INCREASED AWARENESS ABOUT “A DEFINITION OF FAMILY“

Abstract. The paper is dedicated to approach a family definition by various field of sciences, such as sociology, archaeology, humanistic psychology, social psychology due to their investigation data. To be involved to premarital institutions or programs is an effective way to comprehend a definition of the family. This is a powerful way to increase people's awareness about “what is marriage” and the responsibilities they should carry.
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Family connotes various things according to the time and place of the culture and people involved wherefore some people are explicit suppositions are for others impossible. There are simply multiple scientific approach to family by various field of science due to their investigation data and for this point of view, it is unthinkable to express that nobody is correct (Cagan, 2011, p. 88-89). The unit of socialization is identified through various sociological approaches within especially being touched to the relationship between diversity of family forms in contemporary societies related to ideology, gender differences, and state policies such as those concerned with marriage (Crossman, 2011). Due to Turkish sociologist O. Sayin, the family is the institution in which produces the continuation of the human, first appearance of the socialization process, transmitting material and spiritual wealth that created in society from generation to generation (Sayin, 1990, p-2). The Turkish professor of Islamic law and sociologist H. Karaman claims that family is the social institution in which "births, marriages and individuals are bound together by ties of biology (Karaman, 2006, p-59). German social scientists Marks and Engels claim
family is all of the significant contradictions that develop within society and that slavery is latent within the structure of the family (B. Heather, 2012, p. 12). British sociologist Giddens claims a group of individuals related to each other by blood ties, marriage or adoption, who form an economic unit, the adult members of which are responsible for the upbringing of children (Zafer, 2013, p. 122). The family is the primary social and economic unit in human societies. In addition to reproducing the population physically and socially, it establishes the quality of life for each societal member (Vannoy, Dana, 1999, p. 31). Jewish sociologist D. Patricia argues that the family, in all its various forms, is a basic social institution around which much else in society is structured seems to be a tautology (Patricia, 2009, p. 1). The family based on marriage is still considered to have a fundamental social value even the changes in the structure and functions of the Slovak family. Regard to Human Development and Family Studies Prof. Dr. Robila, the family is perceived both as a buffer for the impact of society’s problems on individuals and as a resource provider (Mihaela, 2004, p. 10, 13. Czech sociologist PhDr. Maříková argues that the family provided the individual with economic support as well as the possibility of self-realization (Mihaela, 2004, p. 31). Moreover, Lithuanian sociologist Prof. Dr. Juozeliūnienė comes to the result that the structural and economic changes, the liberalization of society determined changes in values such as increased individualization, freedom and independence, reduced acceptance of normative constraints and institutional regulations of the state and the church which was accepted the family formation through marriage remained universal during soviet period, therefore, cohabitation and births outside marriage were stigmatized. New demands such as faithfulness, mutual understanding, and respect regulated the quality of interpersonal relations is a new and accepted definition of family (Mihaela, 2004, p. 214). The family seems to individualize and socialize its children, to make feel at the same time unique and yet joined to all humanity, accepted is and yet challenged to grow, loved unconditionally and yet propelled by greater expectations (Stephens, 2012, p. 1).

Functionalists come to define the family on the basis of the functions that the family performs. An American anthropologist G.P. Murdock argued that “the
nuclear family which exists as a unique and strongly functional group in every
known society is a universal social grouping. According to G. P. Murdock the family
in general and the nuclear family are also functional for society in that they fulfil the
following essential functions:

– The Sexual Function refers to the regulation of sexual activity. Husbands and
wives have sexual access to each other and in all societies, there are norms
concerning sexual activity outside marriage. Therefore, Murdock has argued that the
family caters to the sexual needs of its adult members and also limits sexual access
of other members of the society thereby maintaining stability.

– The Reproductive refers to bearing and raising children. The family provides
the society with new members and assumes responsibility for raising them.

– The Educational Function / Socialization function refers to transmitting a
society's way of life, norms, and values to the younger members. This function is an
important one as, without culture, the society could not survive, and too much
deviation from the norm would disrupt the stability of the society.

– The Economic Function deals with a division of labor along gender lines. He
considers this division of labor as rewarding for the spouses and as strengthening
the bond between them, as they are perceived as doing distinct but complementary
work (Davis, 2013). B. Malinowski, Polish anthropologist, declared family universal
and his definition (Sarkisian, 2009, p. 4) was (1) a bounded set of people (a mother,
a father and children) who recognize each other and are distinguishable from other
groups; (2) a definite physical space, a hearth and home; (3) a particular set of
emotions, family love.

Family connects economic and kinship structures within and between
household. Because these obligations and connections are deeply gendered, through
processes that are historically developed in each particular culture, the interaction of
gender with race and class is theoretically important (Ferree, 1990, p. 871). Approaching
the word family as a historical point of view that from time to
time the family assimilates from a band of slaves, then slightly adopted by blood
and marriage and later love ones gives its place to authority relations by american
history and family researcher S. Coontz. The emergence of competitive
individualism and formal egalitarianism for males are referred historically and functionally to the sentimentalization of family life and female nurturing (Coontz, 1992, p. 43-44). US archaeologist D. Anderson claims the family is a group of kin-related people (including fictive kin) who may or may not reside together and whose primary function is to reproduce its members biologically. A household is a person or a group of people who live together in one or more structures, who carry out daily activities necessary for the maintenance and social reproduction of the group within a specific space associated with the residence, and who interact with other households (Brandon, Jamie C., Barile, Kerri S., 2004). Family is the most commonly used trope for communicating visions of the past and hopes for the future or, put differently, for expressing ideological positions about how society has been organized and how it should be properly ordered (Doumani, Beshara, 2004, p. 3). The family, as the primary social unit, would be a necessary relay between individuals and the larger society. The individual would exist as such only within the family (Doumani, Beshara, 2004, p. 29). Families are not just simple, harmonious social units but are in fact far more interesting. Families serve as forums for rival evolutionary agendas where brothers and sisters, parents and offspring, cooperate, compete, deceive, and nurture. As family members we even compete with ourselves, in a war of genes derived from mother and father. There is strategy, counter-strategy, and layers of intrigue (Forbes, Scott, 2007, p. 6). Living in groups which symbolize families also enhances the potential for social learning. The benefits of cooperation reach their zenith when individuals become morphologically and/or behaviorally specialized for specific roles within a team. And specialization becomes more plausible with the production of surplus offspring under a strategy of parental optimism (Forbes, Scott, 2007, p. 151). Regard to Ecclesiastes 4:9–10, 12, family is the best teamwork. It has the following benefits. Two are better than one, because they have a good reward for their labor. For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow, but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up.. And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a three-fold cord is not quickly broken (Forbes, Scott, 2007, p. 156).

Drawing attention to the psychological approach, it is obviously visible that
even within psychology, there are various branches, and all of them have multiple approach to define the notion of family. Great attention is payed to an American humanistic psychologist A. H. Maslow’s the five stage model of hierarchy of needs that include safety needs within Social Needs - love and belonging – family, friendship, sexual intimacy. He formulated a more positive account of human motivation is based on people seeking fulfillment. The growth of self-actualization refers to the need for personal growth and discovery that is present throughout a person’s life (Maslow, 1943). Due to Professor D. Kenrick who focuses on the evolutionary psychology and dynamical systems perspectives, each person is unique the motivation for self-actualization leads people in different directions. For some people self-actualization can be achieved through creating works of art or literature, for others through sport, and for most creating good family model (Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L., Griskevicius, V., Becker, D. V., & Schaller, M., 2010, p. 2).

According to social psychologists R. Baumeister and M. Leary, people have a basic psychological need to feel closely connected to others like compassionate bonds from close relationships are a major part of human behaviour. It seems fair to finalize that human beings are fundamentally and pervasively motivated by a need to belong, by an intense lust to form and maintain enduring interpersonal attachments. The need to belong is wired into us, and the family keeps all these satisfactions in which is the source of your identity and security. On the another hand, family which keeps inside spirituality is a release from worldly distresses, but it can also be a way to concatenate ourselves with reality. Life is tough and within family it can be easy to overcome and get things done (Holton, 2003, p. 1-2). It is possible that the fulfillment of certain needs is more strongly associated with some types of “happiness” than with others. For instance, there seems to be a close connection between social relationships and extraversion, on one hand, and positive feelings, on the other hand a lesser relation between negative feelings and sociability. Similarly, one might hypothesize that feeling unsafe could produce negative emotions but that being safe might not produce long-lasting positive feelings (Tay and Diener, 2011, p. 2). Societies have a substantial influence on whether basic and safety needs are fulfilled, whereas individual factors are more
associated with whether psychosocial needs are fulfilled (Tay and Diener, 2011, p. 11). Due to social psychologist R. Baumeister, it is already well established that there is a relationship between self-esteem and happiness, self-esteem can affect, or at least interact with, immunocompetence, which implies that self-esteem may be related to physical, as well as mental, well-being. A relationship between self-esteem and authenticity which brings up interesting possibilities concerning self-actualization and the good life which is based on family (Mruk, Christopher J., 2006, p. 10).

The following cycle (Table N 1) is summarized the used theories about family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociologist</th>
<th>Anthropologist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Humanistic) psychology</td>
<td>(Social) psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The first appearance of the socialization process
2. The continuation of the human
3. Being bound together by ties of biology
4. Develop within society
5. A group of individuals
6. An economic unit
7. Responsible for the upbringing of children
8. A basic social institution
9. A fundamental social value

| 1. A band of slaves
2. Sexual relationship
3. Reproduction
4. Economic cooperation
5. A bounded set of people by blood and marriage
6. A particular set of emotions
7. Economic and kinship structures
8. To reproduce its members biologically
9. hopes for the future
10. The primary social unit
11. Rival evolutionary agendas

| 1. Compassionate bonds
2. A need to belong
3. An intense lust
4. Release from worldly distresses
5. Happiness

In the conclusion, the most conceded conformation is "the family is the institution that fulfilled the following functions, such as producing new individuals in order to increase the rate of nation, keeping national culture and national 'I', socializing children and satisfying spouses economically, biologically and
psychologically (Unal, 2013, p. 2). A family is a body that every part has a role to play and ordinances to follow. Due to their ordinances parts of the body are expected to respond to each other in a certain way, which is determined by relationship agreements. Taking into consideration increased divorces, premarital institutions or programs are inevitable and more important than marital programs after marriage for modern societies.
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