

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

The term 'Family' has been employed in different ways by different writers. These variations are because of the different 'Frame of references' used by writers belonging to variety of disciplines. Variety of perspectives and dimensions are emphasized by series of social and behavioural scientists. In the simplest biological sense, the family consists of those individuals who are related by mating and descent. In the sociological sense, the family is the social group of intimate persons, most of them are blood relatives and some of them are through marriage institution, that is regarded as distinctive social unit. Nuclear family, called 'Conjugal group' or 'Marriage group' is made up of husband, wife and children. Joint family includes relatives of husband and wife staying in the same house. Family of orientation is the one into which one is born, and is 'socialized' or 'oriented', 'family of procreation' is the one which helps to establish family through marriage.

The significance of the family as a basic social unit has been established by empirical data since last couple of decades. The family has three main functions,

reproduction, care and nurture of children and mutual helpfulness for the peaceful human life in the society. The family as a social unit is built up and modified by the concerned society from time to time depending upon the social changes and the changed structure of society. The family is the social unit which smoothenes the burden of society and plays a most pivotal role in the easy functioning of society. But 'Family' has certain limitations too in discharging its functions. The fact remains that 'Most adequate' and 'Most symmetrical' families do contribute to the society's sounder development.

Social work as a profession falls mid way between healing and education disciplines. It draws insight from various social and behavioural sciences. In so doing, it becomes heavily dependent on researches in such disciplines. Researches in these disciplines are not necessarily conducted on the basis of social work profession's practice needs. Therefore practitioners and researches~~es~~ are not profited a great deal from each other. Family researches and family centred social work interventions are not exception from this truth. Hence, often social work profession is over-burdened with the dual responsibilities of research and research based actions. Field practitioners^t do expect social work educators and social work researchers to do

this arduous job of precise data on families in changing socio-cultural and psycho-social contexts.

Hill (1974) expressed "We are in a pre-paradigm phase with respect to the theory of family phenomenology". Thomas Kuhn too talked about paradigm and disciplinary matrix and later family sociologists, took it up as family conceptual frameworks which can guide family research (Rodman, 1980). These researches are expected to address unanswered family related problems and justification of various approaches to same.

Family cohesion and family adaptability are crucial aspects of Indian families. In present research these two variables are addressed alongwith various other dimensions of family functioning.

The Inter-relationship of Family and Society

Family has been the centre and core of many social processes and social sub systems. Family and most of the social legislations are having quite high relationship. In fact evaluating various family related and family centred problems, many social legislations have emerged and they are directed at improving the family functioning. 'Societal values' too largely depend upon 'family' as a socializing agent to take up responsibilities in

cultivating various ethical and work values. Societal needs, social organisations and economic institutions too rely heavily on family to facilitate their functions. Polity and religion, two strong social sub systems do depend heavily on family in discharging various tasks. Family is the most important vehicle to carry the cultural aspects. Social change, modernisation and other developmental endeavours are also governed by family in direct or indirect sense. Thus family is the focal point of attraction for variety of social, economic, education, cultural institutions.

Family:- It's Role and Functions in the Society :

Family is one of the most important sub-systems of the society. Not only it contributes as one of the sub-systems of the society but it is also helpful in enriching other sub-systems viz-economy, polity, religion etc. and these sub-systems too contribute to the positive functioning of the family. Individuals in the society are shaped by the family and family shares the larger burden and own the higher accountability of them as useful members of the society. Socialization through family is of paramount importance which is a critical determinant to the positive productivity of the individuals. Family on one hand socializes to make members responsible in the society, while on

the other hand it also regulates and controls the negative traits/characteristics/behaviour of the individuals. It is family which takes care of non-contributing individuals viz. mentally sick, mentally retarded, handicapped of various types, aged and social-dropouts. Thus family's role is quite wide right from socialization, care, development, opportunity facilitator to the conservator of culture. Smith and others (1975) identified 12 functions of the family based on various needs:

1. Reproduction
2. Socialization
3. Protection and safety
4. Economic security
5. Conferral of status
6. Conferral of role
7. Social control
8. Sexual fulfilment
9. Belongingness, love and affection
10. Physiological needs
11. Recreation and
12. Religious needs.

Transmission of Culture :

A social function of family : Cultural and racial continuity is assured through the medium of parenthood and family life. Transmission of culture, through family has

been considered the important aspect by family sociologists. Culture includes norms, values, beliefs etc. acquired by a member in the family. Individual members are respected by the status of the family in the society. Status of society is governed by the cultural aspects cherished by the family. Hence in the Hindu families cultural transmission function of the family plays a vital role.

The Changing Trends in the Family :

It is being argued that there is great difference between the families in past and families of today. The effects of industrialization and urbanization have not left families untouched. The changes appear to be shocking to the scientists and they have been concluding that the roles and functions of families are changing. It is losing its status and a process of disorganization of family pattern have already begun. Moreover, Parson, Mead, Toffler, Reissman, Fromm and several others have shown concern and argued upon the changes taking place in the family.

Though several functions of family has started getting weakned like educational, economic, recreational, care of handicapped, sick and aged, yet it continues to discharge some of the basic functions like reproduction and procreation, care and ~~nat~~ture of young ones and the most

important one is to provide affectional security to its members. Long ago, Ogburn (1929) concluded that the future strength of the family will depend on the 'affectional bonds'.

The reasons for these transitions in families may be, as researchers have pointed out, due to increase in personal mobility, and personal achievement, decline in status ascription, decrease in the parental authority and importance of grandparents, irresponsibility of children, changing values which are inconsistent to familial values, equalitarian role of male and female and increased responsibility of state.

Families in India are also in a state of transition as viewed by several social scientists. There are more of structural changes like nucleation of families, migration, education of female, changing functions etc. that show a decreasing trend of jointness (structurally) in the family, Acharya (1974) Gupta (1976) Naik (1979) Laxminarayan (1982) Singer (1968) Kapadia (1959) etc. have talked about the same.

It is difficult to get a true picture of contemporary family and also to say whether these changes (gradual/fast) will strengthen and promote families or weaken the families. However its future will appear to be break,

if the emphasis is on negatives and this is highlighted more. It is a powerful system in maintaining peace and order in society. If this is well recognized, it will remain a permanent reality.

Family and Urbanization/Industrialization : Towards the end of the nineteenth century, social scientists started showing concern about the changing make up of the family due to rapid urbanization and industrialization. Visible poverty, child labour, increase in the divorce rate, prostitution and such salient evils affected the smooth functioning of the family. The major work on industrialization, modernization with family perspective by Goode (1963) has a profound impact on family's cross-cultural researches in authenticating the view that industrialization led invariably to the decline in family functions. Chicago school of sociology and sociologists such as Earnest Burgess, E. Franklin, L. Wirth, W. I. Thomas contributed much in the development of family and urban sociology.

Various theories and concepts were offered by them to understand the phenomena of urbanism and its impact on the family life. The prevailing image of the urban life is both positive and negative. While it is a centre of learning, technology, light, communication and a variety of attractions, it brings pollution, alienation and indifference, insecurity

and instability because of its complexities, formal means of control, socio-economic heterogeneity, materialistic transactions, calculative rationality, sophisticated advancements etc.

Growth of slum should also be viewed in this phenomena of urbanization and industrialization. The search for jobs and various other pull and push factors bring the migrant villager to the city and finally landing into slum living. Family life in slum is typically characterized by dirt, squalor, disease and poverty. It gives rise to various evils and problems which affect the smooth functioning of family. Social Scientists have attempted to study slum families in this context as well as from various psycho-social and ecological correlates influencing them.

Family Process :

It refers to the interaction network in which adaptation of roles within the family structure, establishing and maintainingⁱⁿ relationship among family members, communication and ways of coping with conflict are included. Family process can be linked to the creation of new members by birth, the establishment of new roles through marital relationship and contribution by members towards welfare and development of all.

This studies the observable, ongoing interaction patterns of individual families rather than the social characteristics of family or attitudes and beliefs of individual family. To quote Williams (1983) "It is by this process that the exact shape of the set of relations which constitute the web of kinship in any given society at a given time is determined".

Broderick and others (1979) have identified five basic components which are necessary to constitute family process which are (1) establishing a pattern of seperateness and connectedness (2) Establishing a satisfactory congruence of image (3) Evolving family themes (4) Establishing the boundaries of the family's world of experience. (5) Evolving definitions of male and female and ~~older~~ and younger.

Assessment and analysis of such process with ongoing interaction and communication will be different and of great importance.

Marital Relationship and Satisfaction :

Marriage is one of the key sub system in the family. It is the base for family of procreation and a significant part of family process. Marital and family satisfaction are primary outcome variables because they reflect the

happiness with overall functioning of the family (Olson 1983). Literature on family studies have emphasized three areas - the satisfaction with the marriage, with their family lives and with the overall quality of their lives. Researches on marital satisfaction are increasing. Hicks and Platt (1970) provided a decade review researches on marriage. In 50's and 60's researchers were studying marital integration. During 1970's marital satisfaction was the major variable in several hundred studies (Olson 1983). Marital satisfaction has been enjoying a central place in family studies (Lewis and Spanier 1979). Marital satisfaction includes areas viz. communication, sexual relationship, child rearing, management of household affairs, leisure, religious orientation, and social relations etc. Currently marital quality is being studied more along with marital stability. Lewis and Spanier (1979) indicated four major patterns on 'marital quality' and 'marital stability' dimensions; they are - High Quality and High Stability, High Quality and Low Stability, Low Quality and Low Stability, and Low Quality and High Stability.

Family and Communication :

Communication is the backbone in assessing family relationships and dynamics. Effective and right type of

communication brings family members together emotionally, and makes family functioning more meaningful and sound. It is through communication that members in the family transmit their concern, feelings, ideas, reactions and other human transactions. It facilitates task accomplishment, goal achievement and promotes personality development of family members. Therefore it is a psychosocial affair which has the potential for promoting or breaking the family.

The study of communication pattern becomes imperative in order to understand family relationships, roles and other family dynamics. Researchers have focussed upon goals, content, method (verbal/non verbal, direct/indirect/intrapersonal/interpersonal) of communication, factors affecting effectiveness and theories of communication have also been aimed at (Carnes, 1980, Miller, 1982, Grando, 1976).

Family and Role Orientation :

Family is playing a very vital role of inducting its members to their roles and responsibilities. Roles are patterns of behaviour that form the interactional matrix for interpersonal and group functioning. They are beliefs or expectations that people ought or ought not to behave under appropriate conditions. Each role fits into a

position which an individual has. Each role has its complement and it can not be performed in isolation unless there is a counterpart to receive it and respond. Thus a mother's role can not be thought unless there is a child role or husband's role with wife's role etc.

Bates (1956) defined roles "cluster of norms make up roles and cluster of roles make up position in the same system". Family defines, clarifies and facilitates the easy acceptance of societal norms, value, beliefs, and helps members have expected behaviour, attitude, duties based on them.

Role - induction is not an end in itself. Family is extending its function by smoothening various problems associated with role performance by its members viz. Role overload - Absence of the either of the spouse and responsibilities carried out by one spouse only as 'Both the parents'; Role strain - poor capacity of the family members to perform various assigned tasks; Role stress - Certain psycho-social barriers in performing roles effectively; Role overlapping. Roles are not defined properly. Therefore duplication of roles or overlapping occurs; Role transition - where individual prepares himself for a new role. Role competence, Role behaviour or role enactment

have the same connotations of meaning - an ability to perform a certain pattern of behaviour and compliance to it. Researchers have bothered themselves to find out not only multiroles played by an individual in a family but also about the typologies as well as on the various concepts on roles.

Personality Issues :

This is a sensitive area for assessing and predicting family dynamics. Each member of the family has a distinct personality which interacts with others. There are possibilities of clashes and conflicts, affectional exchanges, emotional dependence, rivalry, competition, sentimental attachments etc, which may occur due to the unique traits each one has. Personality issues include perception of a member for others in terms of behaviour, traits, level of expectation, satisfaction, role performance, reward system, moods, temper and series of other emotions and sentiments. Maturity of members is a significant criteria which influences interactions, communication, handling of conflict, decision making etc. This determinant also affects the family satisfaction.

Maturity in an individual is otherwise also valued upon, hence it becomes more necessary to assess it in family relationship context. If there is incompatibility,

conflicts may arise. A matured partner usually handles family's issues, interpersonal issues in such a way that other's needs are taken care of and family also does not remain at stake.

Parent-Child Relationship :

Another significant relationship next to Marital or spousal relationship is the parent-child relationship. The traditional and perhaps universal image of the parents is that they are the primary agents of socialization and child is the object of socialization. With the arrival of the child, the dyadic interaction gets converted into triadic interaction and new tasks and roles await for the newly parents. Bigner (1970) has put this relationship as "It is a dyadic or triadic interaction system involving sequences of behaviour in which there is mutual stimulation, reinforcement and response so that each individual in the family is a recipient as well as initiator of behaviour".

Parent child relationship is a developing interaction between parents and children and is viewed in the form of authority pattern and handling of discipline by parents, display and control of emotions, child rearing practices, transmission of cultural directives etc. The parents are responsible for setting reasonable limits and boundaries

to the child's behaviour, the use of rewards and punishments and formulations of rules in order to enable the child develop into an integrated, firm and well developed human being. The parental control and support may get expressed in the form of giving directions or instructions, commands, suggestions, punishments and threats, rewards, explanations, making requests and imposing rules and restrictions. The discipline in the family may be rigid, firm and flexible, repressive, absent, inconsistent, minimal and parental contradictory.

The range and depth of emotions which parents display to the children builds up ~~xx~~ psychological interior of the child; his attitude towards the home, identification with the parents, feeling of respect, love, fear and aggression for each parent, communication between child and parent and psychodynamic structuring of the parent by the child.

Sibling Relationship : It is another contributory relationship in the personality development of a child and in the healthy functioning of the family unit. The mutual sharing, respect and affection which prevail in the family among the siblings lays the foundation of certain finer traits and strengths required for adjustments and coping in the later life.

Family Life Cycle :

It is viewed in the developmental context. The family dynamics are understood in the total family life cycle perspective where family moves into different stages having accomplished the required tasks of the previous one. Each stage has distinct characteristics. Havighurst (1948) and Duvall (1950) Nock (1979) formulated stages in family life cycle. The Hindu Varna Ashram classification of life span can also be compared with the family life cycle perspective.

The first stage ^{is} beginning families of newly young married couples. It is a stage which requires settling down and adjustment to marital life. The couple gets support from families of orientation. Cultural differences may bring variations in the nature and tasks of this stage. Marital satisfaction is assumed to be higher. In Indian context, the young couple usually stay with family of orientation. The duration of stage vary from culture to culture e.g. in U.S.A. according to Olson (1983) average married life without children was 3.8 years. In Indian situation such data does not seem to be available but the duration may be lesser. The second stage is of child bearing where couple acquires new roles and status of parents. They are expected to gain competence in child

rearing and parental tasks. Support from kins may continue in this period in Indian context.

Third stage is called families with pre-school going and fourth stage is with school going children. Parent-child relationship, socialization and training continue to dominate this stage. In Indian situation, ordinarily the child starts going to the school latest by the age of five; especially among the lower socio-economic group of families. Higher class families children do go to nursery schools little earlier than this. The U.S. data reveals that average age of married couples at this stage was 11 years. In India, it would be little lower than this.

The next stage is of families with adolescent children. The parents have increased responsibility of children's career, marriage and completion of other responsibilities. In Indian situation this is a "Preparation period for searching proper match for female children". Female children are inducted in household jobs.

The sixth stage is known as 'Launching Centre' or middle aged families where transfer of responsibilities and search for alternative ways of living begin, feeling of loneliness, companionship, financial calculations become the crucial issues. The children are expected to be on their own and contribute in the family and society.

The last seventh stage is called to be 'Empty nest' or aging families, where children are in their own family of procreation which began in the previous stage. Active responsibility and accountability for running the house come on to them. The couple leads a life of detachment.

In Indian conditions, children may not necessarily go out of the parental house. The retirement age varies from organization to organizations; it fluctuates from 55 to 60 years. According to Varna ashram, it is called Van Prastha, where the retired persons are expected to detach themselves as an active social being and lead a life of sanyasi. Having fulfilled all the duties of a Gihstha and practised Artha, Dharma and Karma in family life, he/she should concentrate on the attainment of ultimate goal i.e. liberation or Moksha.

Family life satisfaction vary from stage to stage. Researchers have studied families in the family life cycle context to have a better insight into family dynamics and behaviour since each stage characteristics and tasks may influence.

Family Crisis :

Crisis are part of human life. They are inevitable and unavoidable in the family. Family conflicts are of

varied nature. A crisis in the family occurs when a sudden highly significant change produces a situation that can not be handled effectively by its members. They might run short of resources and behaviour pattern or they do not know about the behaviour or ways of coping and solving their problems.

The crisis usually has a stressor event that precipitate it. Severity of crisis depends upon the nature and degree of event and also on the person or group of person who face it. The equilibrium or smooth functioning of the family gets affected by any crisis whether a single member of the family or entire family is involved. It may bring the family members more closer and they jointly attack upon the problem, make newer adjustment and upgrade the family or it may bring negative effects by breaking the family into pieces and disturbing its peace and harmony.

Current attempts and trends in research is to apply concept of life changes or accumulation of life events and strains on the family. In contrast to life changes inherent in the family life cycle, are the changes called accidental which are precipitated by hazards and calamities over which family members may not have control. These may involve significant losses such as death, failure, illness etc.

Family Coping Strategies and Crisis Resolution :

Coping strategies are also complex to understand as all individuals in the family may not have common properties. Family scientists have tried to conceptualize coping and develop measurement of the same. Coping has been considered a life long process, it is a never-ending phenomena. Much of the earlier work was done on individual stresses but increasing attention is being given to coping in the family. Family coping is viewed as family's response to stressor but it is more than so because it includes family's interaction within the family and transaction between the family and the community. Koo's (1946) Hill (1949) Caplan (1961) Murphy (1974) Patterson (1983) Klein (1983) all have contributed in the concept and coping strategies. Meneghan (1985) used different concepts like resources, coping efforts etc. Klein (1985) used the term efficiency of coping strategies in family life.

Resistance coping, adaptive coping terms are described by Patterson (1983)- Reframing, Passive, appraisal, social support, spiritual support, and family's ability to mobilize community resources for meeting stressful situations are also emphasized by different experts (Olson 1983). Stress and problem situations are increasing day by day in modern days

especially in the urban area. Slum families are no exception to this. Social work has a great deal of concern in planning intervention strategies for problem families. Hence family assessment do demand family coping style's probing.

Conflict Resolution :

Conflicts are unavoidable in the family but it is not true for their resolutions. Family conflicts are of varied nature. Conflicts resolution is governed by a host of factors, viz, family strengths in general, family concern for each other, family member's ability to understand each other, and skills/techniques they use in resolving the conflicts. To be brief, it can be submitted that conflicts resolution with minimum side effects is of prime importance in restoring family functioning on smooth grounds. This category assesses the individual's attitudes, feelings, and beliefs towards the existence and resolution of conflicts in the family. Openness of the partner, type of strategies, resources and relationship's strengths are significant factors in resolving family conflicts.

Values :

Values are foundations by which family guides the member's behaviour. Values have an ought character that guides personal actions, provides standards for reaching

decisions and resolving conflicts, justifies behaviour and maintains self-esteem. Values also help in judging other's behaviour.

Values which are cherished commonly by the family members have a vital contribution in the family process and functioning. They help in understanding the meaning and continuity of actions undertaken by members and also in achieving desired ends. Thus it gives a goal to family members and a criteria to identify the goals.

Values are of various types some are personal like pleasure, inner harmony, mature love etc. Some are social like friendship, family security, love and affection, some are moral like honesty, forgiveness, benevolence etc. Some refer to competence like ambitions, intelligence, imagination etc. values can also be treated as hierarchical i.e. lower order values and higher order values. Gandhian Philosophy lays importance on values in guiding 'SADHYA' i.e. 'Cultural goals' and 'SADHAN' i.e. 'Cultural means'.

Transmission of values take place in the families. This takes place among children through observation, reinforcement and modelling. Families differ in value orientation and also in terms of degree of strength. Each family chooses from the range of values, the particular value-orientation that best fulfill their own needs as individuals

and as an interacting small groups. As the family changes and develops, the value orientation must also be expected to change. Rokeach (1973) divided values into Instrumental and Terminal. Kluckhohn (1951) Hoffman (1970) Rausch (1974), Bernard (1979) and various other scholars, have worked on values.

Leisure Activities of Family Members :

Leisure time is an important component of family satisfaction. Recreational activities differ from culture to culture. Healthy leisure time activities help a lot in reducing tensions, strains and monotony of family life. Leisure includes every day's schedule and week end's schedule, or bi-annual or annual planning of spending time together outside home/town. Social visits, religious ceremonies, picnics, marriage parties, etc. are certain unique features of Indian family where leisure is interwoven : Leisure time/activities have been enjoying a definite place in family assessment. Quite a few family-centered social interventions are planned through leisure or at least leisure is used as an entry point. This category assess each family member's preferences for spending time together. Assessment gives emphasis on social V/s personal, active V/s passive, shared v/s highly individualistic leisure. Higher level

satisfaction indicates compatibility, flexibility and consensus about the meaningful use of leisure time activities among family members.

Family Strengths :

Family strengths have been referred as resources by family sociologists. Early work in this area viewed family strengths in the context of family resources, which were divided into two broad categories : Integration and Adaptability. (Angell, 1936, Cavan and Ranck, 1938, Koos 1946, Hill 1958). Family strengths are qualities that enrich family relationships and functioning. Young (1953) stated that the most important research for families is to develop sound adaptability. Otto (1963) attempted to clarify the definition of family strengths from different dimensions which included family pride, family support, cohesion, adaptability, communication, religious orientation, and community relationship. Family strengths could be focused through family pride, and family accord. Marital strength is also a part of family functioning. Marital strengths include conflict resolution, leisure time, sexual relationship, financial management, child rearing and religious orientation. Burr (1973) expanded on the definition of resources to be the 'Variation in a family's ability to prevent a stressor event in a family social system from

creating some crisis in the system. But it would be incomplete without mentioning the role of family in providing resources for the betterment, welfare, and development of its members both internal or external resources.

To assess family strength normal/~~impact~~ or adequate families should be identified and the positive aspects of them should be explored. They have comparatively more positive resources, lower stress levels, higher levels of coping and greater marital and family satisfaction. These families may function adequately. The strength of adequate families act as buffering from stress and they have better ways of coping with stress.

Adequate Family :

Adequacy of the family starts with the physical lay out where family members are housed. Physical aspects, civic amenities do play a vital role in making family member's stay comfortable. Another aspect of adequacy is the satisfaction of basic needs i.e. food and clothes. The higher aspects of family adequacy are quite a few viz. higher level of security, safety, growth-development opportunities, sharing of joy and sorrow, emotional and other aspects of support at the time of crisis and stress situations and 'we-feeling' in leading life happy and peaceful.

The adequacy of family is governed by a host of factors viz. relationship quality among family members, communication style, socialization aspects, value-system, socio-economic status, health status, stress events and capacity to handle them, resource mobilization capacity, family size, family solidarity, family adaptability, roles and tasks clarity, roles commitment, recreational aspects, socio-religious rituals, family status, social net work and support and personality traits of family members.

Family Cohesion :

It refers to the level of organization of the system to the degree that family members function smoothly as a unit and feel themselves to belong together more than a part. To be precise it is defined as the emotional bonding that family members have towards one another.

The fact that at least forty concepts relate to this dimension of family, indicates the significance of cohesion as an unifying dimension. (Olson, 1983) At least six different social science fields have used this concept in some way or the other. This cross-disciplinary use of the concept also indicates its significance. Different family experts used various concepts related to cohesion are viz. Benjamin (1974,77) - Affiliation; Epstein, Bishop, Levin (1978) -

Affective involvement; French and Gindera (1974) Kantor & Lehr (1974) - affect dimension; Leary (1957) Constantine (1977) - affection hostility; Lewis (1976) Closeness, Nye & Rushing (1969) - solidarity; Beavers (1977) Autonomy - coalitions; Parsons and Bales (1955) - Expressive role Angell (1936) - Integration. All these concepts lead to two building blocks viz. enmeshment at one extreme of cohesion, there is overidentification with the family and on another extreme - disengagement as characterized by low bonding in the family. It is believed that balanced family cohesion is the most conducive to effective family functioning. (Olson et al 1983) There are certain variables that are recommended to be used to assess the degree of family cohesion are : emotional bonding, boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, interests and recreation. When all these areas are balanced, family can deal more effectively with the stress situations. Psychiatrists, family therapists, family sociologists, small group theorists, social psychologists, and anthropologists have utilized the cohesion dimension in their works (Olson 1983). Hess and Handel (1959) believed that 'Cohesion' was used by quite a few psychiatrists specializing - in family therapy. Minuchin (1974) gave a prominent place to Enmeshed families in his family therapy. Many others Schaeffer, Hoffman, Haley supported him (Olson 1983). A few other concepts connecting

the same were used by few other family therapists viz. Fusion (Nagi 1965) affect fusion (Kantoor Lehr 1975) Undifferentiated egomass (Bowen 1960), Family wide symbiotic ego (searles 1965). Disengagement or low cohesion has also been described by family therapists in the form of emotional divorce (Bowen 1960) disengagement (Minuchin 1974) pseudohostility (Wynne 1958).

Stierlin (1974) clarified the struggle to balance separateness and togetherness in family by identifying two opposing forces. Family sociologist also identified the cohesion dimension in the work viz. Angell (1936), Hill (1949), Hess (1959), Nye (1969) Black (1973), Carisse (1975). Small group experts like Back (1950), Kelly (1967) Zander (1962) also described the cohesion as an important dimension in studying family. Yalom (1970), Rosenblatt (1976), and Olson (1983) too continued showing active interests in family cohesion.

Family Adaptability :

Adaptability is the ability of Marital^{al} family system to change its power structure, role relationship and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress. As Olson (1983) described, certain concepts of family adaptability are : family power structure, negotiation style, role relationships, relationship rules and feedback.

It is more of a quality, an ability of a person or unit to deal effectively with problem situation by being flexible and accommodate changes or redesign itself. Adaptability has its roots in the concepts of change and stability which have been conceptually formulated in the form of Morphogenesis and Morphostasis. System maintenance or stability is one aspect of family's functioning and system change or morphogenesis is another. Haley (1959) Jackson (1957) Satir (1964) advocated for stability and system maintenance, while Wynne (1958) Speer (1970) Hill (1971), Wetherim (1973) advocated for system's enhancement. Both are necessary for a viable family system.

Angell (1936), Hill (1949) Vincent (1966) considered it to be a mediating function between individuals and other social structures. There are quite a few experts who contributed in the field of family adaptability viz. Benjamin (1974), Levin (1978), Leary (1957) Lewis (1976) and Olson (1983).

These all experts used various concepts to identify family adaptability dimension, viz. interdependence, control, problem solving, Roles, capacity to change, power, dominance - submission, instrumental role etc. The family therapy literature also emphasized on family adaptability dimension for the healthy functioning of the family (Olson 1983).

In brief, family cohesion and family adaptability are the two cardinal dimensions for assessment in order to suggest interventive strategies for making family functioning sounder and growth, development producing. In present research also these two dimensions are focused alongwith other variables.

Indian Families :

Families in India have moral religious base. It is founded on a specific ideology which governs the total family life. The sources of understanding Indian family are vedic literature, the epics, Mahabharat and Ramayana, puranic literature and the sutras. Besides these, the literature, and folktales also depicted the life in Indian family and also the domestic conduct of family members.

Various rituals and practices performed in an Indian family are based on - One's religion and social customs. It is believed that a Hindu home is a place where Dharma sastras, Artha sastras and Karma sastras are practised. It is inculcated in the training of a Grishtha that he has to lead a life of detachment/non-attachment and all his actions are dominated as per Dharma and Karma. The individual has to pass through a series of samskaras from the day he is conceived in other's womb, right from garbhadhan

ceremony to Anthyesthi (funeral), there are ceremonies to be performed throughout the individual's life. The significant and meaningful performance of these ceremonies disciplines him and he feels one with the family and the community he belongs to.

(a) Family Relationships :

The scriptures contain description about nature of different relationships and various functions which a family has to perform. A permanent unbreakable relationship with mutual fidelity is the goal of Hindu marriage. The continuity of the family by begetting children is the second most important object and care of the young is the primary function of the family. While male spouse is the head and sole authority in the family, the wife should be protected and treated with kindness and respect by him. She is his half 'ARDHANGNA' and both play a complementary, supplementary role bringing about a psychological unity in the family.

The components of marital relationships leading to marital quality and stability which the researchers have identified today, have been recognized long ago in Hindu scriptures as this relationship is based upon mutual emotional give and take, sympathy, respect and positive

attitude towards each other. The roles of the two are distinct but important and they are laid down as per the very nature of sex and constitution, thus they are incomparable.

(b) Parent-Child Relationship :

The parents are regarded to be protectors and guardians of the young ones with all kindness and goodness. The children in return have the highest amount of reverence for parents and should have unquestioning obedience. Formal and nonformal education of children has been emphasized a great deal in Hindu philosophy. There is a Sanskrit saying 'MATA Satru, PITA Vairi, ye n pathito BALAKAM' (Parents are enemies if they do not educate their children).

The son and particularly the eldest son enjoys unique treatment and status in the family. The daughter is to be treated with utmost tenderness and care since she has to be given as offering (Kanyadan) in another family, she is given a special and supervised training which makes her adaptable to other family to perform the Dharma of a wife, a daughter-in-law and mother.

Mother has the most venerable status in the family especially for the child. She is called as Janani, Dhatri, because of the unique role she performs.

The home is a 'Yagna Kunda' where an individual has to pour his life for the performance of Dharma, Artha and Karma to the attainment of final goal-Moksha. He practices his duties towards parents, spouse, children, kith and kin, departed ancestors and to his community.

To conclude, Indian families are characterized as traditional, orthodox having rigid boundaries but with strong ties blended with sentiments and sacrifices and a kind of family centricism (Ramu 1977) which is interwoven in the lives of individuals. Belonging to a family, a Jati gives him a name, an identity and reputation. It is the extended family in India which provides insurance to the individual in all calamities. The craving to be connected with this extended family is mostly so strong that wherever he is, he keeps constant touch with it by frequently visiting, attending all occasions, ceremonies and festivals. The family identity and bond is a fundamental, unmutable psycho-social reality that an individual inherits and internalizes within himself. According to Kakkar (1981), from the earliest years, the Indian child learns that the core of any social relationship - therapeutic, educational, organizational, is the process of caring and mutual involvement, the psycho-social world of children is governed by the principle of the inviolable primacy of family and secondarily Jati relationship. He

observes his individual preferences and ambitions as subordinate to the welfare of the family and community.

Need of Family Assessment for Holistic Social Work Interventions :

Family centred social work is enjoying a key position in the social work interventions. It has been realized by the academicians, researchers, practitioners and policy makers that family is the most crucial unit which should be concentrated for various types of interventions - curative, preventive or developmental. Individuals and group can not be dealt in isolation, neither the communities can exist without families. Thus in order to ~~xx~~ strengthen the family and improve the quality of family life, family assessment should be sound and complete. Systematic studies of family processes and family life are necessary to train families in interpersonal competence and change the environment suiting to their needs and problems.

The present researcher has worked as practitioner and social work educator since last 18 years. It was realized by her observations both at practice level and through student's field work training that family assessment from social work perspective is the dire need. Experiences of working with mentally sick, destitute and delinquent

children and at community level, it was strongly believed by the researcher that no services could be rendered without working with the families. It was felt that research should be manageable and focused, hence it was decided to confine the study to urban slum families. These families are most deprived and vulnerable to all hazards of living. Therefore slum was chosen as it covers 25% of the urban population.

Among the various dimensions of studying family processes and dynamics, cohesion and adaptability are the two most significant dimensions which are compared with socio-economic status, marital adjustment, spouse's psychosocial maturity, family life satisfaction, communication, role performance, crisis and its resolution etc, in order to find out a complete family assessment model.

Having introduced the research problem, it would be quite meaningful to give details of various family theories, frameworks, perspectives and approaches which play a prime role in guiding various family researches.

The growth of theories and conceptual frameworks to study family :

The process of identifying major conceptual frameworks was began by Hill and others in 60's. They identified ^{a few} conceptual approaches viz. Institutional,

interactional, structural-functional, situational, developmental to study families. Five of these were published in a paper from Hill and Hansen (1960). Their work had immense effect on the family field in 60's. Later in 1966, Nye and Berardo gave a detailed account of these conceptual frameworks alongwith few more. They added four more to those presented by Hill and Hansen. These frameworks are necessary for a sound research and systematic practice. These frameworks were further classified by family scholars. Parsons and Shil's (1961) attempted this exercises and divided them into four groups namely (1) Empirical theoretical framework which include - The symbolic-interactional approach. Psycho-analytical approach, structural - functional approach.

(2) Theoretical frame work • which consists of - the Marxist approach, conflict approach and social exchange approach.

(3) Conceptual framework includes - the institutional approach, historical approach and social system approach.

(4) Descriptive frame work encompasses - the situational approach, learning theory - maturational approach, household economics approach, developmental approach and empathetic approach.

Helman and Burr (1984) classified these frameworks into major, minor and peripheral theories. Major theories

include (1) interactionist theory (2) Exchange theory (3) System theory. Minor theories encompass (1) Conflict theory (2) Behaviour theory (3) Developmental theory. (4) Ecological system theory (5) Phenomenology. Under peripheral theories (1) Game theory (2) Transactional analysis (3) Psychoanalysis, (4) Situational approach (5) Balance theory (6) Institutional approach and (7) Structural functional approach are included.

While reviewing various contemporary studies on current topics and theories they pointed out that "there should be a single perspective that should in some manner unify and consolidate knowledge about family."

Following is the brief description of each conceptual framework as understood by the Researcher.

The Symbolic Interactional Approach :

This approach concentrates upon the processes, effects and sources of social interactions. The relationship between husband and wife, parents and children and among children are viewed within a symbolic environment of cultural norms and values. The interaction of individual in this symbolic milieu is perceived through the roles, position and reference groups.

The crux of this approach gets explained in E. Burgess (1920) definition "The family is a unity of interacting personalities." The family phenomena is studied and interpreted in terms of internal processes consisted of role - playing, status relations, communication problems, decision making, stress reactions and socialization processes.

Though this theory caught the momentum after the classic statement made by E. Burgess (1920), the origin of the framework goes back to Hegel and James (1890, 1948) Cooley Thomas; Later Baldwin, Mead, Dewey, Waller (1922, 1907) and many others have viewed family from the perspective of interactional framework. Depending heavily upon some of the concepts of sociology and social psychology, some of the great pioneers of these two disciplines and their empirical exercises in the field of family research, made this framework as most frequently used by family scholars (Hill & Hansen 1960), In family research, this approach is seen in the significant works of Burgess (1920), Kruger (1928), Angell (1936), Koos (1946) Cavan & Ranck (1938), Foote cottrel (1955), Eliot (1933, 35) Hill (1958) Stryker (1959) and many others.

In India, the direct utilization of this approach is not exclusively made but the implicit use of this model is made by several family researchers. As mentioned by

Hallen (1981) "Indian Scholars have assumed family units as interacting ones, not merely functioning as structural categories but the structural components of the family system and establishing varying patterns of relationship through a process^h_^ of continuous interaction". Straus (1965,75) Mandelbaum (1948) Narain (1957) Ross (1961) Karve (1963) Srinivas (1965), Gupta (1951) Shah (1973), Conklin (1973) and several others have studied marital relationship, parental relations, family power and authority, rituals and social customs, structure and role relationship sibling relationships etc.

The distinctive characteristics of this frame work are that family members are not merely actors but reactors to the stimuli they get from others. They interpret and define the actions of others in their own way and attach a meaning to those actions. Use of symbol in the form of communication is made which is a key concept of this frame-work. Social control and influences are seen within the interactional structure, from mutual affection and compatibility of family members. Another characteristic is that interaction is never in a fixed state; it is to be seen in the process form where individuals are relating to each other in different roles.

An Evaluation : This approach helps in focusing the family as a small group, provides an understanding of family dynamics, the internal aspects of family life; view it as a

closed system which helps in examining family functioning in a scientific way. This approach may help in planning interventions and family life education better.

Despite these advantages, this framework has certain limitations. The very quality of its being closed, intra-family focused is criticized as it limits the analysis of family in the larger social context. Family can not remain untouched under various socio-ecological, political and economic forces as well as vice versa.

Secondly, the framework does not provide a comprehensive and uniformly agreed upon model to study the internal aspects of family life. There are diversified concepts and components which have been studied and formulated by the users of this approach. Hence a unified frame of reference having a common agreement on concepts and assumptions should pave way in building a general family theory.

The structural functional Approach :

This approach views family as one of the subsystems with its relationship with the larger system - society and family as a subsystem with other subsystems. The individual and his relationships may be analysed as subsystem within the family system. First type of analysis is known as

macrofunctionalism and second one is microfunctionalism (Hill and Hansen 1960). The subsystems in the family are striving for boundary maintenance which is under internal and external pressures toward boundary dissolution or maintenance. This framework emphasizes upon integration and equilibrium of the system. The functions of the system are listed as functional prerequisites for the survival of the system and other sub systems. These functional interchanges are reciprocal and facilitate balance. If they fail to do so, stress may arise. Thus some of the primary functions which a family is required to perform are reproduction, socialization, sexual control, transmission of culture, placement^{and} maintenance. The family is continuously contributing in the social system by producing an individual and preparing him for action. Some of the functions gets transfered to other subsystems and vice versa like some of the family's functions have been taken over by other subsystems. This possibly depends upon the structural differentiation and organization; otherwise the family faces the common problems like other systems : task performance, goal gratification, integration and solidarity and pattern maintenance.

Rooted in the disciplines of sociology and social anthropology, this approach is fairly old. One of the earlier definitions of it was given by Redcliffe - Brown

(1935). Later Merton (1957) Bell and Vogel (1960), Parson (1961) had ventured in describing this approach alongwith various other noted family structural functionalists Simmons (1947), Hill and Hansen (1953), Sussman (1970) etc.

A good number of studies in India analysed Indian families in its structural functional aspects such as structure and composition of family, family types, kinship and caste system and also the interrelationships between other subsystems as caste, economy, education etc. Desai (1936) Mukerji (1949) Srinivas (1952) Kapadia (1966) Ross (1961) Singer (1978) and several others have followed this approach completely or partially.

Evaluation : This framework is useful in understanding family in a simple but broad sense. It continues to provide an insight into family functions though does not offer any explanation as how family as a unit and its members change and grow. The intra family processes are not emphasized and individuals are accepted as passive receptors than actors and reactors. It is also difficult to understand the exact functions performed by the family for the survival of society. Critics have argued the key terms "Equilibrium" and 'survival' are difficult to define clearly. Whatever the criticisms are, this approach continues to stimulate scholars and practitioners.

Psychoanalytic Approach :

This approach is based on a particular school of thought psychoanalysis, founded by sigmund Freud in the beginning of this century. The essence of his theory is on the unconscious mind and its relation to the human body and the environment. Man is a bundle of innate needs known as instincts or impulses which are generally in conflict with cultural norms and social institutions. These instincts (id) are rooted in the unconscious mind. The ego or reality emerges out when the individual interacts with the environment. Ego is the active, conscious part of human personality that mediates between Id and superego which is known as Ideal self-deals with morality; so long as individual's ego maintains the balance, he will have satisfying and efficient transactions with his environment. The development of these three elements of personality is during the various stages of psycho-sexual development based on gratification of libido. The earlier experiences are stored in the unconscious and become the basis for consciousness and later adaptation to the social environment.

Number of scholars, have not considered it to be a valid approach for family analysis. Hill and Hansen (1960) have dismissed this approach by saying that it does not cope with the family as a group or regarded it to be a peripheral theory. It has been debated by those who consider

it to be a frame of reference looking deeply at all aspects of family.

One of the earliest works of Flugel (1921) who wrote on "Psycho Analytic Study of the Family", Ackerman (1958) 'Psychodynamics of Family' Kenkel (1960) 'The family in Perspective', Simpson (1960) 'People in Families', Parson and Bales (1955) 'Socialization and Interaction Process', reflect various aspects of psychoanalytic frame of reference.

In India no rigourons attempts have been made by scholars to use this approach in family context yet some beginning was made when Taylor, (1943) Banerji (1944-45) published papers on Freudian theory and Hindu family etc. The most frequent and serious attempts were made by Khatri (1962, 63, 1970, 74) A number of mental health professionals, Surje (1966) Sridharan (1966) Sethi and Nathwat (1971) Kapur (1972) etc. have also followed this approach in one way or the other in their papers and studies.

Evaluation :

This framework is considered to be a comprehensive and integrated personality theory. It may be viewed in the same way in the field of family studies. It has its unique impact on the scholars. Though this theory was highly criticized due to lack of empirical verifications

and overemphasis on sexuality and unconscious which is difficult to discover, this approach may continue to fascinate scholars.

The Marxist Approach :

This approach has also been classified separately though Nye and Berardo (1966) explained ~~ix~~ it within the economic framework. Marx contribution is regarded to be unique and significant in understanding family behaviour, therefore Hallen (1981) treated this approach separately.

The emphasis here is slightly different; which is on the position of women in a capitalist society, the division of labour which has domesticated a woman. Thus the housewife has therefore been central to Marxist analysis of family. This focus neglects the internal relationship between husband and wife, internal role segregation and its significance.

Closely related to this is the feminist movement and their stand in understanding family behaviour. Since last one decade, this movement has caught momentum showing concern towards women's conditions and their experiences of being subordinated and oppressed. Berger & Berger (1983) raised questions like whether family is useful and doing good for women ? Recently Diana Gotts (1988) from a

feminist perspective raised issues why people marry? and there is no such thing as family. In her conclusions she believed that without family ideology, it would be possible to reconsider and reconstruct the realities of relationships between men, women and children and to work towards more equal and more caring ways of living and working together.

The Conflict Approach :

This approach focuses on the conflict and coercion which are also key concepts in understanding how society and family as a social unit operate. It points at the social inequality stemming from power and control found in a privileged elite group. The proponents of this approach advocate for the basic contradictions in the social system which cause changes by producing confrontation and revolution.

The radicalist's approach of attacking the existing system may be considered as an approximation to this approach. Experts raised a basic question "Does family contribute towards growth and development of the individual? How far family through its restrictive environment can damage the 'self' and individuality of a person.

Koedt (1977) perceives such conflicts stemming from lesbianism, a radical alternative to the nuclear family which replaces totally the heterosexual dyad.

Very few studies in India are found having this approach. Orienstein (1965) analysed conflict and cohesion in Indian village. Handa (1969), analyzed marital conflict in Lucknow. Rao (1971) have analyzed the role conflict of employed mothers in Hyderabad and Gangrade (1971) on intergenerational conflicts.

Evaluation :

Conflict approach has challanged the Family's ability to provide growth and development opportunity. Individuality has always been questioned. Individuality either gets lost or gets merged into social fabric of the family problems. This is true in an Indian traditional families where head of the family articulates and voices the feelings of all the family members. Radicals have gone to that extent that either individual will survive or family. But balanced approach can help in maintaining the equilibrium. Individual VS family as groups interests, values may suffer conflicts, but higher level adaptability and cohesion can dillute the security problem. This approach is too young to be evaluated further.

The Social exchange approach : Reciprocity in relations, rewards and costs in interactions are the central concepts of this approach which has its origin in the behaviourist model of human behaviour and skinner's concept of

reinforcement.

Simmel's writing (1908) on family reflects this approach. Goode's work (1963) later had also used such concepts to analyze the power of family elders in various social classes. He also used this theory in the study of force and violence in the family.

In Indian context, some of the practices in the family system can be seen in exchange context like Jajmani system, dowary practice, gift transactions etc. Kolenda (1963), Dumont (1959), Hallen (1960) Rao & Rao (1980) etc. studies have used exchange theory framework.

Evaluation : The simple interpretation of this approach is 'Mutual Help' for the peaceful survival. Second aspect is that life is too complex to lead all alone. Therefore nothing wrong in having social and moral binding of giving rewards and reciprocating the same. Many social security laws in U.S.A. came into being, because of failure of this principle. In Indian joint families these principles are still respected. In fact stronger relations ties automatically takes care of the psycho-social and economic investments by the family member on an individual member. And he considered his arduous responsibility to rethink in a proper form.

Evaluation of the three frameworks :

All the three frameworks, though highlight significant aspects of family phenomena but whether they should be considered as sound theories, is debatable. They are still in the beginning phases of developing into a full-fledged theory or model. Materialistic interpretation, inequality, conflict confrontation and reciprocity; Are they individually adequate enough to understand a complex phenomena; secondly, empirical justifications of these approaches may be difficult.

The Situational Approach :

This approach describes behaviour in the context of situation i.e. social, physical or cultural etc. The family is studied in different situations and how it affects the individual behaviour is important to analyse. This situation is conceived as a stimuli which impinge upon the organism or the units and these stimuli are from the exterior world.

Bossard & Bell (1943) brought out clarity and named it as situational approach. Alongwith them, there were few others Tommas & Znaniecki and the behaviorists like Thorndike, Watson, Kohler and others, who have applied this approach in their experiments and theory building. Pollak (1956) advocated the use of this approach in diagnosis and treatment.

Although this approach is not exclusively used by Indian researchers, but some of the studies are conducted in this direction. Various studies in particular regions that of Mehta (1934), Gupta (1951), Singer (1968) and Ames (1969) presented situational analysis of Industrial workers. Kapur (1976), Conklin (1976) have studied rural and urban families. Migrated families have also been analysed by several others.

Similarly Indian researchers have conducted studies on regional differences - education wise, occupation wise or family formation and problemwise.

Evaluation :

This framework is a descriptive way of analysing families in variety of situations. A question may be raised can the entire situation which is multidimensional in nature be studied? Secondly, no two situations are alike and universal acceptance or generalization of situation will be difficult. This approach though accepted so far as cognizance of this fact that situations are significant, it can not be treated as an exclusive framework. It should merge in the other approaches.

The Learning Theory, Maturational Approach :

This approach emphasizes upon study of family in a laboratory i.e. treating family in an experimental situation.

Derived from the learning theories of psychology and concepts of Developmental psychology, this theory claims that family could be treated as an environmental factor from where individuals learn the responses. The behaviour gets stimulated as well as manipulated from the family. The family may not be the focus of study but the individuals, their learned responses and certain regularities in behaviour are targeted. The works of Sears (1950) Aldous & Kell (1956) Baldwin (1946) Cavan (1956) Dewis and Havighurst (1956), Rose (1955), Straus (1954) etc. have employed this approach in ordering their observations and analysing their data. Some of the Indian researchers have indirectly sought to focus on the child and his learning within family - Kennedy (1954) Gore (1961) Levinson (1959) Minturn and Hitchcock (1963) are some of them who have shedded some light on this approach.

The Household Economics Approach :

This approach encompasses in itself the economic concepts of needs, standard of living, socio-economic status, use of resources, home management, consumption patterns and consumer behaviour etc. Study of families from economic factors and conditions point of view is necessary. Karl Marx, one of the pioneers of the origin of this framework employed economic phenomena to

determine or explain the course of human behaviour and social processes followed by Frederic Engel's works and their emphasis on finding out causal relationship between existing institutions and production and other economic factors. As mentioned by Nye and Berardo (1966) within this framework, the family is viewed as an economic unit composed of individuals each with a set of mutual economic rights and responsibilities as well as relationships. This frame work also consists of network of inter related economic concepts and assumptions which focus upon discovery, measurement and analysis of family welfare. This framework has its roots in home economics and sociology or social economics.

Evaluation : This framework may provide a descriptive account of the economic behaviour of couples and families. Relationships, child care and socialization, control of expenditures, education and aspirations of people, wants and drives of people all such concepts get explained within this framework. These concepts contribute to the very form and family system which a society follows.

This approach is described by Hill and his associates that it is restricted to budget studies thus analysis of whole family is difficult and it is more of survey work. This analyzes economic phenomena of the family and not the family itself. On the whole this framework

may help us to formulate family economic theory and family welfare services.

The Developmental Approach :

This approach claims to offer a framework which encompasses several other frameworks and presents them in a unified way. A recent approach which is heavily based on the concepts of Rural sociology, Developmental Psychology and Sociology in general. The family of procreation is focused with its internal dynamics and the development throughout the life cycle. Family development is viewed as a dynamic process from beginning till death.

It views family as a semi-closed system having a dependence - independence situation on ~~to~~ other social systems. Role of each family member and his position is emphasized. The change in the member or position affect the other's role and position since the members are so interrelated and interacting in a unit-family. This approach recognizes the changes which take place in the family from time to time, stage wise and adjustments which the members have to make with each other. Each stage has its specific prerequisites and developmental tasks. It has given special attention to the concepts like development, family as a semi-closed system, roles and positions, tasks, of interacting individuals. This approach has incorporated

elements of structural functional approach, symbolic interaction approach, psycho-social approach, and also from situational as well as psycho-analytical approach.

The initial efforts which should be recognized were made by Sorokin (1931) and others who tried to construct a four stage family life cycle. Concept of development stages and developmental tasks are possibly taken away from Freudian and Erikson's psychology, the framework of the same is taken from Havighurst (1948) and later Duvall's (1957) work who put all these concepts together in the book "Family Development". Some of the books and papers have reflected this approach Hill (1950) Kirkpatrick (1955) Duvall (1957) Olson (1979) some of the social workers and family therapists Scherz (1962) Rapoport (1963) have also suggested that this framework can be used in practice.

In Indian context No exclusive Research efforts based on this approach have been seen though, the Indian social scientists are aware of it (Madan (1965) Gore (1968), Khatri (1972), Pethe (1963) etc. have in one or the other way reflected in their writings this approach. Another significant observation which these scientists have made is that Indian families follows a cyclical development, the death of household, partition etc. may make a family nuclear from joint or it may become residentially nuclear and later

through the marriage of son, a nuclear family may become extended or joint. Thus individuals do pass through such cycle i.e. from one type to another and vice versa or back to same. It is also seen that three methods like geneological, the cross-sectional and the retrospective history techniques have been adopted by these authors. The longitudinal alongwith cross sectional is undoubtedly should highlight the effectiveness of this approach which is difficult to be followed.

Evaluation :

A careful study of this approach gives an unified picture of the framework which is trying to deal with all the necessary concepts of family behaviour but very little empirical evidences are available.

There are methodological difficulties in operationalizing the framework as interpretation of the families through their entire life history is difficult, time consuming and costly affair. Secondly the framework does not clearly describe the processes which should be captured in such a model. Several issues like prescence and absence of children may bring changes in family and family life cycle may not answer. Geographical mobility, housing shifts may not vary or take place in life stages. There is a need to have a comprehensive test of this framework, may be longitudinally and cross-sectionally.

The Empathetic Approach :

Almost negligible literature is available on this approach developed by Klemmer and Smith (1970,75) emphasizing upon the thoughtful and feelingful assessment of people and their problems through introspective evaluation, group discussion and by insight.

The Institutional Approach :

One of the earliest approaches, which has its roots in Anthropology and Sociology. Family is viewed as an institution rather than anything else and an instrument of social control with its basic functions centred around reproduction, socialization, training etc. It has an organismic bias, an evolutionary or historical touch but currently it adopts the comparative and descriptive analysis. The family is perceived as a multi-functional institution.

Burgess and Locke in their works had adopted this approach (1953) and Ogburn, Nimkoff (1955) gave more clarity to this framework. Hill and Hensen (1960) and Sirjamaki (1964) put efforts to delineate it, Zimmerman (1947) recognised that family phenomenon can be studied from an independent variable point of view.

There is no dearth of studies in India. Some of the scientists studied family from this view point. Srinivas (1942) Kapadia (1947) Mandelbaum (1949) Karve (1953,64)

Prabhu (1954) etc. are some of the well known scientists who have adopted this framework.

Evaluation :

This approach, though views family in toto and is unique for a complete understanding of family phenomena is not devoid of criticism. The critiques realized that only family is considered to be the significant unit and the individual, his behaviour gets overlooked. He is a part of this institution. Secondly, this approach is meant for the general family and not for special ones. The internal working of the family is also ignored.

Nonetheless this approach is valuable since it points at certain basic concepts in understanding family. If other frames of references are also taken alongwith this, the study of the family may be complete and more meaningful.

The Historical Approach :

The study of family in time span context in different societies is known as historical approach. The family in the past is compared with the present validated throughout by data and the direction of change, family patterns and impact of certain forces over a period of time on family are seen and studied within this framework.

The earlier Sociologists like Leepay, Westermarck, Zimmerman (1947) etc. have contributed richly to this approach. Even in the writings of Burgess, Hill, Ogburn and Nimkoff the reflections of this approach are seen. Goode (1963) has studied family patterns in different societies over a span of about half a century. Number of Indian social Scientists Karve (1938-39) Pendse (1949) Ghurye (1960) Gore (1965) Laxminarayan (1968) Kolenda (1970) etc. have made use of this approach. The analysis of Hindu joint family system by tracing its origin in Hindu scriptures and historical texts indicates that they have learned on this framework.

Evaluation :

To test sociological propositions with the historical data is very old approach and may be considered a limited one because it views families in time perspective only.

The Social System Approach :

Based on the system theory, Bowen M. (1965-71) developed family theory contributing uniquely in family research field. He assumed that any individual behaviour in a family context can indicate how will he behave in any social setting. Family system is an emotional unit of intimate relationship which are persistent. The family system include many generations and the ~~ex~~ documentation of network can be done. Some

of the concepts which are given by him are; differentiation of self, triangles, nuclear family, emotional system, family projection process, emotional cut off, multigenerational transmission processes, sibling position and the emotional process in society. These form the core of Bowen's family system theory. Not much work has been done based on this framework, especially in India though in America it has caught momentum.

To conclude, it is clear that none of the framework is free from criticisms and inadequacies. Even most of family scholars have not exclusively restricted themselves to a single frame work. They have used the concepts and frameworks (more than one) to elucidate their understanding and findings as and when needed. These frameworks also share a number of concepts and assumptions with other frameworks. A survey by Klein (1977) showed that interactionist approach continues to be the most influential framework. Some scholars like Buckley, Weiner, Broderick, Smith etc. opined that system theory may be the wave in future providing generalizations and understanding not only of family system but other systems as well. Kantor and Lehr (1975) also expressed usefulness of this approach. Conflict theory and developmental approach got a great deal of attention in 70's. The behavioural approach remained controversial, though it was considered useful in therapeutic interventions.

The term eco system was coined during 1970's replacing the home-management approach. It emerged as a part of the emphasis on environmental impact and the use of system approach in studying the family (Brown, Paolyucci 1978). Phenomenology did gain popularity in family studies. Several scholars applied this perspective to the family studies. It is also considered to be an important perspective in marriage and family therapy.

A thought about the future of family field is necessary while examining these framework, Farber (1964) suggested that theoratical work that does not strive for the goal is virtually useless and Klein (1979) added the field does not seem to be moving closer to encompassing paradigm. Certain ways to make family theories sounder are - Identifying contingency factors (zetterberg 1965-71), Strengthening relationships, identifying logical connections between parts of the theories, finding nature of relationships and clarifying concepts that constitute building blocks for family theory.