as the rules of exogamy, the laws of succession and inheritance and the composition of its households. Even before the advent of the technological age many factors were instrumental in causing joint families to split up or one member to leave and establish separate family of his own. The group of family itself often made it too large a unit to be manageable in one household family.

Naturally, the changes in the joint family system occurred from time to time. Fortes' concept of 'developmental cycle' is helpful to understand such changes. Fortes[2] held that joint family expands in the event of birth of children, disperses into different component units in the event of marriage of sons and daughters, gets rearranged when any member dies or departure by new members, and finally the cycle ends which is marked by the death of the founding parents. Birth, marriage, and death, thus, eventually produces changes in the structure of all families and can result in a fair amount of variation in a proportion of various family types in a given community from year to year. Such variation is random and should not be interpreted as a unidirectional change. These are natural changes. But the present day family change is not a normal development process, because normal development process does not create any conflict in the family

---

[1] I.P.Desai, "An Analysis" in "Symposium: Caste and Joint Family". *Sociological Bulleten*, vol-4 (1956), p.94.
[2] Mayor Fortes, "Introduction", pp.4-5. in Jack goody (Ed.), *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Group*, (Cambridge, 1958).

affairs. But now-a-days family conflicts, such as conflict of hierarchy, role conflict, changing role of women, parent-child relations, sexual frustration, etc, are very common in the industrial urban society.

Many scholars have argued that Indian society had been a static society and the internal dynamism in it was brought in by British rule. It seems this is a half truth. Most of the earlier intruders who came to India had settled within India's frontiers, were absorbed by India's superior culture and had become one of the land and its people. And because of this, India presented the picture of a stagnant civilization and a static and decadent society. However, British conquest was different. India, thus, for the first time encounter an invader who considered itself racially superior and culturally more advanced. The policies of British had a vast impact on various Indian social institutions including joint family. For some time it seemed that India was completely bowled over by the new Western ideas and Western values in life.

The new values came in the form of liberalism and evangelism emphasized the values of individualism, rationality and social justice. Evangelical Christianity emphasized the spiritual equality of human beings and an absolute Christian morality. The caste system, based on, assumption of spiritual inequality and expressing itself in social inequalities, the many megico-ritual practices of everyday Hinduism, and the distinctly inferior treatment meted out to women, were among the main targets of the criticism of Christian missionaries and, to a greater extent, of Indian social reform. This produced diverse reactions. Some English-educated Bengali youth (known as Derozios) developed a revulsion against Hindu religion and culture, gave up old religious ideas and deliberately adopted practices most offensive to Hindu sentiments, such as drinking wine and eating beef. More mature minds led by Rammohun Roy were certainly stimulated by Western ideas and Western values but refused to break away from Hinduism; their approach was to reform Hindu religion and society and was to deny superiority of Western culture and prevent India from becoming a colorless copy

of Europe; they drew inspiration from India's past heritage and reinterpreted it in the light of modern rationalism. The various reform movements gave the much needed confidence to educated Indians who had been demoralized and uprooted from their mornings by propaganda of western cultural superiority. These reform movements reassured Indians about the greatness of their ancient religion and their rich cultural heritage. The same set of circumstances – the impact of modern education, rational, humanitarian and scientific approach to life – which ushered in – both in action and reaction – reform movements in religion were largely responsible for social reform movements in the 19th and 20th centuries. Social reform became an integral part of religion reform in India and this was equally true of Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, Arya Samaj, Ramakrishna Mission, and Theosophical Society in Hinduism as also among the Muslims, the Parsis and the Sikhs. Hindu social reform movements in India has passed through distinct stages in the history of social reform in India, viz., first phase of individual revolt and reform together with strong religious links from Rammohun to the early 1880s; the second phase was marked by the elevation of social reform movement to a rational plane as exemplified by the efforts of Behramji Malabari and the Indian National Social Conference; the third stage began when social reform was identified with a regeneration of the traditional spirit of the nation and is popularly associated with the activities of 'extremist' leaders of the early 20th century. To it may be add the fourth phase under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi when social reform become a main plank in the all round regeneration of Indian society.

The social reform movements in India aimed at uprooting social evils, and inculcating in men and women the spirit of sacrifice for the general good of the society. The first and foremost social problem that attracted enlightened opinion was the need for a better deal for women in the society. Another social evil that was a major concern of the English educated and Hindu intelligentsia was the caste restrictions in Hindu society and the degrading position of the lower castes, especially the untouchables. One aspect of the extensive social reform movement

had an impact on the joint family. Universal education, emancipation of women, removal of caste disabilities etc. were the main aims of these movements, which in turn, had effected changes in the joint family system.

India's struggle for the independence was undoubtedly one of the major factors in shaking up the older customary patterns of behavior. It forced both men and women to move out into a wider world and break many previous habits. It would be not an exaggeration to say that Hindu women, in particular, the move must ushered them into the modern world.[3] The freedom struggle brought women from the four walls of home where they had been confined, rather forced for centuries. After independence government brought many acts to empower and educate women, for removal of caste disabilities, and to discard age old practices. Besides government's quest for development of the nation brought large scale internal migration which had a profound impact on the joint family system. The force of modernization and globalization also tend to inculcate among people a set of universal values, which are contrary to value of Hinduism and joint family ideal.

Westernization, Modernization and Joint Family

Westernization refers to all cultural changes and institutional innovations in India as this country came into political and cultural contact with the western nations especially Britain. Srinivas[4] defines westernization as *"changes brought about in Indian society and culture as a result of over 150 years of British rule, the term subsuming changes occurring at different levels....technology, institutions, ideology and values."* Emphasis on rationalism, social justice, liberalism, and humanitarianism are part of westernization which led to series of institutional and social reforms in India. On a wider plane, Westernization includes a scientific approach, emphasis on materialism rather on spiritualism,

---

[3] Nayanatara Sehgal cited in Ross, *The Hindu Family in Urban setting*, (New Delhi; 1961), p.24.

[4] M.N.Srinivas, *Caste in Modern India and Other Essays*, (London; 1962), p.42.

individualism, liberal approach towards various problems of the society, humanism, equality, egalitarianism and rationalism. Establishment of scientific, technological and educational institutions, rise of nationalism etc. are all by-products of westernization. On the other hand, modernization has come to be widely used to describe he changes brought in a non-Western countries on the lines of West European and North American countries that are more advanced technologically, politically, economical and socially. Inkless finds that there are certain attitudes shared by people in modern societies irrespective of cultural differences. Modernization studies typically deals with the effects of economic development on 'traditional' social structure and values. Modernization cannot be described adequately as it has come to be associated with many diverse dimensions of social change. This has also led to many interpretations. It is at times treated as a process of change, while in other contexts it is considered as a goal towards which every society is moving or will strive to move. The contemporary social scientists tend to see the objective conditions of modernity as critical levels of industrialization, urbanization, high standard of living, rising per capita income, development of civilization and broadness of view point. Modernization is also a process that aims at achieving values and attitudes that are universally accepted and common to modern societies. Lerner[5], after considering the suitability of different terms, has advocated the use of 'modernization' to refer to a "dis-quieting positivist spirit" diffused among a wider population and touching public institution and private aspirations. Modern man has developed a degree of self-consciousness surpassing that of any previous epoch. The mental horizon has been expanded and at the same time narrowed with the extremely rapid multiplication of separate domains of work and life, of specific outlooks, and of specific social units.

After independence social change in Indian society is mostly related to modernization process. Spread of education, development process,

---

[5] R.N.Saksena, "Modernization and Development: Trends in India", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol-21, (September, 1972), p.91.

humanitarianism, social justice, empowerment of women etc. are consequences of modernization process. In a world of profound and accelerating changes, the institution of joint family has perforce to withstand their repercussions, and the question is whether it has succeeded in doing so. In India particularly, the post-independence period has witnessed a social, cultural and economic upheaval which has not left the family unassailed but has affected it in its various aspects. The social and legal phenomena which have appeared and developed in the course of this transformation give us an indication of the impact of the times on joint family. Legislation in the form of various acts has profound impact on joint family. No doubt these acts did not deal with the joint family but with its various aspects. If these legislations can be regarded as State intervention on family matter, it would be helpful for analysis of changes in the joint family system. Thus the problem of state intervention is that it accelerated the breakdown of social bonds instead of counteracting it. Any interference of external powers-political or social authorities – must act dissolvingly upon it, because it affects the fundamental principle of the family as a social institution – the principle of solidarity. Kapadia[6] states administration of the Hindu law by British courts resulted in the disintegration of the joint family organization, and assertion of the individual's inherent right in the property held by the head of the family. Agrawal[7], on the basis of his study of Marwari community of Mumbai, predicts that the Income Tax law and the new estate duty will go even further in disruption of joint family because such tax and duty tend to increase the tax amount if members of a family lived in the same household. Beals[8] argues that the change in the legal position of the joint family, and the use of law courts, explains why all but one of large families divided after 1920. In a globalize world, joint households are falling by the wayside. The Indian family – large, noisy, with parents, children, uncles, aunts, cousins and grandparents, all living together under a single roof, squabbling but presenting a united front to the world – more of a

---

[6] K.M.Kapadia, *Marriage and Family in India*, (London;1958), p.238.

[7] B.R.Agrawal, "In a Mobile Commercial Community", in Symposium: Caste and Joint Family *Sociological Bulletin*, vol-4 (1955), pp.144-145.

[8] A.R.Beals, "Interplay among factors of change in a Mysore village". P.92 in Mckim Marriott (Ed.), *Village India*, (Chicago;1955).

Bollywood reality now. Urban sprawl and spiraling cost of living do not allow three generations live together. And modernity is kicking in.[9]

Prior to independence, the various acts passed under the British rule, were largely under Indian leadership. Between the years 1829 when the Abolition of Sati Act was passed by Lord William Bantick and the year 1956 when the Hindu Marriages and Divorce Act was passed, about 20 laws have been enacted affecting different aspects of joint family. The Hindu Widow Remarriage Act (1856) and the Special Marriage Act (1872) legalized widow remarriage and marriage by a Hindu outside his caste and religion. They were not followed by spate of marriages of one type or the other, but even by legalizing an erstwhile forbidden act they served to reduce the control that the family could have on its members.[10] Dr. M.A.Rauf [11] considers that Hindu joint family, particularly in cities, has been greatly influenced by the introduction of English common law. Dr. Rauf illustrated this point by describing the "Gains of Learning Act" which provided that a man could keep his income from his professional or civil earnings as his own separate property. This did not always has great practical effect for the moral pressure of his family would still often compel the man contribute to the common pool. But if the man wanted to be free from family liability he would always plead this Act. More far reaching legislation has been that relating to property and inheritance rights. The "Hindu Woman's Right to Property Act of 1937" allowed widows to inherit property, and finally in 1956 the "Hindu Succession Act" gave further rights to women to share in the father's property. The "Hindu Law of Inheritance of 1929" recognized females such as son's daughters, daughter's daughters, and daughters as heirs after the death of father's father. It was by the use of these new laws that this right of property was altered. These laws had considerable impact on structure and function of joint family indirectly because they altered the age old role-relationships and practices. Although such laws are common to both rural and urban areas, yet, given the

---

[9] Dayamati Datta, A special Article on old age, *India Today*, July 2007, pp.54-55.

[10] M.S.Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, (Bombay:1968), p-54.

[11] M.A.Rauf cited in A.D.Ross, *The Hindu Family in Urban Setting*, (Toronto:1967), p.26.

general awareness level in urban areas being high and concentration of law enforcing agencies in urban places, the impact of these laws on joint family in such areas tend to be more intense. The impact of these legislations on joint family has been reported by Mancher (1962:236-237) and Gough (1952: 79, 81).

The change in the status of women in India was another factor in the changing pattern of the family. The political movement of Mahatma Gandhi brought many women out of their sheltered homes into public light. They fought side by side with the men in the struggle for freedom, which lasted for at least thirty years. Women faced arrest, led non-violent demonstrations, gave political speeches, and organized women's associations which spoke up both for freedom and for the rights of women. Social emancipation of women began in nineteenth century merely as a plea for the education of young girls. Mahatma Gandhi championed the cause of women in the areas of marriages, education, and individual rights from the time he began the struggle for freedom until his tragic death. He was instrumental in having the status of woman changed radically within the last 40 years. The post-independence phase has witnessed a tremendous upsurge for equality and gender justice. The urban women are showing mass awakening for their rights. Female literacy has increased from 8.0 per cent in 1951 to 54.16 per cent in 2001. No longer is the woman confined to the kitchen. Her horizon has become much wider.

The development and application of new technology affects the whole character and social significance of the family. The increasing numbers of industries take both the work and the worker out of his village home. Above all, these draw ever larger number of women into workshops, factories and offices. The new family which has emerged in the process of this application of technology to industrial production is more dependent upon a number of other production units for the satisfaction of its many wants. Thus urban family has become a consumption unit. With the impact of forces of modernization/westernization, there were significant changes in the position of

the wife and mother in the family, and especially her relations with her husband. With the increase of education among women, especially in urban areas, their taking up occupations outside the home before marriage, and their exposure to various modern values through the mass communication media they were unconsciously beginning to make more and more decisions for themselves. They were developing a more independent judgment in the areas formerly denied to them. This naturally brought about changes in the husband's role-expectations of the wife. It called for mutual readjustments and highlighted new tensions in the home.

The age of marriage for girls has been increased by law. The "Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Act" of 1976 set the age of bride groom at 21 and of the bride at 18 years of age. This increase in the age at marriage would allow the prospective bride to have some basic education and some freedom prior to her entry into the joint family. In the traditional family the bride was usually a child (5-12years) when she entered her household, and was brought up within the close confines of the family. This contact may add to her feeling of "independence." The constitution of India gives women a status equal to men. There have been attempts to reserve seats for women in political bodies. The visible achievements of women-as teachers, as doctors, as soldiers, and as explorers – have demolished some extent the patriarchal notions of confining women's role to home and hearth. These achievements are made mostly at individual level and mainly by urban women. The elevated status of women tends to create a conflict between what patriarchal values expect from them and what they themselves want. In sum, it can be said that the doors for educational, economic, social, political and cultural opportunities have been opened for women and it is creating tensions in the patriarchal joint family.

Some studies have been made to investigate whether the women of today like to live in joint families. Merchant[12] in an opinion enquiry found that 75 per cent of women of women opposed the joint family system and only 13.9 per cent were in favor of it. The enquiry further revealed that even the male graduates who were not opposed to the joint family, in principle confessed that the joint family cramped them and their wives resented living in the joint family. Ross[13] in her study of Bangalore city found that young modern women do not want to live in joint family and desire to have separate homes more than the men. Women want to marry men who either live far away from their families or else afford to set up separate households on marriage, for this will enable them to become independent form their mothers-in-law. The Women Mood-2[14] study conducted by Cogito Consulting of PCN Ulka Group has thrown several interesting light on women's attitudes and changing roles. Women across the bigger cities of India, belonging to both socio-economic classes SEC A and B, are seeing their roles changing. They describe themselves not as housewives but as 'home managers'. They claim to be handling all the affairs of the house, not just cooking and cleaning. They have taken over the banking duties, are paying bills, handling school matters and more. They want to share greater burden of their business, trade or managing the finances of houses. What is interesting is that, the first study of women, *women mood-1,* done five years ago had pointed to this phenomenon in the metros, among SEC A women, but now the trend has spread to tier-2 cities and to SEC B women as well. They want more independence which is not possible in joint family. Kapadia[15] conducted survey consisting of 347 graduates in Poona and Gujarat. He reports the most of women college graduates are in favor of nuclear families and only 14 per cent were in favor of joint family living. These surveys are thus indicative of a general trend away from the joint family. All these studies

---

[12] K.T.Merrchant cited in Sudha Kaldate, "Urbanization and Disintegration and Rural Joint Family", *Sociological Bulletin,* vo-l.11 (1962). pp.103,111.

[13] A.D.Ross, *op.cit* .pp.49-50.

[14] Women mood-2 study has been published in "The Economic Times", 10/7/07.

[15] K.M.Kapadia cited in Ben Schlesinger, "The Changing Patterns in the Hindu Joint Family System of India". *Marriage and Family Living,* (May; 1961), p.173.

incidentally tend to support the view that the modern joint family represents a mere phase in social reorganization and in course of time likely to disappear.

Education is a powerful force that affects joint family system. Education is usually assumed to play an important role in shaping the structure of a family. Traditionally education has been the privilege of upper castes and was not accessible to lower castes and women. The earliest attempt to educate people of India was made by Christian missionaries. They were very enthusiastic in spreading education throughout India. The British established many schools and colleges to educate masses. Indian social reformists too took initiatives in this regard and especially enthusiastic in spreading education through vernacular languages. It can be said that hardly these efforts made any difference in the life of large masses. In 1951 the literacy rate was just 18.33 per cent, which due to the effort of independent government, arose to 65.38 per cent in 2001. Past few decades have witnessed education providing a channel for social mobility and migration, which, in turn, have affected the structure of joint family. Variation in structure automatically introduces changes in the functions and role-relationship as well. In India, the general trend seems to be that, as the level of education rises, the percentages of those in favor of the nuclear family increases. Various studies, conducted by researchers, are indicative of this trend. Goode argues that education has begun to cause the emergence of the nuclear family in India. Education is one of the main causes behind emergence of individualistic ideology. It is a step towards attaining an egalitarian society. Goode[16] feels that education has made itself felt in India even before industrialization and urbanization. The modest amount of changes in Indian joint family, he thinks, can be attributed to the new ideological elements – by products of education – than could be imputed to industrialization and urbanization alone. Morrison states:" *The proportions of joint familism and quasi-joint familism decrease as education increases, while the*

---

[16] W.J.Goode, *World Revolution and Family Pattern*, (New Your; 1963), p.204.

proportions of nuclear familism increase as educational attainment increases... "[17]

Ross' (1961) too identified education is one of the factors which have contributed to break up the traditional large joint family system. Education also altered role-relationships within the family and wider kin network. Gore conducted a study in Delhi area, including urban and rural residents and some 'fringe' villages near the city. He also obtained response from 100 additional families of men in professions and office workers who did not follow the traditional occupations. Their educational level among them was much higher than the average main sample. Most of the families in the main sample are migrants. The main sample conforms to the pattern of joint family living in behavior, role perception and attitudes. The additional sample, however, indicate that education and non traditional occupations do seem to introduce a certain measure of variation. These people are in less favor of joint family living. This is mainly due to the fact that education and entry into new occupations and professions have produced a lack of satisfaction with the old-style living in complex households.[18]

Chakraborty and Bhowmick[19] collected data from 1417 households in Calcutta city. They found that low education is highly pronounced among the non-familial units. The nuclear families, on the other hand, are characterized mostly by the medium level of education, while the converse relationship holds good for the extended structures. Their data indicates that there is no progressive correlation between education levels and different types of family.

---

[17] W.A.Morrision, "Family types in Badlapur: An analysis of a changing institution in Maharshtrian village." *Sociological Bulletin*, vol.8 (1959), p.66.

[18] .M.S.Gore, *Urbanization and Family Change*, p.232.

[19] P.Chakrabarty and S.Bhowmick, "Some Aspects of Household Organization and Family Structures in Calcutta", p.355. in P.K.Roy (Ed.), *The Indian Family: Change and Persistence*, (New Delhi;2003).

As far as attitude towards joint family is concerned, educated people mostly prefer nuclear family. Merchant's[20] study of 446 graduates shows that 60.54 per cent are in favor of nuclear family living. Even Kapadia's[21] study of 347 graduates in Pune and Gujarat indicates that only 41 per cent of male graduates were in favor of joint family living while the corresponding figure for women graduates is 14 per cent only. There are few other studies that support this trend.

In urban areas, cultural conformity and traditional patterns of belief and behavior tend to be broken and social change accelerated. In urban places the ratio of population to land is high. By its very nature it throws people into close contact with strangers, facilitates the rapid diffusion of news and fashions, and permits a high degree of individualization. Thus individualism in urban places is high. There are no quantitative indices of the extent and the development of an individualist philosophy in urban places. But this problem can be tackled by way of argument and day-to-day experiences one has. It can be argued that in India individualistic ideology is more likely to characterized urban population rather than rural population. Secular education has been major channel for spread of secular and individualistic idea. Since high numbers of educated people are found in urban areas, there would be high degree of individualism among people. The press and films is two other important channels for spread of individualistic philosophy among urban population. The assumption here is that these are channels of secularization which in turn depend upon level of education prevalent. Secularization obviously means loosening of kinship bonds and weakening of religious norms. Consequently people are under no compulsion to have relationships with others, especially outside the primary kin group. Durkheim's concepts of 'mechanical solidarity' and 'organic solidarity' are helpful here in understanding the rise of the ideology of individualism. Mechanical solidarity is solidarity of resemblance. People are homogenous, mentally and morally; they

[20] K.T.Merchant cited in Sudha Kaldate, "Urbanization and Disintegration of Rural Joint Family", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vo.11 (1962), pp.103-111.
[21] K.M.Kapadia cited in Ben Schlesinger, *op.cit.* p.173.

feel the same emotions, cherish the same values, and hold the same things sacred. Durkheim suggested that mechanical solidarity prevailed to the extent that ideas and tendencies common to all members of the society are greater in number and intensify than those which pertain personally to each member. This type of solidarity grows only in inverse ration to personality.

Organic solidarity, unlike mechanical solidarity grows out of differences between individuals in modern societies. Individuals are no longer similar, but different; their mental and moral similarities have disappeared. A society having organic solidarity is characterized by specialization, division of labor and individualism. Although Durkehiem used these two terms to differentiate between primitive and modern societies, this difference can be used to differentiate between rural and urban places as well, especially in developing countries where exhibit characteristics both primitive and modern societies. Economic independence of people too promotes individualistic ideology as it reduces dependence upon others, which in turn responsible for spread of individualistic ideology. If we study the modern joint family on an ideological plane, we observe that because of ideological clashes between the members of two generations, the same intensity of jointness has not remained in the family.

The degree of secularization is more in urban areas than the rural areas. In the past, secularization, where it occurred, was the exclusive property of the cynical elites who had lost faith in the religious myth of their ancestors. Now the idea that life on earth is the here-and-now has a meaning independent of the hereafter, is shared by the "masses".

India is a welfare state and it is enshrined in the preamble of Indian constitution. The preamble states that India is a secular, democratic and socialist state. Secularization of Indian state has resulted in passing of various acts. Marriage in India has now been freed from sacred domain. Like in the West, marriage is fast becoming a contact. Increasing incidence of divorce and desertion

is manifestation of this. Further, this manifestation of this impact, more so on urban communities and it may be due both to a rururban or semi-urban influx of population to the city and to the influences among other of education and legislation which are ameliorative in character. It is the legislation which has been instrumental in undermining the stability, on the one hand, of families which were already 'weak', and in giving an impetus, on the other hand, to those families who consider themselves as advanced and would not hesitate to take recourse to law. Divorce and desertion of late has become principal cause of family disorganization.

The take over of some functions of joint family by Government appears to have affected joint family solidarity. Education of children beyond formative years has been taken over by schools and colleges. Asylums and hospitals assumed responsibility of providing health care and protection. Joint family traditionally provided social security to old members, handicapped and widow. Now state and its agencies have taken these functions to a certain extent. Progress in a modern urban society does seem to emphasize the importance of nonfamilial socialization in systems of formal education and in occupational advancement, and to place a premium on friends rather than kin in meeting our needs for companionship. Now many voluntary and non governmental organizations are taking and sharing this responsibility with government.

K.M Kapadia[22] gives evidence that the introduction of certain social security programs such as pensions and provident funds in government and semi-government services, increased savings in banks and post offices, and an increased sale of insurance have given the individual a little more security, and this in turn diminishes his dependence on the joint family. Now-a-days there are proliferations of insurance companies that act as security provider to people during old age. Since independence government of India has been taking several steps in the form of various development and unemployment programmes that is

---

[22] K.M.Kapadia cited in Ben Schlesinger, *op.cit.*p.174.

bound to affect joint family solidarity. There is no direct evidence of effects of these programmes on joint family system. But it can be argued that programmes like Nehru Rozgar Yozna (NRY) and Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yozna (SJSRY) which provide gainful employment to urban unemployed and underemployed through self-employment, reduces dependence of youths on joint family. Economic independence is a powerful factor which produces chain reaction. For example, economic independence weaken authority structure in the family, which in turn cause strains in the role-relationships, which in turn may gives rise to conflicts, and finally may lead to separation of members from the family. Government is also taking very active steps to improve literacy rate and make higher education accessible to all.

The status of the elderly in the contemporary society has been altered. While there is some reason to believe that the ascendancy accorded to old age in the preindustrial world has been exaggerated, nevertheless, as vocational tasks increasingly demand skills that are passed on by formal agencies of socialization, the role played by the mature in the transmission of knowledge has declined. Another important factor is that due to increased life expectancy there are many more older people now than there previously were. In 1911, the percentage of older people aged 60 years and above was 5.2 per cent which increased to 7.4 per cent in 2001. The increased number has forced government to think in terms of special programs for them Government is implementing a plethora of programmes for the benefit of senior citizens.

For example, the Varishtha Pension Bima Yojna is a Government subsidized scheme sponsored by Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) with a assured return of 9 per cent per annum. Persons aged 55 years and above are eligible for life-long pensions. Some castes and sects have set up homes for their aged in pilgrim centers, thus giving a new form to the ancient idea of old persons spending the rest of their life in pilgrim centers. The community institutions also provide a more congenial environment than the government institutions. Older

people live in the conditions of discomfort and misery and are particularly vulnerable in illness or infirmity. These people are extremely dependent upon kin, specifically on their offspring, for relief from their solitude. Even though they may see their children with some regularity – and by no means insignificant number of such persons live too far from their children to make this possible very often – the visits may be brief and the periods between visits socially arid.

A survey conducted by World Health Organization in 2002[23] reveal the inaccessibility of elderly people to money, work, health, mobility and leisure. They were narrating how it feels to "talk to wall", "be burden in children, of disrespect and neglect that make "old age a disease." They were telling tales about the younger generation: of children splitting responsibility by separating mom and dad, taking care of parents by rotation, pushing parents to smaller rooms. And they blame it to all "changing scenario and value system" that exist "every where" and not just their homes. Prof. N.K.Chadha summarized the current situation of elderly in the following words; *"Two decades ago caring of the elderly was hardly an issue. Joint family was a good place for very young and old. There is a new premium now on privacy, personal choice and less tolerance for cramped communal living."*[24]

Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter an examination has been made of the impact of westernization and modernization on urban families. In the discussion of westernization, modernization and family change, case material has been presented and the general trend as observed in the present study shows change taking place in urban families, and this has been materialized due to changes in the different spheres of the lives of the people. Legal phenomena, government policies, emancipation of women, economic development, education and

---

[23] Dayamati Datta, *ops cit.* pp. 48-58.
[24] *Ibid.*

individualistic ideology, and the reshaping of the family form into a new type of family as a consequence of modernization and westernization are shown in the present investigation.

Some broad observations on changes in family system, mainly with reference to urban India as a whole, have been presented. It seems that the changes in the joint family system is not yet great but the direction of change is clear, a greater emphasis being laid on the conjugal bond in urban India.

Appendix-1

Year	Legislation	Purpose
1829	Sati Legislation	A regulation declaring the practice of sati or burning or burying of Hindu widows illegal and punishable by criminal courts.
1856	The Hindu Widow Remarriage Act	Legalized the remarriage of Hindus of all castes.
1870	Age of Consent Act	Rising the age of consent from 10 years to 12 years.
1929	Child Marriage Restraint Act	Minimum age at marriage for girls raised to 14 years.
1937	The Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act	Gave the Hindu widow the right to interstate succession equal to a son's share in regard to her husband's property to liable to devolution by succession.
1955	The Hindu Marriage Act	Minimum age for marriage as 18 for boys and 15 for girls.
1956	The Hindu Succession Act	Converted the limited life estate of a Hindu female to full and absolute owner.
1956	The Hindu Maintenance Act	Inserted certain rights of adoption which she had not enjoyed before.
1956	The Hindu Minority	Hindu women are empowered under this

	and Guardianship Act	Act to choose guardians for the adopted children.
1961	Dowry Prohibition Act	Prohibits giving or taking of dowry.

Source-Gulati (1995: 134-154)

Conclusion

Recent literature of family life in all countries strongly stresses the influences of total society, so that one might easily get the impression that family life is merely a function of culture and society. Experience in the India, with various types of families under similar social and cultural condition has shown that today we are apt to overrate the social and cultural determination somewhat, while underestimating the changes in the family. Such societal and cultural determinism among some Indian sociologists is very strong. On the other hand, Western sociologists while analyzing an alien society try to impose their own view while ignoring local reality.

The researcher, after preliminary readings, started with the assumption that family is not changing as radically as some theorists argue, and that there are regional variations in the family structure. As the research progressed many new facts came into the light gradually and the researcher forced to shift to this view that joint family is changing under the impact of industrialization, urbanization and modernization processes and it seems that the direction is toward nuclear family pattern. This does not mean that the researcher endorses the notion that the extended family is dysfunctional in industrial system, nor does he state that the nuclear family invariably emerges under the impact of industrialization, urbanization and modernization. What he observed is that joint family is changing in urban areas. Critical analysis of existing family studies points out that joint family is changing and there are regional variations in the family structure. In many cases, industrialization and urbanization appears to have strengthen the joint family while in some other cases, it seems that joint family is disintegrating under the impact of various forces of change. Therefore, in the absence of double point studies, it can not be concluded that joint family is changing into nuclear type. But these studies clearly point out that some changes have taken place in the traditional family structure and functions. However, researcher own interpretation of quantitative data from various sources shows that there is decline in the household size both in the urban

areas and rural areas and the rate of decline is more in the case of the former than the later. This trend seems to be due to urbanization and industrialization process. In India, factors other than industrialization and urbanization, appear to be related to this trend are (a) secular education, (b) development of market cash economy, (c) changes in family law or legal practices, (d) reform movements, (e) demographic factors, and (f) rise of individualistic ideology. These factors and their interactions with family have been discussed in forgoing chapters.

The joint family in India, although has some distinct features, is not a special type of family. Its equivalents are also found in China and Japan. Prior to industrialization, extended families were found almost every part of the world. Many anthropological studies reveal that nuclear families too coexisted with extended families. The extended family is suited to an agricultural economy. Dube and Beteille (1964:239) say that joint family is characteristic of landowning groups, as it provides many hands required for agricultural activities. Gideon Sjoberg (1966:159) argues that extended families have historically been found only among the wealthy elites in feudal cities because they could alone support such a unit in the pre-industrial society. So whatever be the case, it is obvious that common residence has been the main characteristic of joint family system. Further residence is the main criterion to define joint family in the Hindu law. The traditional joint family consisted of several households inhibited by its members. But these households were located in very close proximity, and very often in a single house and exercise of authority by the head and participation of members in the household affairs had not been a problem. If we observe contemporary scenario, it is evident that households comprising married couple and their children, are scattered far and wide, and thus their participation in joint household affairs has been hindered.

Some sociologists have argued that it is the residential aspect of joint family has been weakened, but other aspects still prissiest. This assertion certainly contains a graining truth. But it is equally true that everywhere some kind of relationships always there between family of orientation and family of procreation. Even in highly industrialized and modern states like USA and England, intra-familial relationships have been found (Wilmott 1957, Axelord 1956:15). Of course, intra-familial relationships are much stronger in India than in the West. But this should not lead us to conclude that the cases in India and the West represent two extreme forms. Thus what is found in India and in the West should be treated as just a matter of degree rather than two extreme cases. Desai (1964: 68-69) in his study of Mahuva town, shows that 95 per cent of families practice some kind of jointness. He supports his findings by classifying 'jointness' into as, traditionally joint, marginal joint, joint in term of property and joint by way of mutual obligations. But question arises, what is the use of such classification? Anyone can evolve such criteria and can show that every household under the sun practices some kind of jointness or other. India is still a semi-urbanized and industrialized state. If intra-familial relationships and frequency of interaction is emphasized then it would be better to prefer such concepts as 'kutumb' or 'parivar' rather than joint family which is originally a residential unit. It can be predicted here that in future intra-familial relationships will be further weakened, if not disappeared completely.

Ever growing migration, both national and international, has reduced kin contact considerably. The work culture in today's globalized World has produced stresses and strains in the family itself, let alone the joint family. The unemployment rate in India is still very high, which in turn, increases the number of temporary dependants in nuclear families.

This, however, does not mean that family has been treated here as a dependent variable. What is here argued is that there are certain features in joint family which are not suitable to modern day industrial society. Thus such features of joint family under impact of changing forces tend to disappear. And these lead to decrease in the size of the family as well as decreases in intra-familial relationships. Even with the weakening of many of its essential functions, the family has not been destroyed by urbanization and industrialization. This proves that family has a life of its own. Given the current situation in India, the intra-familial relationships are and should remain strong. Emphasis here is on humanism. Human beings are not just mere nuts and cogs in the urbo-industrial system. The process of industrialization and urbanization thus can not affect the humane part of individual.

Some sociologists have argued that industrialization and modernization in their various manifestations may serve to strengthen the joint family because an economic base has been provided to support the joint family (Friedi, 1964; Johnson, 1964). But whether this support is temporary or permanent – a question which has not been answered by these sociologists. It is beyond one's understanding why a person would continue to support other non-working members. There are some other sociologists who cite cases of collateral families and argue that joint family in urbo-industrial system is thriving rather than dying out. But they deliberately forget that fraternal or collateral joint family was never the common form of family (Gore, 1968: 235; Kurian, 1974) in the past.

Most of ethnographic studies available in India were carried out during 1960's and 1970's. These studies do not support linear transformation of joint family to nuclear family. In the absence of such studies in recent times, it is extremely difficult to understand change taking place in the family system. However, interpretation of quantitative data

obtained shows that household size has declined considerably and seems the direction is toward the conjugal family pattern.

A Word about Family Research in India

When a researcher enters into the world of family research in India, he has to encounter numerous difficulties. Extremely limited materials on family studies, the inadequate methodology, and dearth of data come in the way of research. In India, one can get an idea about the Indian family system of today only in terms of varying and emerging patterns of family living. Diverse classifications of family types exist. But none of them is suitable to every context. A researcher thus helplessly tempted to evolve his own classification in order to make family types fit into his own scheme of study. If one adopts simple 'nuclear-joint' dichotomy or 'nuclear-transitional-joint' type, it can be used anywhere in India, and through this it is possible to develop better methods and techniques for the study of family types as well as its changes under any impact. It is not wise thing to prefer several types of family, because it creates complexity in the study of family types and also of its dynamic aspects.

From the above it is apparent that one of the most important areas concerning Indian family that needs systematic investigation is the family structure. Taking for granted the separation of some significant forces of change, viz., industrialization, urbanization and modernization, the question needs to be investigated is what sorts of family patterns are now emerging. Since scholars are divided on the issue of whether joint family or the nuclear family is the dominant type in India today and they display a tendency to delineate varying types between these two extremes, it may be examined what family types are characteristic of specific family patterns now emerging in a given region or locality or community. We have seen that forces of change are bringing out changes in role expectations of

different family members as also in the inter-personal relations. Hence, it requires to be investigated as to what changes in role expectations and inter-personal relations correspond to family patterns and family types? An examination of these questions is likely to provide a fuller picture of modern Indian family in the region.

Bibliography

Primary Source

Censuses s of India-1961, 1981, 1991 &2001.

61 Round. *National Sample Survey*

Sivaramkrishnan, K.C., M.Kundu and B.N. Singh.2005. *Handbook of Urbanization in India.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Secondary Source

Ahuja, Ram. 2003. *Society in India.* New Delhi: Rawat Publication.

Ames, M. 1969. *Class, Caste and Kinship in an Industrial City of India.* Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

Basham, R.1978.*Urban Anthropology: The Cross Cultural Study of Complex Society.* California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Burgess and H.J.Locke. 1953. *The Family.* New York: American Book and Co.

Desai, A.R.1959. *Rural Sociology in India.* Bombay; Vora and Company

Desai, I.P.1964. *Some Aspects of Family in Mahua*. Bombay: Asia Publishing.

Dube, S.C. 1988. *Modernization and Development: the Search for Alternative Paradigm*. New Delhi; Vistar Publication.

Dunbar, G.1951.*India and Passing of a Empire*. London: Nicholson and Watson Ltd.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1973. *Tradition, Change and Modernity*. New York; Interscience Publication.

------------ and A.Sachar.1982. *Society, Culture and Urbanization*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Fairchild, H.P.1944. *Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Gadgil, D.R.1942. *Industrial Revolution in Recent Times*. London: Oxford University Press.

Goode, W.J. 1963. *World Revolution and Family Pattern*. New York: The Free Press.

-------------. 1965. *The Family*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India (Pvt.) Ltd.

Goody, Jack. 1958. *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Group.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gore, M.S.1968. *Urbanization and Family Change.* Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Harolombos, M.1997. *Sociology. Themes and Perspectives.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hatt, P.K. and A.J.Reisse (Eds.). 1957. *Urban Sociology.* Glenco: The Free press

Kapadia, K.M.1961. *Marriage and Family in India.* Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Karve, Irawati. 1953. *Kinship Organization in India.* Poona; Deccan College.

Kolenda, Pauline. 1987. *Regional Differences in Family Structure in India.* Jaipur;Rawat Publications.

Kurian, George. 1974. *The Family in India: A Regional Approach.* The Houghe: Mouton & Co.

Laslett, P(Ed.). 1971. *Household and Family in Past Time.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leslie, G.R. 1973. *The Family in Social Context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Levey, Jr. M.J. 1949. *The Family Revolution in Modern China.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MacIver, R.M. and Charles H. Page. 1988. *Society: An Introductory Analysis.* New York; MacMillan India Limited.

Marriott, McKim. 1955. *Village India.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Murdock, G.P. 1965. *Social Structure.* New York: The Free Press.

Ogburn, W.F. and Meyer Nimkoff. 1955. *Technology and Changing Family.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Parsons, Talcott and Bales, R.F. 1955.*Family, Socialization and Interaction Process.* New York: The Free Press.

----------. 1951. *The Social System.* New York: The Free Press.

Patel, Tulsi. 2003. *Family in India: Structure and Practice.* New Delhi: Rawat Publication.

Pernau, Margarit, Imitiaz Ahmad and Helmut Reifield (ed). 2003. *Family and Gender: Changing Values in India and Germany*. New Delhi; Rawat Publication.

Prasad, Geetanjali.2006. *The Great Indian Family*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Premi, M.K.1983. *Introduction to Social Demography*. New Delhi: Vikash Publication.

Puri, B.1966. *Cities of Ancient India*. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan.

Ramchandran, R.*Urbanization and Urban System in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Ramu, G.N.:1977. *Family and Caste in Urban India: A Case Study*. New Delhi: Vikas publication.

Rao, C.N.R. 2005. *Sociology*. New Delhi; Sultan Chand and Company.

Rao, VLS Prakash.1983. *Urbanization in India*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Ross, A.D.1967. *The Hindu Family in its Urban Setting*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Roy, P.K. (Eds.).2000. *The Indian Family*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.

Sandhu, R.S.2003. *Urbanization in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Shah, A.M.1973. *The Household Dimension of Family in India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Publication.

--------------.1998. *The Family in India: Critical Essays*. New Delhi; Orient Longman.

Sinha, Raghuvir. 1980. *Family to Religion: A Theoretical Exposition of Basic Social Institutions*. New Delhi; National Publishing House.

Singer, M. and B.S.Cohn (Eds.). 1968. *Structure and Change in Indian Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Singh, Yogendra. 2001. *Modernization of Indian Tradition*. New Delhi: Rawat Publication.

Sjborge, Gideon. 1960. *The Preindustrial City*. New York: The Free Press.

Srinivas, M.N. 1962. *Caste in Modern India and Other Essays*. London: Asia Publishing House

Thapar, Romila.1992. *A History of India.* New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Uberoi, Patricia.1993. *Family, Kinship and Marriage.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Wheeler, M.1960. *The Indus Civilization.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Young, M. and P. Wilmott. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Zimmerman Carle and T.K.N.Unithhan. 1975. *Family and Civilization in the East and West.* Bombay: Thacker & Co. Ltd.

ARTICLES

Axelrod, M. "Urban structure and Social Participation." *American Sociological Review.* Vol-21 (September, 1956). pp.13-18.

Bailey, F.G. "The Joint Family in India." *Economic Weekly.*Vol-20 (February, 1960). pp.345-352.

Betille, Andre. "Family and Social Change in India and Other South Asian Countries". *Economic Weekly.*

Chandrasekhar, S. "The Family in India." *Marriage and Family Living.* Vol.16 (November, 1951). pp.336-342.

--------------. "The Hindu Joint Family." *Social Forces.* Vol.21 (March, 1943). pp.327-333.

Datta, Dayamati.2007. "Home Alone", *India Today.* July.pp.48-58.

Desai, I.P.1956 "Symposium on Caste and Joint family; An Analysis." *Sociological Bulletin.* Vol.4. pp.85-146.

D'Souza, Victor. "Urbanization as a Perspective for Social and Historical Analysis in Developing Societies." *Sociological Bulletin.* Vol.33 (September, 1954). pp.91-98.

Friedi, E.1964. "Lagging Emulation in Post-peasant Society". *American Anthropologist.* No.66.pp.559-586.

Gulati, L.1995. "Women and Family in India: Continuity and Change". *Indian Journal of Social Work.* Vol.56. pp.134-154.

Johnson, E.1964. "The Stem Family and its Extension in Present-day Japan." *American Anthropologist.*No.66.. pp.64-72.

Kaldate, Sudha.1962. "Urbanization and Disintegration of Rural Joint Family." *Sociological Bulletin.* Vol.11. pp.103-111.

Nimkoff, M.F and L. Middleton.1960. "Types of Families and Types of Economy". *American Journal of Sociology.* Vol.66.pp.215-225.

Redfield, Robert and Milton Singer.1954. "The Cultural Role of Cities". *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* Vol-3. pp.53-73.

Saksena, R.N. "Modernization and Development: Trends in India." *Sociological Bulletin.* Vol-21 (September, 1972). pp.91-102.

Shah, A.M.1996. "Is the Joint Household Disintegrating?" *Economic and Political Weekly.* (March, 1996). pp.537-542.

Sinha, Ramesh. 1977. "Indian Joint Family: An Attempt Towards Taxonomic Refinement". *Man in India.*

Schlesinger, Ben. 1961. "The Changing Pattern in the Hindu Joint Family System of India". *Marriage and Family Living.* (May, 1961). pp.170-175.