In these units of the last Block of this Course, we will look at various institutions operating within our social system from a gender perspective. This first unit deals with the institution of Marriage and Family from a feminist perspective. We will start with the conceptual understanding of family and marriage. This section is followed by definitions and theories of marriage. Thereafter, you will learn about history, functions and patterns of family in the west. Next, you will learn about various changes in the forms and functioning of family as a result of socio-economic forces like urbanization, modernization and globalization. Finally, we will examine the institutions of marriage and the family in Indian context.
1.2 OBJECTIVES

Through the inter linkages between family and marriage as discussed in this unit you will be able to:

- Explain the concepts of marriage and family;
- Define the two terms;
- Distinguish between the notions of marriage and family in the West and in India;
- Describe the changes in these institutions over time and space; and
- Examine the institutions of family and marriage from a feminist perspective.

1.3 UNDERSTANDING FAMILY AND MARRIAGE

Family has been seen as an active organic entity by social anthropologists and sociologists as it is constantly evolving from a lower to higher order along with the society. For Marxists most of the systems, whether political, religious, social or philosophical, follow the same rule, which is while ‘the family undergoes living changes, the system of consanguinity ossifies; while the system survives by force of custom, the family outgrows it....’ (Friedrich Engels, 2000, p.100). Following the tradition of theorizing by Western and American writers it has been argued that family and family ties are prone to evolve over a period of time. Therefore, a basic disharmony exists between modern democratic industrial society and extended family relations partly because educational achievements coupled with occupational mobility are antithetical to extended family living.

Marriage is an institution which leads to the formation of family. Here, it would suffice to say that families can be formed even without marriage but marriage leads essentially to the formation of family. Thus, both the institutions, which form the basic unit of society, are essentially complementary to each other. On analyzing the concept of marriage in its ancient context as well as with its modern connotations, several questions arise. Some of them are- why is marriage the necessary culmination that marks the beginning of adult life? What is the need of marriage? Why do most men and women accept it as such in its present form? Why are the voices of discontent, disapproval and reform very few and far between? A search for answers to these multidimensional questions takes one across several barriers into an exploratory journey of historical analysis over time. This voyage transcends barriers of time and space and has far-fetched implications. At the same time it reveals the fact that as an institution
marriage has undergone several changes and is still undergoing changes in order to keep it in tune with the changing times. In the next section, let us start with a very basic understanding of the institution of marriage before we attempt to define or theorize it.

1.4 MARRIAGE

According to the Merriam Webster Dictionary, marriage is the “state of being united to a person of the opposite sex as husband or wife in a consensual and contractual relationship recognized by law or the institutions whereby individuals are joined in marriage or an intimate or close union”. Marriage is a social union or legal contract between people that creates kinship. It is an institution in which interpersonal relationships, usually intimate and sexual, are acknowledged in a variety of ways, depending on the culture or subculture in which it is found. Such a union, often formalized via a wedding ceremony, may also be called matrimony.

People marry for various reasons, including one or more of the following: legal, social, emotional, economic, spiritual and religious. These might include arranged marriages, family obligations, legal establishment of a nuclear family unit, and legal protection of children and public declaration of commitment. The act of marriage usually creates normative or legal obligations between the individuals involved. In some societies these obligations also extend to certain family members of the married persons. In cultures that allow the dissolution of a marriage, this is known as divorce.

Marriage is usually recognized by the state or a religious authority, or both. It is often viewed as a contract. Civil marriage is the legal concept of marriage as a governmental institution irrespective of religious affiliation, in accordance with marriage laws of the said government. If recognized by the state, by the religion(s) to which the parties belong or by society in general, the act of marriage changes the personal and social status of the individuals who enter into it.

1.4.1 Definitions of Marriage

Anthropologists have proposed several competing definitions of marriage so as to encompass the wide variety of marital practices observed across cultures. In his book The History of Human Marriage (1921), Edward Westermarck defined marriage as “a more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring” (Westermarck, 1921). In The Future of Marriage in Western Civilization (1936, p.26) he rejected his earlier definition, instead provisionally defining marriage as “a relation of one or more men to one or more women that is recognised by custom or law”.

Family and Marriage
The anthropological handbook *Notes and Queries* (1951) defined marriage as “a union between a man and a woman such that children born to the woman are the recognized legitimate offspring of both partners.”

Edmund Leach expanded the definition and proposed that “Marriage is a relationship established between a woman and one or more other persons, which provides that a child born to the woman under circumstances not prohibited by the rules of the relationship is accorded full birth-status rights common to normal members of his society or social stratum” (Gudeman, 1976, p. 131). Leach argued that no one definition of marriage applied to all cultures. He offered a list of ten rights associated with marriage, including sexual monopoly and rights with respect to children, with specific rights differing across cultures. Duran Bell (1997) also criticized the legitimacy-based definition on the basis that some societies do not require marriage for legitimacy, arguing that in societies where illegitimacy means only that the mother is unmarried and has no other legal implications, a legitimacy-based definition of marriage is redundant. He proposed defining marriage in terms of sexual access rights.

It has been reckoned by sociologists and anthropologists that marriage is not so much about the gaining of a wife or a husband as about social and economic relationships and kinship and has to be considered accordingly. The changeover from a partnership and association or coalition to being relatives by marriage, both socially and economically, is central to the process. Thus, marriage may be understood as an important element of the social set up the world over, which plays a major role in the construction of family and in turn contributes to the stability of society.

Feminist theory approaches opposite-sex marriage as an institution traditionally rooted in patriarchy that promotes male superiority and power over women. This power dynamics see men as ‘the provider’ operating in the public sphere and women as ‘the caregiver’ or nurturer operating within the private sphere. This is contrasted with a conception of egalitarian marriage in which power and labour are divided equally and not according to gender roles. (Weadock, 2000.) The performance of dominant gender roles by men and submissive gender roles by women influences the power dynamics of marriage. Often women internalize the gender role stereotypes and assimilate into the role of ‘wife’, ‘mother’ and ‘caretaker’ in conformity to societal norms and their male partner. Often, within the family structure, individuals learn to accept sexist oppression as ‘natural’; and are primed to support other forms of oppression too. Despite the fact that egalitarian ideals are more common, the opposite-sex relationships are still unequal and are more commonly dominated by the male partner. In the next section, you will learn more in detail about such feminist theories relating to marriage.
1.4.2 Theories of Marriage

Feminists consider marriage to be an involuntary state where women are reduced to chattel. To them, marriage and family are inextricably bound up with private property, the class structure and the mode of production which is an aspect of capitalism. Fredrich Engels argued that the oppression of women sprang from the nuclear family. But, Engels, a pioneer of gender theory, disapproves the notion that the family had subordinated women throughout history. Instead, he places the blame firmly on the shoulders of capitalism, which has destroyed the prestige of women within the family. Thus, feminists romanticize pre-industrial times, claiming that spheres of work of men and women were indistinct.

The liberal idea of ‘equal marriage’ where men and women share equal responsibilities, including housework, has also been dismissed by feminists. The truly radical assault on the institution of family begins with Kate Millett in her book *Sexual Politics* that was first published in 1969. In attacking sexual politics, Millett attacked the entire structure of power in society that originates from the institution of patriarchy. Marriage is the agency that maintains the traditional pattern of man’s power over woman.

The critics question whether 18th century men really did more cooking, cleaning and diaper changing than their 20th century counterparts. Feminists insist that the status of women’s work used to be equal to that of men in the pre-industrial years. In the 19th century, industrialization was said to have brought in a divide between ‘home and production’ work. It further caused transfer of men’s labour from home to factory, while women remained at the hearth. Men came to dominate the public sphere while women were relegated to the private realm. Women accepted this unfavourable arrangement, including monogamy because it offered the security from growing complexities of life. Thus, the nuclear family did not evolve as a matter of biological intervention but as a result of forces of industrialization. So to say, men left the home to become wage earners in the outside world and women assumed the role of care givers in the family within the home. Women’s labour became essential but subordinate, freeing men to earn wages outside the home.

Feminists cannot ignore the fact that industrialization offered women an unprecedented opportunity to earn wages outside the home, that is, to be economically independent. But, they also argue that such a freedom was illusory. Women were paid lower wages and were excluded from many jobs. Under capitalism women assumed the role of breeders, housewives and buyers of consumer goods. Women maintain the workforce by providing laundry, food and cleaning services to men, all without a wage. Moreover, mothers provide the next generation of labourers, complete with appropriate socialization for exploitation by the capitalist society.
Karl Marx claimed that the production class entails at the same time the transmission and accumulation of skills from one generation to another. But, feminists have a problem with both Marx and Engels as they reject gender as the basis of class analysis. The important factor in class analysis is one’s relationship to the mode of production, i.e. whether one is a worker or a capitalist. Marx believed that once women enter the workforce, they will become equal to men. In other words, both Marx and Engels denied that women, as a group, formed a class with unique interest and needs.

To explain that women have gender interests, feminists evolved a theory of patriarchy, of male capitalism, in which women were oppressed by male culture as they are by the economic system. Recently, feminists have been edging away from outright condemnation of marriage and family. But still feminists insist that the state must thrust justice into inherently oppressive condition related to marriage and family life. But on the contrary it is argued that adults involved should work out their own definition of justice in the privacy of their own homes. Since, marriage and family are intimately connected to each other, let us understand the concept of family next.

1.5 FAMILY

In the human context a family is a group of people affiliated by blood relations although the dictionary meaning of the word family has much wider implications. In human context, a family (from Latin: *familiare*) is a group of people affiliated by consanguinity, affinity, or co-residence. In most societies it is the principal institution for the socialization of children. Extended from the human “family unit” by affinity, economy, culture, tradition, honour, and friendship, are concepts of family that are metaphorical, or that grow increasingly inclusive extending to nationhood and humanism. A family group consisting of a father, mother and their children is called a nuclear family. This term can be contrasted with an extended family.

There are also concepts of family that break with tradition within particular societies, or those that are transplanted via migration to flourish or else cease within their new societies. As a unit of socialisation and a basic institution, key to the structure of society, the family is the object of analysis for sociologists. Genealogy is a field which aims to trace family lineages through history. In science, the term “family” has come to be used as a means to classify groups of objects which are closely and exclusively related. In the study of animals it has been found that many species form groups that have similarities to the human “family”—often called “packs.”
One of the primary functions of the family is to produce and reproduce persons, biologically and socially. Thus, one’s experience of one’s family shifts over time. From the perspective of children, the family is a family of orientation: the family serves to locate children socially and plays a major role in their enculturation and socialization. From the point of view of the parent(s), the family is a unit for procreation, the goal of which is to produce, acculturate and socialize children. However, producing children is not the only function of the family; in societies with a sexual division of labour, marriage and the resulting relationship between two people, it is necessary for the formation of an economically productive household. A conjugal family includes only the husband, the wife and unmarried children who are not of age. The most common form of this family is regularly referred to in sociology as a nuclear family. A consanguineal family consists of a parent and his or her children, and other people. Although the concept of consanguinity originally referred to as relations by “blood”, cultural anthropologists have argued that one must understand the idea of “blood” metaphorically and that many societies understand family through other concepts rather than through genetic distance. A matrilocal family consists of a mother and her children residing at mother’s place of residence. Generally, these children are her biological offsprings. This kind of family in west is common where women have the resources to rear their children by themselves, or where men are more mobile than women.

1.5.1 History of the Institution of Family

The diverse data coming from ethnography, history, law and social statistics, establish that the human family is a social institution and not a biological fact founded on the natural relationship of consanguinity. Early scholars of family history applied Darwin’s biological theory of evolution in their theory of family systems. American anthropologist Lewis H. Morgan published Ancient Society in 1877, based on his theory of the three stages of human progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization. Morgan’s book was the inspiration for Friedrich Engels’ book The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State first published in 1884. Engel’s expanded Morgan’s hypothesis that economic factors caused the transformation of primitive community into a class-divided society. Engels’ theory of resource control, and later that of Karl Marx, was used to explain the cause and effect of change in family structure and function. The popularity of this theory was largely unmatched until the 1980s, when other sociological theories, most notably structural functionalism, gained acceptance.
1.5.2 Functions of Family

- **Economic Functions:** Anthropologists have often supposed that the family in a traditional society forms the primary economic unit. This economic role has gradually diminished in modern times, and in societies like those in the United States it has become much smaller, except in certain sectors such as agriculture and a few upper class families. In China the family still plays a strong role in the countryside as an economic unit. However, the relations between the economic role of the family, its socio-economic mode of production and cultural values remain highly complex.

- **Political Functions:** On the other hand family structures or its internal relationships may affect both state and religious institutions. J.F. Del Giorgio in *The Oldest Europeans* points out that the high status of women among the descendants of the post-glacial Paleolithic European people was coherent with the fierce love of freedom of pre-Indo-European tribes. He believes that the extraordinary respect for women in those families meant that children reared in such an atmosphere tended to distrust strong, authoritarian leaders. According to Del Giorgio, European democracies have their roots in those ancient ancestors. Even in India the status of women was generally high in the ancient times as has been depicted in the ancient *Vedas* and *Upanishads*.

---

Check Your Progress:

1) Write in your words about the functions of family.

2) Describe how marriage has been defined by different sociologists.

---

1.6 FAMILY IN THE WEST

Family arrangements in the west have become more diverse with no particular household arrangement, either nuclear, joint or extended. In US diverse household arrangements represent half of the United State’s population. There are different types of families in a wide variety of settings and their specific functions and meanings depend largely on their relationship to other social institutions. Sociologists have a special interest in the function and status of these forms in stratified (especially capitalist) societies. The term “nuclear family” is commonly used, especially in the United States and Europe, to refer to conjugal families. Sociologists distinguish between conjugal families (relatively independent of the kindred of the parents and of other families in general) and nuclear families (which maintain relatively close ties with their kindred). The term “extended family” is also common,
especially in the United States and Europe. This term has two distinct meanings. First, it serves as a synonym of “consanguinal family”. Second, in societies dominated by the conjugal family, it refers to kindred (an egocentric network of relatives that extends beyond the domestic group) who do not belong to the conjugal family. These types refer to ideal or normative structures found in particular societies. Any society will exhibit some variation in the actual composition and conception of families. Much of sociological, historical and anthropological research dedicates itself to the understanding of this variation and of changes in the family form over time. Thus, some speak of the bourgeois family, a family structure arising out of 16th century and 17th century European households, in which the family centers on a marriage between a man and woman, with strictly defined gender roles. Typically the man has responsibility for income and support, the woman for home and family matters. According to the work of scholars like Max Weber, Alan Macfarlane, Steven Ozment, Jack Goody and Peter Laslette, the huge transformation that led to modern marriage in western democracies was fueled by the religio-cultural value system provided by elements of Judaism, early Christianity, the Roman Catholic canon law and the Protestant Reformation. In contemporary Europe and the United States, people in academia, political and civil sectors have called attention to single-father-headed households and families headed by same-sex couples, although anthropologists and sociologists have pointed out that these forms exist in other societies as well. Also the term blended family or stepfamily describes families with mixed parents: one or both parents remarried, bringing children of the former family into the new family. In sociology, particularly in the works of social psychologist Michael Lamb, the term traditional family refers to a middle class family with a bread-winning father and a stay-at-home mother, married to each other and raising their biological children and non-traditional refers to a situation that is different from this. Most of the households in US and Europe are now non-traditional as per this definition.

A nuclear family is a family group consisting of a father, mother and their children, who share living space. This can be contrasted with an extended family. Nuclear families can have any number of children. It was not until the 17th and 18th centuries that the nuclear family became prevalent in Western Europe. With the emergence of industrialization and early capitalism, the nuclear family became a financially viable social unit. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary dates the term back to 1947, and the Oxford English Dictionary has a reference to the term from 1924; thus it is relatively new, although nuclear family structures themselves date back thousands of years. The term nuclear is used in its general meaning referring to a central entity or “nucleus” around which others collect. George Murdock (1949) also defines the term family and suggests that the family is a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction.
It contains 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 cohabiting adults.

The term **extended family** has several distinct meanings. First, it is used synonymously with consanguineous family or joint family. Second, in societies dominated by the conjugal family or nuclear family, it is used to refer to kindred who do not belong to the conjugal family. Often there could be many generations living under the same roof, depending on the circumstances. People living together as an extended family occasionally feel a greater security and belonging. This is an advantage of extended type of family because this family contains more people to serve as resources during crisis and provides more role models for behavior of values. The disadvantage of living in an extended type of family is shouldering of greater expenses for the basic needs of all members.

**Complex family** is a generic term for any family structure involving more than two adults. The term can refer to any extended family or to a polygamous family of any type. A **joint family** (or extended family) can also be known as a complex family, parents and their children’s families often live under a single roof. This type of family often includes multiple generations. In India, the family is a patriarchal structure, with sons’ families often staying in the same house.

In the **joint family** set up the workload is shared among the members, often unequally. The women are mostly housewives who cook for the entire family. The patriarch of the family (often the oldest male member) lays down the rules and arbitrates disputes. Other senior members of the household babysit infants in case their mother is working. They are also responsible for teaching the younger children their mother tongue, manners and etiquette. The house often has a large reception area and a common kitchen. Each family has their own bedroom. The members of the household also look after each other in case a member is ill. In many cultures, such as in many of the southern European, Asian, Middle Eastern, African, Latin American and Pacific Island countries extended families are the basic family unit. Cultures in which the extended family is common are generally collectivistic.

Australian aborigines are another group for whom the concept of family extends well beyond the nuclear model. Aboriginal immediate families include aunts, uncles and a number of other relatives who would be considered “distant relations” in the context of the nuclear family. Aboriginal families have strict social rules regarding who they can marry. Their family structure incorporates a shared responsibility for all tasks. It refers to people related by blood or those who are close to each other in age, in contrast to
elementary/nuclear family and joint family, which has married/unmarried offspring, married/unmarried siblings and may not have three generations living together, 6-10 members living in a house. A big family is a family consisting of at least three generations living together. Usually the family is headed by the oldest man. More often than not, it consists of grandparents, their sons and their sons’ families.

1.7 CHANGES IN FAMILY FORMATION

The popularity of the nuclear family in the west, as opposed to extended family living together, came about in the early 20th century, prompted in part by increased wages earned by the working class. This enabled more and more families to be economically independent, and thus to own their own home. Family arrangements in the US have become more diverse with no particular households arrangement prevalent enough to be identified as the average; however, 70% of children in the US live in traditional two-parent families.

Thus, the nuclear family no longer seems adequate to cover the wide diversity of household arrangements we see today. A new term has been introduced, postmodern family, which is meant to describe the great variability in family forms, including single-parent families and child-free couples. Patriarchally structured families have been critiqued from a feminist perspective, as we will see next.

1.8 MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY: A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

To the feminist, marriage oppresses women, the family breed’s patriarchy and both result from capitalism. The feminist view of marriage borders on the abused e. g housework as “surplus value”. Within feminism, the discussion of marriage has shifted over the past few decades. Virtually all feminists share the belief that men and women experience the family in totally different ways. This is not a biological truism but a statement of political and economic fact. For centuries, marriage laws favoured men to such a degree that a wife would even involuntarily sign on the dotted line if told to do so by the husband. Even after marriage laws have been reformed, the institution seems to favour men again e.g in the distribution of house work. But, for liberal feminists marriage is salvageable as an institution that needs reforms rather than elimination.
Liberal feminists started in the sixties with Betty Friedan’s pivotal work *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), where she argued that American women of that era were enslaved by domesticity and defined by their roles as wife and mother. Although, she called the family ‘comfortable concentration camps’, Friedman’s goal was not to eliminate marriage. She merely wanted women to insist on more from family and to reach outside marriage for fulfillment.

In another work, *The Second Stage* (1981), she has asked gender feminists for a ‘reconsideration of marriage’. She pleads with feminists to move away from anti family rhetoric and back to the dialogue that addresses the needs of most women who are wives and mothers. She calls for a humanistic evolution that would enrich the institution of family by including the needs and desires of men. Betty Friedan represents the liberal feminist point of view.

Conservatives believe that the traditional family is the basic building block of the institutions of society; it weaves the very fabric of cultural values. Many feminists agree but only up to a certain point. Conservatives champion the family as indispensable to civilization. Only families can offer long term emotional stability and commitment that child rearing requires. Only families can ensure reproduction and the proper socialization of children. Beyond this, families provide an emotional and sexual support system for married couples, who need a shelter against the buffets of a hostile world. Without family, conservatives predict the breakdown of moral values and an upsurge of social anarchy. On the contrary, feminists scholars reject the family for much the same reason that conservatives embrace it. It is a bastion of traditional values and a training ground for the institutions of society. In short, the family is the foundation of patriarchal capitalism, whereas feminists claim it as a source of women’s oppression.

The conflict over the modern family is further complicated by how quickly this institution is redefining itself. In 1950s, a typical family consisted of a husband and a wife with 2 to 4 children. The wife stayed at home, while the husband worked outside to provide for the family.

Today, there seems to be no typical family, no stereotype of a nuclear unit. Divorced parents, unwed mothers and adopting homosexuals have changed the portrait of parenthood. Domestic life has been transformed by economic realities that force most mothers into the workplace and out of the kitchen. This transformation in the ‘family’ presents something of a problem for feminists. It is difficult to consider something that takes as many forms as the modern family to be uniformly unjust in every instance. Yet feminists see a common denominator within all marriages namely the oppression of its female members.
Another pioneer in women’s liberation who has felt the need to publish a book to defend the concept of family is Germaine Greer. It was in 1970s that she called for the breakdown of sex roles. She encouraged women to be promiscuous and otherwise sexually adventurous. She advocated that women should refuse to be monogamous or to accept the ‘trappings of a marriage’ e.g. wearing a wedding ring or women using the husband’s last name after marriage. She also condemned women who carry out roles as consumers in a capitalist society.

Despite her pro-women discourse, Greer was not absolute in condemning the family nor was she unsympathetic to men. On the other hand she considered men to be fellow victims of the system and evolved the concept of ‘organic family’. In her later work, Greer defended a more traditional version of the family forthrightly, accepting it as the ‘basic unit’ of society.

Check your Progress:

1) Discuss the contemporary changes in family formations.

2) Describe the relationship between marriage and family from a feminist lens. Do you agree or disagree. Discuss in your own words.

1.9 INDIAN NOTIONS OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

Based on Hindu Scriptures, the system of marriage in India was well established in the Vedic period (2000-500 B.C.) and is viable even today. In Hindu society it is considered a very significant samskara especially for a girl, so much so that it moulds her whole life, which is circumscribed by the changes that follow. The Indian family also falls into several categories like the western family and may be classified into nuclear, joint or extended. However the features of these types of families may differ from those of their western counterparts.

A Hindu joint family or Hindu undivided family (HUF) is an extended family arrangement prevalent among Hindus of the Indian subcontinent, consisting of many generations living under the same roof. All the male members are blood relatives and all the women are either mothers, wives, unmarried daughters or widowed relatives, all bound by the common sapinda relationship. The joint family status being the result of birth, the cord that knits the members of the family together is not property but the relationship. The family is headed by a patriarch, usually the oldest male, who makes decisions on economic and social matters on behalf of the entire family. The patriarch’s wife generally exerts control over the kitchen, child rearing and minor religious practices. All money goes to the common pool and all property is held jointly.
There are several schools of Hindu Law, such as Mitakshara, the Dayabhaga, the Murumakkattayam, and the Aliyasanthana etc. Broadly, Mitakshara and Dayabhaga systems of laws are very common. In these family ties are given more importance than marital ties. The arrangement provides a kind of social security in a familial atmosphere. Due to the development of Indian Legal System, of late, the female members are also given the right to share to the property in the Hindu Undivided Family (HUF). In CIT vs Veerappa Chettiar, 76 ITR 467 (SC), Supreme Court had an occasion to decide on an issue whether after the death of all the female members in a HUF, the HUF would still exist.

1.10 LET US SUM UP

In this unit you read that marriage is a social-legal contract between people creating kinship. Then you learnt about what is understood by family. To put it simply, a family is an active organic entity, a social institution, bound by consanguinity, affinity or co-existence. Functions and types of family has been going through a change from time to time.

The discussion over the family and marriage is an ideological one where conservatives and feminists view the same institution but draw dramatically different conclusions. Conservatives see a family as a natural and smooth functioning unit. Feminists, on the other hand, look at family with an unfiltered lens where subjugation and oppression come up front. In the final analysis it is a question of power and gender roles which are sought to be adjusted within the society through the institution of marriage and the resultant family.

1.11 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1) Critically analyse the theories of marriage.
2) Discuss how industrialization changed the institutions of family and marriage.
3) Analyze the Indian notion of family and marriage and how these institutions are changing in modern times.

1.12 GLOSSARY

Kinship: Kinship is a relationship between any entities that share a genealogical origin, through biological, cultural, or historical descent.
Clan: Clan denotes a tribe, folk, race or a band.

Polygamy: Refers to the practice of having more than one wife at the same time in societies where this is legal.

Nuclear Family: The most common form of family type nowadays is the nuclear family denoting a parent or parents living together and constituting a household.

Extended Family: The term is used to denote a large group of people living under one roof, not necessarily joined together by relationships of onsanguinity or conjugality. Often there could be many generations living under the same roof.
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