

not assume that, where they encounter resistance to change, they are dealing simply with irrational attachment to outworn values. Explanations in terms of the traditions of the society are probably beside the point. The more African history is explored, the more it seems that—as anywhere in the world—societies have been adapting and changing as far back as knowledge reaches. To blame resistance to innovation on conservatism only evades the need to explain. Where people refuse to accept economic innovations, it is likely to be because the collective risk is too great.

At the same time, very radical changes in social structure will not necessarily lead to a readier response to opportunity. The creation of a settled, wage-earning, urban population is, for instance, a characteristic consequence of modernization. But, as it consolidates, it will probably develop values far more hostile to individual ambition than at present pervade African society. As the new middle class pass their educational advantage on to their children, the rest of society will draw in upon itself in compensa-

tion, emphasizing loyalty at the expense of achievement. And as plans of economic development advance some regions of the country to the neglect of others, the backward communities may turn their backs on a nation which offers them so little, seeing in economic innovation nothing but a final blow to their self-respect. They may then, indeed, invent a myth of their traditional greatness: the attachment to tradition may be, after all, not a cause but a consequence of economic stultification.

These discursive illustrations suggest, then, that resistance to change cannot be traced to family structure. Fundamentally similar structures may accommodate very divergent attitudes towards individual achievement, and these attitudes will reflect, not an autonomous tradition of kinship obligation, but a contemporary calculation of the risk to the security of the group as a whole of the economic aspirations of its members. The outcome is likely to be a subtle balance between the economic insurance which personal possession and mutual obligation each can provide.

Family Structure and Modernization*

A. W. VAN DEN BAN**

Although many people believe that persons living in extended families or in families with a high degree of familism are slow to adopt innovations, there is no empirical evidence that this is true.

IT IS often assumed that modernization takes place less rapidly in extended family households than in nuclear family households.¹ Some people even called the extended family households "traditional households."² However, most authors do not consider it necessary to give empirical evidence for this opinion. In this research note we will summarize some empirical studies

which show that extended family households do not lag behind nuclear family households in the same villages in adoption of new farm practices, new attitudes towards the use of credit, or opinianateness on events in the outside world.

There are two reasons why one assumes that extended families will be less prone to adopt new ideas than nuclear families. One is that in extended family households the older generation has much power in the decision-making process and prevents the more innovative younger generation from adopting new ideas. However, it is not yet sure that age is always closely related to innovativeness. Rogers and Stanfield³ found, in only 51 out of 158 publications in which this relationship was studied, that younger people are more innovative. Another reason is that in the process of modernization of society the proportion of extended fami-

* This article is a revision of some pages from *Boer en landbouwvoorlichting; de communicatie van nieuwe landbouwmethoden* (The Communication of New Farm Practices in the Netherlands), Assen, Van Gorcum, 1963, 279 pp.

** A.W. van den Ban is Professor of Extension Education at the Agricultural University in Wageningen, Netherlands.

¹ E.g., H. Becker, "Processes of Secularization: An Ideal-Typical Analysis," *Sociological Review*, 24 (1932), pp. 141, 143; G. Germani, "Secularización y Desarrollo Económico," in *Resistencias à Mudança*, Rio de Janeiro: Centro Latino-Americano de Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais, 1960, pp. 261-279; and S. Groenman and H. Schreuder, "Ommen," *Verlagen Landbouwkundige Onderzoeken*, 55.19, Den Haag, 1949, p. 75.

² G. A. Kooy and E. W. Hofstee, "Traditional households and neighbour-group," *Transactions of the 3rd World Congress of Sociology*, Amsterdam, 1956.

³ E. M. Rogers and J. D. Stanfield, *Adoption and Diffusion of New Products: Emerging Generalization and Hypotheses*, mimeograph, Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

ly households is gradually decreasing and one assumes that families which modernize in one aspect, such as in family structure, will also modernize in other aspects, such as adoption of new ideas. This hypothesis sounds plausible, but has to be proven.

Van den Ban⁴ studied the modernization of agriculture in 22 Dutch villages. In five of these villages there was a sizable number of farm families in his sample which consisted of at least one member of another generation than the parents and children, usually one of the grandparents. In these villages he compared the nuclear and the extended (three-generation) family households on three indices for modernization of agriculture, viz., adoption of recommended farm practices, judgment on the quality of farm management by the local extension officer, and the frequency of contact with this extension officer. All differences between nuclear and extended family households were small, and only nine of the 15 differences studies (five villages \times three indices) indicated that the nuclear families had a more modern agriculture.

Benvenuti⁵ studied this problem in a Dutch community where only 43 percent of the farm families lived in nuclear households. His measure for modernization was the ability of the head of the household to give a meaningful or sensible answer on ten opinion questions on current issues, such as: "What do you think of the initiatives taken by the Dutch political parties for the farmer's interests?" He could prove that farmers who gave an answer to most of these questions were in many respects more modernized than those who failed to answer them. However, he did not find a significant difference between the heads of nuclear and of extended family households with this opinion scale.⁶

Fliegel⁷ studied in an agriculturally less prosperous part of Pennsylvania the difference in attitude towards credit between farmers in nuclear families and farmers who lived with their parents in one household. Probably this attitude toward the use of credit is related to many other aspects of the modernization of the farm enterprise. He found in nuclear families that only 23 percent of the farmers had a positive attitude

⁴ A. W. van den Ban, "Enkele kenmerken en eigenschappen van de vooruitstrevende boeren II," *Bulletin 10 Afd. Sociologie en Sociografie*, Wageningen, 1958.

⁵ B. Benvenuti, *Farming in Cultural Change*, Assen: van Gorcum, 1961.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

⁷ F. C. Fliegel, "Traditionalism in the Family and Technological Change," *Rural Sociology*, 27 (1962), pp. 70-76.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF FARM OPERATORS WHO HAVE OTHER RELATIVES THAN SONS ON THEIR FARMS, ACCORDING TO THEIR ADOPTION OF FARM PRACTICES

Adoption Category	Percent with Relatives	Number of Observations
Low	14	49
Medium Low	16	44
Medium high	26	44
High	24	27

towards the use of credit, whereas this percentage was 54 if both parents of the farmer were present in the household.

Somewhat similar results were found by Galjart⁸ near Rio de Janeiro in Brazil (see Table 1). These relatives were not only fathers, but mainly cousins, sons-in-law, etc.

Why has the expected correlation between family structure and modernization not been found more clearly in these four studies? A possible explanation could be that nuclear families are less prevalent on large farms than on small farms.⁹ In two studies the relationship has been studied for different farm size categories separately,¹⁰ and there also no indication at all was found that nuclear families are more modern than extended families.

Fliegel¹¹ finds some indications for an interesting hypothesis. It is possible that the man who lives in one family with his father has to play the role of a "boy" and therefore has more innovative attitudes than a man of the same age whose parents live elsewhere and who therefore has to play the role of an adult. However, this cannot explain the findings from the Netherlands, where usually the older generation was interviewed.

FAMILISM

Related to the difference between nuclear and extended family households is probably a dimension often called familism, which indicates the relative concentration of efforts of the family towards the achievement of group as opposed to individual ends.¹² It is often assumed that

⁸ B. F. Galjart, *Itaqui: Old habits and new practices in a Brazilian land settlement schemes*, manuscript, Department of Non-western Sociology, Agricultural University, Wageningen, 1967.

⁹ Benvenuti, *op. cit.*, p. 302; and L. K. Sen, "Family in four Indian Villages," *Man in India*, 45 (1965), p. 11.

¹⁰ Benvenuti, *op. cit.*, p. 303; and Fliegel, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

¹¹ Fliegel, *ibid.*

¹² F. C. Fliegel, "A Multiple Correlation Analysis of Factors Associated with Adoption of Farm Practices," *Rural Sociology*, 21 (1956), p. 287.

this dimension also retards the adoption of innovations, because it decreases with modernization of society, and because other than economic motives are involved in the decision whether or not one will adopt these innovations. Contrary to his expectation, Wilkening¹³ found in a Wisconsin study a slightly positive relationship between familism and the adoption of some innovations. In a restudy of his data, using partly different questions for the familism index, Fliegel¹⁴ found a low, but significant, negative correlation-coefficient (-0.198).

Ramsey, Polson, and Spencer¹⁵ studied this relationship between the adoption of recommended farm practices and a familism scale and also with scales for 11 other values among dairy farmers in New York State. In measuring familism they asked, e.g., whether the farmer in moving would try to move close to his relatives and whether in rearing children one considers teaching them that respect for their parents is very important. The null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between familism and adoption, could not be rejected.

In a study near Calcutta, India, Bose¹⁶ used a

¹³ E. A. Wilkening, "Adoption of Improved Practices as Related to Family Factors," *Research Bulletin 183*, Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, 1953.

¹⁴ Fliegel, "A Multiple Correlation Analysis of Factors Associated with Adoption of Farm Practices," *op. cit.*, p. 289.

¹⁵ C. E. Ramsey, R. A. Polson, and G. E. Spencer, "Values and the Adoption of Practices," *Rural Sociology*, 24 (1959), pp. 35-47.

familism scale and five other attitude scales. For his Likert-type familism scale, he used statements such as: "Living in a joint family is better than in a nuclear family." Nearly all his respondents were near the extreme familism end of his scale, and this might have been the reason that he found hardly any correlation of this scale with the adoption of farm practices and with the other attitude scales.

Again the evidence that familism is an important factor in the adoption of innovations is quite meager. One reason can be the correlation between familism and farm size,¹⁷ but no negative correlation between familism and adoption of innovations has been found after controlling for farm size. Another reason might be that the ends of the family as a group are not always opposed to the individual ends of the family members. A vivid description of some ways in which family connections can be used for personal goals is given by Leeds.¹⁸

CONCLUSION

Our understanding of the effect of the family structure on the adoption of innovations by the family and on their acceptance of modern attitudes is quite limited. It is hoped that this note will stimulate some more research in this field.

¹⁶ S. P. Bose, "Peasant Values and Innovations in India," *American Journal of Sociology*, 67 (1962), pp. 552-560.

¹⁷ Wilkening, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁸ A. Leeds, "Brazilian Careers and Social Structure: An Evolutionary Model and Case History," *American Anthropologist*, 66 (1964), pp. 1321-1347.

Normative Family Orientations of Chinese College Students in Hong Kong*

BARTLETT H. STOODLEY**

A random sample of Chinese college students are interviewed with reference to family norms. The data suggest that the younger generation, while adopting the Western norm of individual choice in marriage, observe proprieties of parental respect and Confucian tradition while only partially accepting Western norms of dating and romantic love. This movement toward an extended family type may, in the light of American studies, be functional in the urban context.

THE sociological concern with social change has frequently focused on the relation between "modernism" and family structure in tradition-

* This is an expanded version of a paper read at the meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, spring, 1964. The research was supported by grants from the American Philosophical Society and Wellesley College.

** Bartlett H. Stoodley, LL.B., Ph.D., is Professor of Sociology and Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

al societies.¹ William J. Goode has modulated the rather determinist views of the functional-

¹ See Talcott Parsons, "Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification," *Class, Status, and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification*, ed. by R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, New York: The Free Press, a division of the MacMillan Co., 1953, p. 92; Eugene Litwak, "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," *American Sociological Review*, 25 (1960), pp. 9-21; also, his "Geographic Mobility and Family Cohesion," *American Sociological Review*,