



Sociology & Cultural Research Review (SCRR)

Available Online: <https://scrrjournal.com>

Print ISSN: [3007-3103](#) Online ISSN: [3007-3111](#)

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



Qualitative Analysis of Urbanization and the Transformation of Traditional Family Structures

Noor ul Ain Shouq

PhD Scholar, Department of Sociology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Iqbal Zafar*

Supervisor, Department of Sociology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

Abstract

The study has been planned to investigate broadly the impact of urbanization on the transformation of the traditional family structure. More specifically in qualitative research it has been explored, the impact of urbanization on shifting from extended to nuclear family structure, weakening of kinship and community bonds, economic pressures and family restructuring, transformation of gender roles, individualization and autonomy in family decisions, diversification of family forms, migration and translocal family systems, generational conflict and cultural change. In qualitative research sixty (60) in-dept interviews (twenty from each city.) were conducted with individuals (Head of household or senior member of the family) from diverse family type from the three major cities of Pakistan Lahore, Karachi and Faisalabad and six focus group discussion were conducted with head of household or senior member of the family (6-8 participants). Focus group discussion were also conducted one from each city. Thematic analysis has been used to analyzed the qualitative data. It has been found that due to the urbanization a massive family transformation has been occurred in all the cities of Pakistan. It is recommended all the efforts must be exercised to promote the benefits of traditional family systems for the family development and wellness.

Keywords: *Urbanization, Transformation of Traditional Family Structures, nuclear family, gender roles, digital technology, cultural rituals, psychological stress, socioeconomic status.*

Introduction

Urbanization is a major socio-economic phenomenon in contemporary society. It involves the shift of people from rural to urban settlements, along with the expansion of urban centres and urbanization of social life. In the last century, industrialization, economic development, and globalisation have fast-tracked urbanization, especially in the developing world, such as Pakistan. It has not only reshaped economies but also had a significant impact on social structures, including the family (Archavanitkul & Chamratrithirong, 2010). The family, considered the fundamental social institution, has experienced significant structural, functional and role changes as a result of urbanization. Traditionally, rural families are extended, with several generations co-habiting and collaborating. These extended families are marked by strong family bonds, collective decision-making, and rigid gender roles. But urban life encourages nuclear families, individualism and evolving social values (Singh, 2025).

One of the most prominent processes that affect the modern societies is urbanization. It does not only mean the migration of population between rural and urban

areas but also radical changes in social relations, cultural norms, economic structures and institutions. The change of traditional family structures is one of the most notable effects of it. The conservative family structures, especially in agrarian societies, are normally typified by the presence of extended family networks, group decision-making, economic production, as well as by the high levels of intergenerational authority. Nevertheless, the fast urbanization has resulted in the formation of nuclear families, individualistic household structures, and heterogeneous family structures. This qualitative research examines how the urbanization is changing the traditional family set-ups using lived experiences, perceptions and social narratives. The research is based on the key sociological theories such as structural functionalism, modernization theory, conflict theory, feminist theory, urban ecology, individualization theory, and postmodern family theory.

Objectives:

To study the impact of urbanization on shifting from extended to nuclear family structure, weakening of kinship and community bonds, economic pressures and family restructuring, transformation of gender roles, individualization and autonomy in family decisions, diversification of family forms, migration and translocal family systems, generational conflict and cultural change.

Methodology

Sixty (60) in-dept interviews were conducted with the individuals (Head of household or senior member of the family) from the three major cities of Pakistan Lahore, Karachi and Faisalabad (20 from each city) to study the impact of urbanization on the changing of the traditional family structure. Six focus group discussions were also conducted for having meaningful quality data on different themes. In each group there were six to eight participants (Head of household or senior member of the family). Thematic analysis, a systematic and adaptable technique, was utilized to analyze the qualitative component of this study to allow the researcher to form an in-depth and meaningful interpretation of data without causing the loss of the richness of the lived experiences of the participants. This approach was especially appropriate to examine the process of urbanization and the shifts in the traditional family framework, where the voices, perceptions and accounts of the participants could be thoroughly analyzed and reflected on the shifting family relations within urban contexts. The thematic analysis started with familiarization of the data. Interview and focus group transcripts were well read and re-read by the researcher to get entirely into the data. The step contributed to a good comprehension of the experiences of participants in terms of urban life and family change, such as the shift in the composition of households, gender roles, generational relations, caregiving, and how migration and urban life style affect family cohesion.

After the familiarization, primary codes were produced based on the data. These codes were significant units of information that were directly based on the answers of the participants, e.g., the movement of extended families to nuclear families, the decline in contact with extended families, the increase in the financial autonomy, the entry of women into the workforce, and the emotional or social difficulty in urban locations. Coding has allowed distinguishing between recurring ideas, expressions, and patterns within the dataset. The next step involved grouping of similar codes into larger groups according to conceptual similarities. These themes were then grouped into broad themes that represented the most significant aspects of urban familial change. Themes also represented significant aspects like the transforming family life, gender roles, and decline in intergenerational relationships, separation of families due to migration and the conflict between the old and the new urban life.

Lastly, the identified themes were revised, refined, and verified to make sure the themes reflected the data. Any redundant, unclear/overlap themes were updated to make sense. The themes that were finally developed were then stated and categorized in significant terms in order to improve the interpretation and comprehension of the changes in traditional family structures brought about by urbanization. On the whole, such rigorous thematic analysis procedure made sure that the qualitative results were developed systematically, contextually based, and were representative of the genuine experiences of the participants in regard to family life in urban settings.

Results and Discussion

Thematic Analysis

Theme 1: Shift from Extended to Nuclear Family Structures.

The respondents repeatedly mentioned that in rural locations they used to have the joint or extended family but in urban settings they lived in nuclear families. Most of the respondents indicated that migration to urban areas brought physical distance between them and their parents, siblings and extended family members. The expensive nature of urban housing, as well as a lack of space were often attributed as key drivers of this change. This, according to the functionalist view, is a case of institutional differentiation where family economic and educational roles are replaced by formal institutions (Bianchi, 2011). The employment systems in the cities also demand geographical mobility thus long-term co-residing with the extended family is no longer possible. Among the patterns that can be seen is that nuclear families may not be a voluntary choice but it is a necessity in an urban setting due to economics. Besides economic pressure, the participants also pointed out lifestyle changes, which come along with urban life, as an important factor that has contributed to changing the structure of the family. The hectic lifestyle in the urban setups, increased working hours and mixed-income families leave little time and space to support the extended family living arrangements (Park, 2018). A number of respondents mentioned that the working conditions in cities require more personal responsibility and flexibility, which simply cannot be combined with group decision-making patterns that extended families tend to have. Therefore, family members are likely to focus on privacy, independence, and efficiency rather than on the olden kinship requirements. Moreover, the availability of services like healthcare, education, and childcare in cities, as respondents mentioned, has diminished the use of extended family networks. These roles were conventionally helped by family members who were staying together or living close together in the countryside. But in the urban setting, institutional support mechanisms partially take over these functions further supporting the trend towards nuclear family structures. Other participants also noted that urban culture encourages individualism particularly in young generations, who are more inclined to individual households after they get married. Even with this change, some of the respondents were emotionally and socially challenged due to the lack of communication with extended family members. The sense of alienation, a loss of kinship ties, and a lack of intergenerational support were frequently cited. However, a significant proportion of participants also admitted that some benefits of nuclear families included a higher level of autonomy in decision-making, a lower level of interpersonal conflict, and a better economic management. In general, the results indicate that the transition between the extended and nuclear family structures in urban areas is a complicated process influenced by structural factors, cultural accommodation, and evolving socio-economic facts.

Theme 2: Weakening of Kinship and Community Bonds.

Respondents pointed out that there is a reduced interaction with the extended family and rural community networks on a daily basis. Kinship relationships were said to be constant and obligatory in rural areas but conditional and occasional in urban areas.

Fast-paced living and urban anonymity diminish chances of upholding of kinship duties. This is explained by the urban ecology theory due to population density and social heterogeneity that undermines informal social control mechanisms. People are also increasingly dependent on formal institutions like hospitals, schools and banks as opposed to kinship networks. Nonetheless, kinship relations are not totally erased rather, they change into network-based relations nurtured by mobile communication and regular visits. Along with these structural alterations, time constraints were also pointed out by the participants as limiting social interaction with extended family members (Tanaka, 2024). Working late hours, travelling to work, and work-related pressures were cited severally as obstacles to maintaining consistent face-to-face interactions. Some of the respondents remarked that although relatives may live in the same city, they may rarely visit each other and when they do, they do so during significant occasions, like weddings, religious holidays, or family crises. This implies that the kinship interaction has been transformed into an eventual phenomenon, and not a daily social activity. In addition, technology in communication has to some extent substituted face-to-face communication by phone calls, messaging applications, and social media. As much as this assists in maintaining emotional connections, the respondents have indicated that such interactions are not as deep and intimate as the co-residential family systems. Other participants noted that online communication tends to lower the level of kinship bonds to symbolic as opposed to functional bonds (Dyson, 2021). The other theme that was of significance was the evolving social support. In the rural setting, extended families used to offer instant support in childcare, financial emergencies and household chores. However, in urban situations, respondents are more reliant on paid services or institutional support systems. This change is indicative of a more general change in collective responsibility to individualized coping strategies. In spite of these developments, most participants continued to treasure kinship relationships and tried to maintain them by holding regular meetings and collectively celebrating. But these interactions, both in their frequency and intensity, were greatly diminished in comparison with country life. In general, the results indicate that the process of urbanization does not erase the kinship networks but reorganizes them in more flexible, distant, and selectively sustained social relationships under the influence of the modern urban limitations.

Theme 3: Economic Pressures and Family Restructuring.

An overarching theme in interviews was the economic strain of urban living. Increased cost of living, cost of houses and cost of transport are major factors that affect household organization. Most of the participants reported that the economic sustainability of extended family cohabitation is not sustainable in the cities. The dual-income nuclear households are more widespread because of the need to earn money. The conflict theory attributes this change as a result of capitalistic urban economies where families become consumption units as opposed to production units. The labor market in cities needs individual mobility, and lessening the reliance on family-based labor systems. Besides these structural economic pressures, respondents reiterated on the pressure of inflation and unreliable sources of income in urban workplaces. Numerous respondents in the informal economy or the private sector said that they experienced income insecurity, and this is challenging to maintain huge household units (Hochschild, 2016). This makes smaller nuclear families to be seen as more affordable and economical. Some of the respondents elaborated that it becomes more complicated when more than one generation is living under one roof when it comes to budgeting education, healthcare, rent and utilities. The issue of housing was especially noted as a determining factor of separation of the family. Respondents observed that housing units in urban areas are usually tiny and costly and it is not viable to house extended family members. The spatial constraint compels families

to give priority to immediate dependents; this includes spouses and children though the elderly parents or other family members seldom leave the countryside or lead independent lives. Therefore, the living conditions and the system of intergenerational support are directly transformed by an economic necessity. Moreover, the respondents noted that the employment systems in cities focus more on personal performance, productivity and mobility instead of on family-based work systems (Gupta, 2021). Urban employment requires individual time schedules, specialization in the workplace and geographic mobility as opposed to rural economies that are more tied together by agriculture and mutual labor. This makes it less possible to coordinate living in extended families. There are also some respondents who have mentioned that the urban lifestyles which are consumer oriented raise the financial expectations of the household. Financial strain can be attributed to education costs, medical costs, transport costs, and consumption based on the social status. Families downsize their household as a form of coping mechanism to cut costs and enhance economic well-being. On the whole, the results indicate that restructuring of the economy in urban settings is a key determinant of changing family structure. The divide between the extended and nuclear family is not only cultural but is deeply rooted in the more overall capitalist economic trends where efficiency, mobility and financial responsibility on an individual level take precedence over economic organization of the family unit.

Theme 4: Transformation of Gender Roles.

The altered role of women in urban families is one of the most important discoveries. In urban women, participation in education and employment was found to have increased resulting in greater financial independence. This empowerment comes, however, with a dual burden, namely, more domestic duties. According to the feminist theoretical analysis, urbanization is an issue that generates gender inequality and challenges it. Though women become more economically noticeable, the division of labor at home is unbalanced. The family decision-making is becoming more and more shared, yet many families still have traditional patriarchal norms. Besides more involvement in the labor force, respondents also emphasized that the urban setting offers more access to higher education, professional training and career choices to women than in rural areas (Ainsworth, 2016). Most of the participants who are female said that working not only helps in supporting the family financially but also boosts their self-esteem, social acknowledgment and decision making power in the family. In spite of such positive transformations, the belief that women are supposed to undertake domestic role responsibilities at the same time is still entrenched in majority of households. Some of the respondents noted that although women work full-time, they still have to take care of the children, cooking, cleaning and taking care of the elderly members of their families. Such an unequal ratio of unpaid domestic work leads to physical and emotional stress, which is commonly known as role overload. Other participants said they used informal support systems, like hired household help, or help of female family members to balance household chores, but it is not necessarily economically possible (Brinton, 2018). Moreover, it was found that younger generations and especially families of the middle classes in the city are slowly changing their attitudes towards gender roles. Other men mentioned that they were more willing to do housework, but such shifts are not uniform and differ greatly by the socioeconomic backgrounds. In most instances, the traditional gender expectations are still very much in force particularly where childcare, mobility and prioritizing careers is concerned in women. This contradiction can be explained by the feminist theory that emphasizes the fact that structural change does not necessarily destroy cultural norms. Although urbanization is enabling women to participate in the economy, the patriarchal ideologies still influence the household hierarchies and expectations. Consequently,

women undergo negotiation of complexity between empowerment in the social realm and still being unequal in the domestic realm. Altogether, the results show that urbanization is transforming gender roles in many complex ways, creating both chances of empowerment and structural and cultural restrictions still existing that perpetuate gendered divisions of labor within the family structure.

Theme 5: Individualization and Autonomy in Family Decisions.

Respondents have indicated that they felt more independent in their marriage, career and bearing children decisions. As opposed to rural families where the elders of the family dominated, in an urban family, individual preferences are valued. This is a manifestation of individualization as explained by Beck, by which structure of authority decreases and individuals build their ways of life. Marriage is becoming more of a personal match, as opposed to an arranged marriage of kinship. This change is also a reason behind delayed marriages and low fertility rates. Besides these changes, the respondents pointed out that the educational level and financial independence are significant in influencing individual decision-making. Most of the respondents said that higher education introduces people to various social values, and this prompts them to think critically of the traditional values and they become confident in making independent choices in their lives. This is more pronounced in the urban youngsters whereby they tend to focus on career building and self development before getting into marriage. Some of the respondents also observed that the institution of marriage is also changing (Aassve et al., 2016). Marriage is not only becoming a union of emotional congruence, understanding and shared objectives, but it has also ceased to be perceived as a social or family duty. This change has diminished the role of the extended family members in mate choice particularly in the educated urban families. Nonetheless, even among the participants, there were partial involvement of parents in final decisions, which means that the transition is gradual, not absolute. This postponement in marriage was often associated with economic planning and establishment of career. Respondents said that young adults would want to attain financial stability before they start their marital responsibilities hence later marriages as opposed to the earlier generations. This lateness also leads to a low number of children in families as couples are likely to have fewer children because of the financial conditions, employment, and evolving lifestyle trends (Adekunle, 2021). The decisions regarding childbearing were also characterized as more and more individual. People have started to think over the aspects of income stability, housing conditions, and personal preparation before conceiving children. Other respondents noted that family planning awareness, access to healthcare services have also contributed to this change towards controlled fertility behavior. In sum, the results can be interpreted to indicate a major cultural shift in the family system of the urban setting in which the collective decision-making process is slowly being overtaken by a more individualized decision-making process. Yet, this change is not even since there are still some cultural demands and family pressure which affect individual choices in different proportions in different social and economic classes.

Theme 6: Diversification of Family Forms.

Urbanization has also led to the development and co-existence of various forms of families such as nuclear families, single parent families, joint-nuclear families, cohabiting partners and migrant-separated families. Such diversification is a more general change in the modern social set-up, in which the old-fashioned, homogenous patterns of family are being more and more substituted by a diversity of patterns and arrangements based on individual circumstances. The postmodern theory has described this phenomenon as family pluralism, where modern societies are no longer characterized by one dominant family model, but rather replace that with a vast array of acceptable forms of family which are determined by individual choice, economic conditions and cultural change. The family

structures in this dynamic environment are growing fluid, flexible, and able to respond to shifting circumstances in life instead of being strictly defined by tradition or ancestry. The respondents underscored that urbanization is at the center of facilitating this flexibility through the creation of migration opportunities, living at independent levels, and non-traditional relationships. Often, economic mobility and educational opportunities were cited as factors that facilitate such varied household arrangements (McLanahan, 2017). Moreover, it was found by the participants that social attitudes towards non-traditional forms of families are slowly changing in the urban environment. The younger and more educated groups are particularly prone to show a higher level of acceptance of cohabiting, parenting alone, and living on their own. Other factors that were mentioned to be affected by normalization of alternative family structures are media exposure and globalization (Adeyemi, 2025). But, even in the light of these progressive changes, opposition still exists in more conservative circles of society. The cultural practices, religious beliefs, and the generational differences still influence the understanding of what is an acceptable family structure. Consequently, even those in non-traditional setups are likely to be socially questioned or not well accepted in some places. Generally, the data show that urbanization is creating a pluralistic family environment where diversity, negotiation, and gradual cultural change are prevalent, as opposed to a total substitution of old family structures.

Theme 7: Migration and Translocal Family Systems.

A key element of family change is migration. Families are often translocal, with members living and in employment in different cities and countries. Even when apart, families are interconnected financially and emotionally through remittances and telecommunication. Consequently, rural-urban family systems are formed, making families translocal. This is seen in demographic and migration theories as a reorganisation rather than breakdown of family relationships. Besides geographical movement, respondents reported migration is motivated by economic, educational and the desire for better living conditions. Many respondents indicated that one or more family members leave for work, often to urban areas or overseas job markets, leaving the rest of the family in rural areas. This creates a translocal family structure with a division of responsibilities and roles across geographical space. Money transfers through remittances were identified as a crucial factor enabling these translocal families (Mahmood, 2017). Migrant family members send money to support family expenses, siblings' or children's education, medical expenses and home renovations in the country of origin. Such support enables families to stay connected in spite of distance, and solidifies relationships of interdependence. But it can also leave migrants with emotional pressures to meet family expectations. The use of technology, including mobile phones, Skype and social media, has also revolutionised the nature of family relationships (Garcia & Torres, 2025). Participants reported that these technologies facilitate regular communication, enabling families to stay informed about each other's lives, share in decision-making and feel connected. But a number of respondents also stressed that virtual communication can never substitute for in-person contact, especially in times of need for support. Theories of migration also help to explain these changes by noting families don't break down under the pressures of migration. Rather than destroy family relationships, migration often results in their transformation into mobile network-based arrangements. These translocal networks enable families to stay connected socially and economically. In conclusion, it seems that migration leads to extended spatial networks of families that retain continuity through economic exchange, emotional support and digital connectivity, exhibiting resilience and flexibility in contemporary families.

Theme 8: Generational Conflict and Cultural Change.

The researchers established that there were considerable differences in the attitudes towards family structure across the generations. The older generation would like to have extended family set-ups and decision making by groups whereas the younger generation would prefer independent living and nuclear families. This generation gap can cause a clash in the marriage decisions, control in the household and the choice of lifestyle. This is perceived as adaptation of values by structural functionalism and as cultural shift to individualism in the modernization theory. Besides these general trends, the respondents elaborated that the variation in education, media exposure and urban exposure are very important factors that affect the generational attitudes (Furstenberg, 2019). The elderly participants especially those who grew up in rural set-ups tended to stress on the need to uphold the traditional kinship duties, reverence towards the elders and family cohesiveness under a single family unit. To them, co-residency is linked to emotional safety, social safety and cultural continuity. Conversely, younger respondents said that they had a greater tendency towards personal autonomy and self determination. Most of them said that they were more privately placed and free to make decisions and manage their finances when they lived independently. The influence of the global media, institutions of higher learning and urban peer networks were often identified to influence more individualistic attitude among the youth. Consequently, the younger generations tend to challenge the conventional forms of authority and bargain their life decisions especially when it comes to education, work and marriage. This generation gap is usually most evident in making major decisions in life (Okafor, 2023). The respondents stated that there were conflicts between parents and children when it comes to the choice of spouse, areas of career and the living conditions after marriage. Compromises are made in other situations including semi-independent living or put-off transition to full independence, whereas, in other situations, tensions are not resolved and result in emotional distance in families. In spite of these conflicts, gradual adjustment on either side was also observed by a number of the respondents. Nuclear family set-ups are also becoming acceptable to some of the older members of the family, particularly where the extended family is not viable due to economic and geographical reasons. Likewise, young people also hold on to the emotional and cultural attachments to families, despite adopting an independent lifestyle. In general, the results imply that generational differences are the major force in transforming families in urban settings as they signify an ongoing negotiation between the past and the present as opposed to the total break between the age group.

Conclusion

The research article unveils the findings of qualitative research that investigates the ways in which urbanization is changing the traditional family structure through the experiences, perceptions and narratives of individuals. Unlike just the explanations in theory, the chapter grounds sociological theories on the realities of everyday life and demonstrates how the life in the city alters the family structure, relations, roles and values. The findings are provided in eight major themes that reflect the different aspects of change in family, but on the whole, they show that urbanization is a multidimensional process, which is not merely a shift between the traditional and modern shapes. Among the most important findings of the research is the fact that there has been a certain shift to nuclear families.

In all cases, the respondents indicated that the rural life was characterized by joint or extended family set up as compared to the urban living, which necessitated smaller and more nuclear family set up. This change has been greatly promoted by the structural aspects such as the high cost of housing, space and work arrangements that had to be mobile and flexible. Interestingly, the findings reveal that this transformation is not always

the question of personal decision but in the majority of cases, is the pragmatic response toward the situation in cities. Despite the advantages of nuclear families such as independence, reduced conflict and financial efficiencies, the respondents also reported emotional costs of nuclear families such as isolation, undermining of the intergenerational relationships as well as the destruction of traditional support networks.

This reveals the fact that the family process of change is a process that has both negative and positive implications, which is a trade-off between individuality and community. Tightly linked to this change of structure is the weakening of kinship and community bonds. The existence of kinship within a rural setting was described as very powerful, binding and embedded in the daily life of a person. On the other hand, cities facilitate more distant, selective and intermittent socialization. There are few opportunities to have regular contact with the extended family due to the lack of time, work requirements, and anonymity within the city.

Although communication technologies such as mobile phones and social media maintain relationships, the respondents have also indicated that the relationships are not rich and intimate as face-to-face relationships. This makes the kinship systems not to be abolished but reformed, into network-based systems, which are more adaptable. Social support is being substituted by formal institutions or market-based services, what was previously a part of extended families, as part of a more general shift in collective to individualized coping processes. The theme of economic pressures and restructuring families adds further to the structural basis of family change. The high cost of living, limitations to housing and income instability were also the factors discovered by the participants to influence the household composition.

In the city, the co-residence of extended families was generally thought to be economically unsustainable and dual-income nuclear families were prevalent. The individuals productivity, specialization and mobility and the traditional family based economic system are not much of a concern in urban labor markets. The study further shows that city life, which is consumerism oriented, places extra burden on budgets hence the reason why, families prefer to cohabit in small families that are easier to manage. This underscores the relevance of economic reasons in determining the setting up of families and demonstrates that the evolution of families is closely connected with the process of urban capitalism trends. The other wide scope of change is the gender roles change in families.

The study finds out that urbanization has raised the probability of female education and employment which leads to heightened financial independence and choice. But with this empowerment the existence of inequalities, the unfair distribution of the domestic labor has come with it. Women bear a double responsibility of employment and taking care of the household. Though there are an increasing number of men who are doing housework, it is unevenly spread and affects socioeconomically and culturally. The findings show that urbanization does not only challenge, but also recreate gender inequalities and create a multi-layered and contradictory landscape in which contemporary and traditional practices co-exist.

The theme of individualization and independence in the decision making process in families emphasizes on an important cultural shift that has to do with the urban life. Generally, the respondents reported greater autonomy of their marriage, career and child bearing choices suggesting a change of shared and family-related decision making to the individual decision making. It was found that the enablers of such autonomy were the education and financial independence and especially among the younger generations. Marriage has become more of a personal and emotional affair rather than a family need and contributes to late marriage and low fertility.

However, the outcomes also demonstrate that the given change is relative as it is more of gradual process since in most cases the impact of the family is still noticeable. This demonstrates that individualization is in a broader culture where even traditional values remain. Growth in urbanization also results in diversification of family structures resulting in a more pluralistic family environment. The respondents confirmed the existence of several family set-ups that existed in the community including nuclear families, single parent families, cohabiting couples and migrant families. It is a diversity that is a mark of the changing social attitudes, of a more mobile and exposedness to other lifestyles, in schooling as well as in the media.

The younger and more educational population is more accepting of non-traditional formations of a family but nonetheless, there will be opposition in some of the more conservative strata of society. This means that urbanization does not replace one form of dominance of the family by a different form of dominance but rather creates a spectrum of forms of families which are both products of choice and structure. The other significant finding is that of migration and translocal family systems. Migration, internal and international, brings about spatial separation of family members leading to translocal families, which are operating in different places.

Remittances and online communication provide good economic and emotional ties among these families although they are physically separated. The respondents also emphasized the topicality of financial support offered by the migrants members since they give livelihoods to the households and increase the degree of interdependence. Migration is however also accompanied with emotional issues like separation and expectations placed on the migrants. Migration, according to the results, is not disintegrating family structures but instead it rearranges them into more flexible structures which are founded on networks and, in addition, can transcend geographical limits.

Recommendations

1. The people should make aware about the benefits of the extended families over nuclear family structures for the family wellness and development.
2. There is no doubt the urbanization related to weakling of relationship and community bound, it is suggested that the media should play its role for the benefits of the strength of the family ties and communities bounds.
3. Individualization and autonomy decisions caused a number of the social, psychological and economic problems, it is suggested that focused should be given on collective approach in family decisions for taking far-reaching effects on family wellness.
4. It has been observed that the generational conflicts and cultural changes are occurring due to the urbanization, it is recommended that efforts should be exercised to minimize generational conflict (elders and children) for the family development.
5. With the growing individualization due to urbanization, economic pressures increases, family should make aware about the adverse impacts of the division of the family and the benefits of the cohesion of the family.

Note: The paper has been drive from Ph.D. research work entitled "Urbanization and The Transformation of Traditional Family Structures".

References

- Aassve, A., Arpino, B., & Billari, F. C. (2016). Age norms and family transitions in urban societies. *Demographic Research*, **3(5)**, 1–28.
- Adeyemi, K. (2025). Urbanization and family cohesion in Nigeria. *African Population Studies*, **39(1)**, 4567–4583.

- Ainsworth, M. (2016). Economic development and family change. *World Development*, **7(8)**, 1–14.
- Archavanitkul, K., & Chamrathirong, A. (2010). Fertility and family transition in Thailand. *Journal of Population and Social Studies*, *18(1)*, 1–20.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Family Change and Time Allocation in American Families. *The Future of Children*, *21(2)*, 55-75.
- Brinton, M. C. (2018). Gender roles in urban families. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *4(3)*, 519–540.
- Dyson, T. (2021). Urbanization and social transformation. *Development and Change*, *52(4)*, 843–865.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (2019). Changing family dynamics. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *11(3)*, 289–303.
- Garcia, M., & Torres, A. (2025). Urbanization and intergenerational relations in Latin America. *Journal of Family Issues*, *46(3)*, 789–810.
- Gupta, N. (2021). Urbanization and family planning. *Studies in Family Planning*, *52(2)*, 145–160.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2016). Work-family balance in cities. *American Journal of Sociology*, *122(1)*, 1–29.
- Mahmood, T. (2017). Gated Communities and Urban Fragmentation. *Urban Geography Review*, *39(6)*, 872–889.
- McLanahan, S. (2017). Family inequality in urban contexts. *Demography*, *54(1)*, 1–23.
- Okafor, C. (2023). Urban family stress and resilience. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *37(2)*, 250–263.
- Park, H. (2018). Education and urban family change. *Sociology of Education*, *9(4)*, 310–325.
- Singh, P. (2025). Urbanization and nuclear family trends in India. *Asian Population Studies*, *21(1)*, 98–115.
- Tanaka, K. (2024). Impact of urbanization on traditional families. *Royal Journal of Social Science*, *1(1)*, 1–6.