

Factors that Influence the Changing in Family Function in Sudan (Khartoum case study)

Ebtihaj Abaker Musa Adam*¹, Hassan Mohammed Yousif²

*¹ Master student in Sudan University of Sciences and Technology, Khartoum, Khartoum, Sudan

²Department of Social Sciences, Sudan University of Sciences and Technology, Khartoum, Khartoum, Sudan

ABSTRACT

This study conducted to verify the influence the changing in family function in Sudan. To achieve this goal, the researchers used descriptive statistic methods. Questioner technique is used as method of data collection. Study group include (1254) families from some aria in Khartoum city capital of Sudan. (120) families were selected randomly as a study sample. The data was analyzed by using SPSS program. The results revealed that: the factors that influences the changing in family function in Sudanese families are: communications and technology revolution (95.8%), socialization disorders (87.5%), high cost of living (87.5%), cultural homogeneity between the couple (85), low salaries (87.2%), influence of the media (82.5%), low salaries (82.5%), disagreement between parents in socialization style (81.7%), spread of the phenomenon of unemployment (81.7%).

Keywords:: Family function, Changing, Influence, Factors.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, a family is "a group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption" • (U.S. Census Bureau). Though this definition seems straightforward, where do married couples or parents and children who live in different places fit in this definition of family? What about aunts and uncles who regularly care for their nieces or nephews while the parents work? According to the Census Bureau's definition, these relatively common family arrangements are not officially recognized as families. While the Bureau's definition of families is clear and is easily tracked over time, it is important to recognize that not all of our families fit this definition. U.S. Census Bureau (2000).

In fact, across time and cultures, using the Census Bureau definition of family is an inappropriate way to measure and examine families. In ancient Greece and in feudal Europe, a family was all of the people who

contributed to the household financial system, including servants U.S. Census Bureau (2000).

In many cultures today, non-parental adults are also considered part of the family if they play a large role in raising or looking after the children of others. These examples highlight the fact that, though the Census definition is clear and helpful, there is no single understanding of what a family is; its definition varies across many groups of people. Families are changing in many ways across the OECD and its enhanced-engagement partners. Most countries have seen a decline in the fertility rate over the past three decades. Today almost no OECD country has a total fertility rate above the population replacement rate of two children per women. As a result the average household size has also declined over this period. At the same time, there has been a sharp increase in the proportion of women entering the labor force. The evidence on trends in child well-being is mixed, and important challenges remain. There are still large gender gaps in employment and earnings and one in eight children, on average across the

OECD, still lives in relative poverty (Coltrane and Collins, 2001).

Family formation patterns are also changing. Increasingly, both men and women want to first establish themselves in the labour market before founding a family. Hence, the age of mothers at first childbirth has risen and with it the probability of having fewer children than previous generations. Many women remain childless. Birth rates have fallen and life expectancy has increased, so there are fewer children and more grandparents than before. (Coontz's 2005).

The structures, or forms, of the family vary as much as the definition itself. There is no single "true" family form. In Western Europe the nuclear family (a single set of biological parents residing together with their children) was prevalent in the Middle Ages, but at that same time in Eastern Europe multiple generations of the same family lived together in the same household (Coltrane and Collins, 2001).

Indeed, the United States has also seen many types of family forms throughout its short history. Stephanie Coontz's (2005) research on the history of marriage reveals that the family forms we see today in the U.S. are actually the result of an evolution of the family that began with an important shift in the culture of marriage in the mid-18th Century.

As marriage evolved in the mid- to late-18th Century into a union based on love, other economic, cultural, and political shifts in the U.S. and in other nations were happening that would further influence the structure of the family. In the 19th Century an ideal of the husband as breadwinner and the wife as homemaker became popular, but the majority of families could not achieve this ideal, as few jobs paid wages high enough to support a single-earner family. This changed as World War II ended and the U.S. experienced a time of dramatic economic growth. The economic prosperity of the time combined with the popular cultural ideal gave rise to family trends in the 1950s and early 1960s that had never been seen before. "Ozzie and Harriet" families that married young, remained married, and had many children were the major family form at this time (McLanahan and Casper, 2001). The realization of the Ozzie and Harriet ideal did not last long, however. In the

late 1960s and 1970s divorce rates rose, births to unmarried women increased, and the average age of first marriage also rose. The reasons for these changes in the '60s and '70s were many: real wages for women rose while those for men fell, the economy weakened, wives joined the workforce due to the downturn in the economy, and women gained access to legal rights, education, birth control, and paid work. (McLanahan and Casper, 2001 Coltrane and Collins, 2001).

This historical examination of the evolution of the family and marriage shows that the family has constantly been under pressure to evolve and shift with changes in the economy, our values, and even politics. The evolution of marriage into an institution of love along with changes in the economy, our culture, and the political scene since the 1950s has meant that American men and women have been able to realize their ideals of the male breadwinner and marriage for the sake of love and personal freedom as time changes (Coltrane and Collins, 2001).

These influences and trends in marriage, divorce, and non-marital fertility did not escape rural America. Comparing urban and rural parts of the country between 1950 and 1970 reveals, however, that rural divorce rates were lower, fewer women age 20-24 were unmarried, and the number of children per 1,000 ever married women age 35-44 was slightly higher in rural America (Brown, 1981). The changes in marriage, divorce, and fertility we observe during the 20th Century in all parts of the U.S. demonstrate that the structure of families are changing and becoming more diverse. While there are now many forms available to people, the family itself is not disappearing. (Pryor, and Rodgers, 2001).

Changes in family structure and changes in poverty are closely related. Single-mother families are about five times as likely to be poor as married-parent families.² Although they are less likely to be poor than they were 50 years ago, single parent families are more common, accounting for a larger share of all poor families. Moreover, eligibility for income support programs, including cash welfare, food stamps, and the Earned Income Tax Credit, are tied to family composition. (M. Cancian & S. Danziger, 2009)

In recent years, policymakers have sought not only to respond to family changes, but also to influence the decisions people make about marriage, divorce, and childbearing. Thus, poverty policies and family policies are increasingly tied. Changes in family patterns are being produced by many factors. The important among these are science and technology (industrialization), expansion of towns and cities (urbanization) and employment of men and women both within organizations and outside family influence. (Kanho Hakhoe 1990).

The material condition of industrial-capitalist society is the main cause of change in the family. Greater affluence, geographical and occupational mobility and economic independence of (some) women are the main contributing factors for the change in patterns of residence and family life.

The global factor (technology and industrial change) is nearly encompassing everything. Since it is everything, naturally it causes everything. Industrial change or industrialization includes not merely machines, but the science and engineering that produced them, the secular attitudes of the modern era, anti-traditionalism, job placement on the basis of competence, an open-class system, high geographical mobility and urbanization.

Industrialization in this enveloping sense does 'cause' the modern social and family patterns. These changes are tending to produce a worldwide movement towards nuclear family systems, eroding extended (joint) family forms and other types of kinship group. It is opined that there is a 'fit' between industrialization and the conjugal (nuclear) family.

There is also some sort of natural harmony between the modern complex of industrialization and the conjugal system. The industrial system has increased the demand of emotional satisfaction which is provided by conjugal bond only. Thus, this family system is attuned to serve the needs of industrialization.

The extended family system is unfit to the demands of industrialization. Decreasing emphasis on land ownership also increases the ease in mobility. The conjugal family is neo-local and its kinship network is

not strong, thus it puts fewer barriers in geographical mobility.

In Africa and the Sudan the family is an extended family. The family includes grandparents, mothers, father, children, uncles, aunts, cousins, nephew and nieces. Children from the same father and different mothers consider themselves as brothers and sisters. All of the children within the extended family are considered equal and must be treated equally.

The head of the family and his wives are obligated to care for their nephews, nieces and cousins as their own children. Once the children become adults they are in turn responsible for caring for them, their own parents, aunts and uncles when they age. (Garfinkel, & et al 1998).

There are many studies conducted about family change and its reasons. Coontz (2005) found that only in the mid-to late-18th Century in Western Europe and North America "did the notion of free choice and marriage for love triumph as a cultural ideal...[opening] the way for it to become an optional and fragile [institution]" thus influencing the structure of the family at that time and into the future. Earlier in history, during the Stone and middle ages, marriage was not based on love and men and women had very little choice about whom they married. In the Stone Age men and women married in order to improve the economic situation of their respective clans, then in the Middle Ages and into the 18th Century marriage served the economic and political needs of a particular extended family group.

W.F. Ogburn (1922) saw a wide range of new elements as sources of family change, from ideology to airplane. He argued that the development of formal agencies like schools, hospitals, hotels, etc., for handling major functions of the family have greatly affected the institution of family.

Labour-saving devices have reduced the number of hours of the housewife. This has offered more freedom and has relieved them from many household tasks. The young ones need not now rely on family elders for job instructions, since the schools and the factory teach them new skills.

The growth of romanticism, the high premium on individual attachment along with individualistic and liberal values of industrial-capitalist society encourages people to change their partners as they want. In this connection, Giddens (1997) observed, ‘for many in the West commitment is “for now,” not necessarily “forever”’.

Relationships depend on feelings, not externally imposed moral frameworks. These values have led in the rise of divorce rates and as a consequence single-parent households, reconstituted family or living with step families are increasing. Cohabitation (where a couple lives together in sexual relationship without marriage) has become increasingly common in many developing and developed countries.

Finlay Study conducted by Chung, (1990). The purpose of this study was to identify the degree of family function and to determine factors influencing family function. The following results were obtained: 1. the mean family Apgar score was 5.70 +/- 0.11, in a range from 0-10. 2. Scores from 0 to 6, which fall into the dysfunctional family range, were recorded for 266 families (59.6%). 3. Significant variables among general characteristics influencing family function were age, sex, marital status, educational levels, monthly income and occupation. 4. Significant variables among family characteristics influencing family function were family life cycle, utilization of family resources and family atmosphere. Luk. F (2011) conducted study to examine teachers' stories of children's coping with changing family situations such as divorce or family separation which can induce discontinuities in their lives. He found that the teachers' stories show that children in changing family situations are facing new kinds of difficulties from the mixing of modern family forms and traditional family values. Implications to teacher education, policy and practice are suggested.

Aims of the Study:

The aims of this study were:

1. To verify the factors that influences the changing in family function in Sudan.
2. To know the influences of social factors in family function in Sudan.

3. To know the influences of economic factors in family function in Sudan.
4. To know the influences of cultural, cognitive and technological factors in family function in Sudan.
5. To know the influences of psychological factors in family function in Sudan.

Question of the Study:

1. What are social factors that influence the changing in family function?
2. What are economic factors that influence the changing in family function?
3. What are cultural, cognitive and technological factors that influence the changing in family function?
4. What are psychological factors that influence the changing in family function?

II. METHODS AND MATERIAL

The study was carried in Khartoum, capital of Sudan. The study adopted a descriptive method.

Population and Sample:

The population of the study was families in Khartoum city (four arias). The researchers chose randomly 120 families from study group as a study sample table 1 shows the study sample.

TABLE 1 SHOWS THE STUDY SAMPLE

Arias	Frequency	Precent
Alazahari	39	32.5%
Arkaweet	34	28.3%
ALsahafa	26	21.7%
Altaeef	21	17.5%
Total of sample	120	100

Instruments:

The researchers used a questionnaire containing (24) items developed by the researcher from literature reviewed was used for data collection. The questionnaire

was divided into four sections, A, B C and D, A was designed to obtain social factors of social change, B was designed to obtain economic factors of social change C was designed to obtain cultural, cognitive and technological factors and D designed to obtain psychological and educational factors of social change.

Validity and Reliability

The instrument was face and content validated by three experts from social study department University of Jazan. Cronbach's Alpha reliability method was adopted to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. A reliability coefficient of 0.87 was obtained.

Practical Procedures

The researchers with the help of three research assistants administered the questionnaire. The respondents were allowed a period of two months, after which the researchers and the research assistants went round to collect the scale items for analysis. The data collected was analysed using frequency, percentage, and Cronbach's Alpha.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. RESULTS

Question one: What are social factors that influence the changing in family function?

To answer this question the researchers used percentage, Table 2 shows the result of question one.

TABLE 2 SHOWS THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL FACTORS IN FAMILY FUNCTION CHANGE

N	Factors	F	%
1	Absence of men and women for a period of time from home	101	84.2
2	Spread of the phenomenon of unemployment	98	81.7
3	Migration from rural to the cities	90	75
4	Change the shape and build of the family	86	71.7
5	Social heterogeneity	80	66.7

6	Dependence on home servants	75	62.5
---	-----------------------------	----	------

KEY: Total number of sample 120, F= Frequency, % = percentage.

As you see in table 2 the result shows that: the social factors that influence the changing in family function are: 84.2% of sample pointed that the social factor is absence of men and women for a period of time from home social, 81.7% pointed that the social factor is the spread of the phenomenon of unemployment, 75% pointed that the social factor is the migration from rural to the cities, 71.7% pointed that the social factor is the change the shape and build of the family, 66.7 pointed that the social factor is the social heterogeneity, and 62.5% pointed that the social factor is the dependence on home servants.

Question two: What are economic factors that influence the changing in family function?

To answer this question the researchers used percentage, Table 3 shows the result of question two.

TABLE 3 SHOWS THE INFLUENCE OF ECONOMIC FACTORS IN FAMILY FUNCTION CHANGE

N	Factors	F	%
1	High cost of living	105	87.5
2	Low salaries	99	82.5
3	The lack of government aid to poor families	93	77.5
4	The rule of economic values	86	71.7
5	Women go out to work	76	63.3
6	The emergence of patterns of consumer entertainment	70	58.3

KEY: Total number of sample 120, F= Frequency, % = percentage.

As you see in table 3 the result shows that: the economic factors that influence the changing in family function are: 87.5% of sample pointed that the economic factor is high cost of living, 82.5% pointed that the economic

factor is the low salaries, 77.5% pointed that the economic factor is the lack of government aid to poor families, 71.7% pointed that the economic factor is the rule of economic values, 63.6 pointed that the economic factor is the women go out to work, and 58.3% pointed that the economic factor is the emergence of patterns of consumer entertainment.

Question three: What are cultural, cognitive and technological factors that influence the changing in family function?

To answer this question the researchers used percentage, Table 4 shows the result of question two.

TABLE 4 SHOWS THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL, COGNITIVE AND TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS IN FAMILY FUNCTION CHANGE

N	Factors	F	%
1	Communications and technology revolution	115	95.8
2	Cultural homogeneity between the couple	102	85
3	Influence of the media	99	82.5
4	The impact of migrant culture	87	72.5
5	Weak laws and legislation	80	66.7
6	Cognitive deficiencies for parents	75	62.5

KEY: Total number of sample 120, F= Frequency, % = percentage.

As you see in table 4 the result shows that: the cultural, cognitive and technological factors that influence the changing in family function are: 95.8% of sample pointed that the cultural, cognitive and technological factor is communications and technology revolution, 85% pointed that the cultural, cognitive and technological factor is cultural homogeneity between the couple, 82.5% pointed that the cultural, cognitive and technological factor is influence of the media, 72.5% pointed that the cultural, cognitive and technological factor is the impact of migrant culture, 66.7 pointed that the cultural, cognitive and technological factor is the weak laws and legislation, and 62.5% pointed that the cultural,

cognitive and technological factor is cognitive deficiencies for parents.

Question four: What are psychological factors that influence the changing in family function?

To answer this question the researchers used percentage, Table 5 shows the result of question two.

TABLE 5 SHOWS THE INFLUENCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN FAMILY FUNCTION CHANGE.

N	Factors	F	%
1	Socialization disorders	105	87.5
2	disagreement between parents in socialization style	98	81.7
3	Large number of divorce	90	75
4	The weakness of male authority in the family	87	72.5
5	Dispose of family size	80	66.7
6	Lack of empathy in families	76	63.3

KEY: Total number of sample 120, F= Frequency, % = percentage.

As you see in table 5 the result shows that: the psychological factors that influence the changing in family function are: 87.5% of sample pointed that the psychological factor is socialization disorders, 81.7% pointed that the psychological is disagreement between parents in socialization style, 75% pointed that the psychological factor is large number of divorce, 72.5% pointed that the psychological factor is the weakness of male authority in the family, 66.7 pointed that the psychological factor is the dispose of family size, and 63.3% pointed that the psychological factor is lack of empathy in families.

B. DISCUSSION

When we analysed that data the revealed that the factors that influence the changing in family function in Sudan are: communications and technology revolution (95.8%), socialization disorders (87.5%), high cost of living (87.5%), cultural homogeneity between the couple (85), low salaries (87.2%), influence of the media (82.5%), low salaries (82.5%), disagreement between parents in socialization style (81.7%), spread of the phenomenon of unemployment (81.7%). These results are in line with

many studies as study of Coltrane, Scott and Randall Collins. (2001), Coontz's (2005), Cancian & S. Danziger, (2009), and Chung, (1990) as you see in literature review.

The researchers pointed that In Sudan (aria study), the family is responsible for caring for family members and the welfare of the family as a whole. Traditionally, men are the head of the family and they are responsible for the whole family. Women look after the old, the sick, and the mentally ill, although many of these responsibilities have been eroded by urbanization. Whether in rural or urban society, however, the burden of these social services falls upon women, except for a small number of liberated, educated young women from wealthy families, girls remain within the household and they are segregated at all festivities, eating separately after the men. Men socialize and eat together separate from women. In a small family, the husband eats alone or, more frequently, takes his food and eats with his male neighbours. Young university couples might live much the same as in the West, in a house without relatives. They might live, eat, and socialize together. Nevertheless, traditional patterns are deeply rooted, and the husband would often be away visiting his male friends in the market and cafés.

In wealthy families in the Sudan, a servant helps the wife with the children. Educated women, whether married or unmarried, have greater freedom and mobility particularly if they are employed. Nevertheless, she would not trespass upon male-dominated social norms.

In some respects, uneducated women have greater freedom so long as it is with their peers and female relatives. Paradoxically, segregation creates a spirit of independence, particularly among educated women, for there are a number of aunts, cousins, and grandmothers to look after the children and allow the mothers to work outside the home. Nevertheless, social traditions govern the way of life of Sudanese women. The segregation and subordination of women in Sudanese society should not obscure the fact that women dominate the household just as their men command public life. The home and the rearing of children are their domain, so long as they uphold male-oriented social norms.

Immigration has changed roles and responsibilities in Sudanese families for men and women, youth and children. In Sudan, the wife and female relatives take care of the house and children without any support from male family members. So that these are the reasons of social change in Sudanese families

IV. CONCLUSION

We conducted to study to exam the influence the changing in family function in Sudan. We followed descriptive method by depending to questionnaire to obtain the goal, the study revealed that:

1. The social factors that influence the changing in family function are: absence of men and women for a period of time from home social, the spread of the phenomenon of unemployment.
 2. The cultural, cognitive and technological factors that influence the changing in family function are: communications and technology revolution, homogeneity between the couple, and influence of the media.
 3. The economic factors that influence the changing in family function are: high cost of living, the low salaries.
- the psychological factors that influence the changing in family function are: socialization disorders, disagreement between parents in socialization style.

V. REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, David L. (1981). A Quarter Century of Trends and Changes in the Demographic Structure of American Families. In Raymond T. Coward and William M. Smith Jr. (eds.), *The Family in Rural Society*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Pp. 9-26.
- [2] Chung, Sandra. (1990). VP's and verb movement in Chamorro. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 8:559-619.
- [3] Coltrane, Scott and Randall Collins. (2001). *Sociology of Marriage & the Family: Gender, Love, and Property*. Fifth Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- [4] Coontz, Stephanie. (2005). *Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy or How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York, NY: Viking Penguin.

- [5] Garfinkel, Irwin, Sara McLanahan, Marta Tienda, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. (1998). Fragile Families and welfare Reform. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 23(4/5).
- [6] Giddens (1997). *Sociology*, 3rd Edition, Polity Press: Cambridge
- [7] Kanho Hakhoe Chi.(1990). Analysis of factors affecting family function. *Korean. PMI* 20(1):5-15.
- [8] Luk. F (2011) Teachers' Stories of Children Coping with Family Situations and Family Changes: A Hong Kong Hybrid Case. *Education* 3-13, v39 n4 p415-427.
- [9] M.Cancian & S. Danziger (2009), Family Structure, Childbearing, and Parental Employment: Implications for the Level and Trend in Poverty,” in *Changing Poverty, Changing Policies*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- [10] Pryor, J. and Rodgers, B. (2001) *Children in Changing Families*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [11] U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *American Fact Finder Glossary*. Downloaded July 8, 2008. Technical Documentation: Census 2000 Summary File 1.
- [12] W.F. Ogburn (1922). *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. University of Chicago Press.