

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SOCIAL VALUES IN TWO GENERATIONS: PARENTS AND THEIR CHILDREN IN EXTENDED AND NUCLEAR FAMILIES IN RURAL EGYPT (A CASE STUDY IN EL MONIRA VILLAGE, EL KANATER EL KHAIRIA DISTRICT, QALYUBIA governorate).**

**Jacinte Ibrahim Rihan**

Rural Sociology and Agriculture Extension Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, Arab Republic of Egypt.

**ABSTRACT**

Family is the first institution that initiates social values and behaviors among their members. Egyptian rural because of conservation of family values, with the starting and developing of modernization, the new generations started turning away from the extended families to the nuclear families, so a great variation happened in family and social values which ranges from the traditional values in extended families and modern nuclear families. The main objective of the study is to determine the relationship of family structure and social values, in contemporary Egyptian rural society.

A purposive sample of 110 rural families was selected from El-Monira village, El-Kanater El-Khairia district, Qalyubia governorate 55 of them were nuclear and 55 were extended families.

Data were collected during July and August 2016 from 330 participants (220 parents and 110 child or youth) using standardized PVQ questionnaire and focus group discussions (FGDs). Descriptive statistics and "T test" Were used to analyze data.

Findings showed that there was no significant differences between children and their parents' social value in the studied families but a significant differences were found between parents and children in relation to social value in nuclear families, this is due to the effect of industrialization and modernization which have changed the concept of family. Finally, findings of FGDs reported that the family values are changing so fast from extended family of which the social values and kinship network is so strong, to companionship nuclear families in which the social values and kinship network is less strong.

**Key words:** Extended families, Nuclear families, Social values.

**INTRODUCTION:**

Everywhere in the world, the family is changing from its old traditional pattern to an innovative one over the time. It is changing in size, perceptions, values, norms, and role structures also. In pre- industrial era, the rural family was the core of life for individual (Parsons, 1967)

The direction of change is from the traditional family system usually extended or joint family system to some form of conjugal family system ( nuclear form ) of which its relationship is not strong (Schaefer, 2008).

Many of the values, rules, practices and family types have changed in recent years, while others have remained as the same (Panda, 1997). In a changing world the rural communities have been exposed to mass media, economic changes, technology, the structure and function of the family has been changing, just as these communities have also been changing. Acculturation and enculturation in response to these pressures for change have also affected the links between social structures, and family types. It is clear that family types have changed most radically in western societies, but changes in the family have occurred throughout the world at different rates and in different forms. (George, 2003)

Value transmission becomes more critical issue for families with adolescent children since the adolescents start turning to peers and media for values, which sometimes threatens the family's function as a support system (Linda – 2009).

Family structure and family values have undergone tremendous changes over the last three decades. The basic structure of the family has been reshaped and family values and related attitudes have also undergone paradigmatic shifts (Tallent, 1978).

Value of children and values for children have altered, and within marriages gender roles have become less traditional and more egalitarian. Collectively the alterations mark the replacement of traditional family types and family values with the emerging, modern family types, and a new set of family values (Tsuneo, 1975).

Family value may differ from family to family, but the basic essence behind it remains the same. Accordingly, teaching the new generation something that was inherited from the previous one and which is tried, tested and improved upon (Padmavati, 2015).

Family values also aim at making children fine elements of society when they grow up. Everyone wants to be well accepted and niched into the norms of society. Family values help children develop such habits from childhood itself. (<http://www.americanvalues.org/search/item.php?id=2040>).

Traditional family values often refer to morality, religion and a way of life that recognizes right from wrong. In the last century family values have without doubt changed significantly alongside the change of family structure and composition. (<http://www.parentiq.com/news/DefiningYourFamilyValues>).

The main objective of the present study is to investigate the relationship of family structure and social values in contemporary Egyptian rural society. Specifically, the study attempts to look at the relationship of social values of parents and their children in Extended/joint and nuclear families.

Three specific objectives could be stated as follows:

*Fayoum J. Agric. Res. & Dev., Vol. 31, No.1, January, 2017*

- 1- Determine the effect of family structure (family types) upon the social value of parents and their sons.
- 2- Identify the differences between parents and sons in relation to social value patterns in joint families.
- 3- Identify the differences between parents and their sons in relation to social value patterns in nuclear families

**Theoretical background:**

Family is a community of blood related social organization which binds each and every member with sincere attitudes, cultural values, emotional attachment and psychological well-being. It is a profoundly important social organization which contributes major cognitive growth, affective skills and psychomotor abilities of a child (Anshubhi, 2008). A child's earliest education is received in his family; it's here that his basic ideas, ideals as well as many attitudes towards himself and his associates are initiated which determine his later adjustment to school and others out of home situations. The economic status, attitudes and behavioral experiences of parents and family environment, all influences the child's behavior and attitudes, both directly and indirectly.

Child is learnt about relationships, manners, self-esteem, worth and loyalty all by watching and participating in family. It is most effective informal agency of education which has emerge impact on the future growth and development of a child such as values, consistency and copying skills, relationships, love and affection etc.

**a- Family structure:**

Two concepts are employed by sociologists in discussing the family: structure and function (Ragini, 2012). Structure refers to the number of members of the family and to familial positions such as mother, father, son, daughter, grandfather, grandmother, uncles and aunts, cousins and other kin (Hoch, 1966). The nuclear family for example, is composed of two generations, parents and children, while the different extended family types are composed of at least three generations, for example, grandparents, parents, children, as well as kin on both sides (Rahul, 2013). The functions refers to how the families satisfy their physical and psychological needs in order to maintain the family and to survive as a group (Krupa, 2014). For example, families universally must provide shelter for themselves- a house. They maintain the home, clean and repair it. Families must be engaged in some type of work in order to provide sustenance and the other family needs. The family must provide food for its members, raising the children, educating them, maintaining contacts with the kin, engaging them in the traditions of the community are part of the process of socialization. The parents provide emotional warmth and comfort to the child and to each other, not limits of behavior, are responsible for the psychological development of the child at different ages. These are some of the major functions of the family which are universal across all societies in the world (Annamma, 1984).

In Egypt, the widely recognized importance of family stands in direct contrast to the ambiguity of linguistic terms dealing with the institution. When referring to their families, Egyptians tend to use the Arabic word *ahl*, a broad term that encompasses various relationships, including immediate family related through blood ties, members of the household, and individuals related through marriage, and can, therefore, refer to up to 100 to 200 people. Another term, *a'ila*, is also commonly used, and can refer to either a nuclear or extended group of people, depending on context. The term *a'ila* carries with it the connotation of close relationship and mutual obligation.

The smallest family unit specified by Egyptian terminology is the word "bait", which means "house ". Bait is used to specify the actual residence of a family or a group of people who live under the same roof most of the time. Although this usually refers to the nuclear family, it can also include a spinster aunt, a widowed parent, or any other member of the extended family who is a part of the residential group. (<http://family.jrank.org/pages/438/Egypt-Defining-Family-in-Egypt>).

**b- Social values:**

Value literally means something that has a price, something precious, dear and worthwhile. In other words values are a set of rules and regulations and behavior

(<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/family-values> ).

Values are therefore, evaluative attitudes and determiners of human behavior. In our most elementary sense, values means whatever is actually liked, prized, esteem desired, approached or enjoyed by any one at any time. A value system is the applied part of values. It is a set of consistent values and measurement procedures. The vision of an organization begins from value system. Every society has their own value system; however some values are universal and common. A community without values is like an extinct species (Schwartz, 2012).

From the literature of the conception of basic values implicit in the writings of many theories and researches' Schwartz (Schwartz 2012) summarize ten broad basic values (table 1) from three universal requirements of the human conditions: needs of the individual biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, survival and welfare needs groups (Schwartz, 2012).

The ten basic values were intended to include all the core values recognized in cultures around the world. Each basic value can be characterized by describing its central motivational goal (Schwartz, 2012).

**Table (1): list of ten basic values, each defined in the terms of its source, and the specific values that represent them.**

<b>Basic values</b>	<b>source</b>	<b>Specific values</b>
Benevolence: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.	Organism interaction group	Honest, forgiving, loyal, spiritual life, helpful, responsible, meaning in life, true friendship, mature love
Universalism: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of <i>all</i> people and for nature.	Organism group	Inner harmony, social justice, world at peace, protect environment, equality, broad minded, unity with nature, world of beauty, wisdom
Self-direction: Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring.	Organism Interaction	Self-respect, choosing own goals, creativity, curious, freedom, independent
Stimulation: Excitement, novelty and challenge in life	Organism	Exciting life, varied life, daring
Hedonism: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.	Organism	Pleasure, enjoying life
Achievement: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.	Interaction group	Ambitious, successful, capable, intelligent, influential
Power: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people	Interaction group	Preserving public image, social recognition, authority, wealth, social power
Security: Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships and of self	Organism interaction Group	National security, sense of belonging, reciprocation of favours, clean, social order, family security, healthy
Conformity: Restraint of actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.	Interaction group	Obedient, honour elders, politeness, self-discipline.
Tradition: Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide.	Group	Accepting my portion in life, moderate, devout, detachment, respect for tradition, humble.

**Source: Schwartz, 2012.**

**c- Family values:**

According to oxford dictionary, family values is defined as values held to be traditionally learned or reinforced within a family, such as those of high moral standards and discipline ( [http:// en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Family-values](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Family-values) ) . The family values is the social standards defined by the family and a history of traditions that provide the emotional and physical basis for raising a family.

Traditional family values are usually passed from one generation to the next, giving children the structure and boundaries in which to function and thrive.

**Methodology:**

**a- Population and sample:**

To elaborate the changes between different generations in nuclear and extended/joint families concerning their social values, El Monira village was selected for this study.

El Monira village is the mother village of El Monira local unit ,El Kanater El Khairia district, in Qalyubia governorate. It is a traditional village characterized by being conservative, tight to culture, wide spread El Azhar education (religious education), in addition to high rate of girls education.

According to the population census projection undertaken by Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS) in 2014, the population of the studied village consists of total of (18077) inhabitants, representing (3996) families. (Health Demographic and population survey, 2014).

A purposive sample of 110 rural families was selected from the village representing 55 nuclear and 55 joint families.

Following criteria were set to select the respondents as follows; 1) age of parents (both father and mother) ranges from (40 - to 50) years, 2) Age of sons ranges from (16- to 21) years, 3) each family included at least one sons/ youth, 4) every selected family has to include 3 respondents (father, mother, and one child / youth) regardless the number of the total family members.

Data were collected during July-August 2016 using Schwartz PVQ reformulated questionnaire. Total number of respondents reached to 330 members (220 parents and 110 sons).

**Table (2): Distributing of the studied respondents (N=330)**

Family	Types of families ( number of families 110 )		Total
	Joint ( N= 55 )	Nuclear ( N= 55 )	
Participants			
Father	55	55	110
Mother	55	55	110
Children/youth	55	55	110
<b>Total</b>	165	165	330

**Tools and techniques:**

The following two tools were used for this research:

- 1) Schwartz, portrait values questionnaire PVQ, (Schwartz, 2012) to measure children and parents values.
- 2) Focus group discussion technique to verify the results.

**1-Schwartz portrait values questionnaire PVQ:**

Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) was added which is a recently developed scale designed by Schwartz (Schwartz, 2012) to measure the ten basic values as previously mentioned above in table (1). The scale consists of 21 items for values measurement. The (PVQ) includes short verbal portraits of

## ***A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SOCIAL..... 156***

different people. Each portrait describes a person's goals, aspirations, or wishes that point implicitly to the importance of a single value type. By describing each person in terms of what is important to him or her – the goals and wishes he or she pursues – the verbal portraits capture the person's values without explicitly identifying values as the topic of investigation. Respondents were asked to compare the portrait to themselves rather than themselves to the portrait.

For each portrait, respondents answer: How much looks like you is this person? They check one of six boxes labeled: very much like me, like me somewhat, like me, a little like me, not like me, and not like me at all. Thus, respondents own values are inferred from their self-reported similarity. People who are described in terms of particular values, the similarity judgments are transformed into 6 scores of numerical scale.

The reliability alpha coefficient of scale score of the PVQ questionnaire is 0.78.

### **2- Focus group discussion:**

In order to verify findings, two Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted aiming to verify the analysis from the results and explaining the findings. Each focus group included 16 participants half of them representing (extended/ joint and nuclear families) with a total of 32 participants.

### **Hypothesis of the study:**

Following statistical hypothesis are proposed to test the above stated objectives:

- 1- There is no significant difference between father's social values patterns of both joint and nuclear family.
- 2- There is no significant difference between mother's social values patterns of both joint and nuclear family.
- 3- There is no significant difference between children's social values patterns of both joint and nuclear family.
- 4- There is no significant difference between fathers and children social values pattern of joint families
- 5- There is no significant difference between mothers and children social values pattern of joint families
- 6- There is no significant difference between fathers and children social values pattern of nuclear families
- 7- There is no significant difference between mothers and children social values pattern of nuclear families

### **Results and discussions:**

#### **(1) Effect of family structure (family types) upon the social value of parents and their children.**

Parents and children social value were examined on all the test variables using t-ratio.

Table (3) indicates that there is no significant difference between social value pattern of both extended and nuclear families according to T value, so the null hypothesis, number (1), (2), (3) were accepted at level of 0.05 significance.

**Table (3): Mean, standard deviation and T-ratio of father, mother and sons social value according to family type.**

Family	Joint		Nuclear		T-value
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
Father social value	47.77	6.7	47.24	8.0	0.37
Mother social value	47.40	6.99	47.43	4.22	- 0.027
Children social value	49.47	7.37	51.19	8.41	- 1.14

Accordingly, Family structure doesn't affect the social value of parents and their sons. Whatever, type of family (extended and nuclear) but social value remain as it is. According to the results of the focus group discussion, the above result could be interpreted as follows:

- Values are fundamental concept in early socialization of sons. Parents taught good habits and give importance for cherished social value to teach their children's.
- Social value of child and parental are highly correlated, because values transferred through verbal or non-verbal interaction and thus the relations is very significant one.
- Mainly the elderly women of the family transmit the cultural value system to the young children (sing, 1984).
- Usually, children show similar value pattern according to his on her parents. The value system emphasizes solidarity and cooperation, affection and understanding, following the traditional norms and customs of the family.

The above results were aligned with the findings of Murdock research (Murdock, 1949) regarding the relationship of the nuclear family, to the joint/extended family, that joint/extended family represents a constellation of nuclear families: the nuclear family of the paternal grandparents, the nuclear family of the maternal grandparents, the nuclear family of the married sons, married daughters, married cousins, and other distant related families. Therefore, focusing on a particular nuclear family in the traditional system, it is a mistake to assume it is an independent unit, because the joint/extended family is essentially a constellation of nuclear families across at least three-generations. The important question is the degree of contact and interdependence between these constellations of nuclear families and their impact on the adolescents, behavior. In the past, close family ties provided a built-in measure of economic, emotional and social security to adolescents and families, but this traditional support for families has been disrupted as families are moving from to urban areas, as families are migrating in search of work, and as individual family members leave the village in search of educational and economic opportunities.

Recently in rural Egypt, the new generation who lived in a joint family system have taken the initiative to break out and start a nuclear family. A large contributor to this break away was industrialization, modernization and globalization.

**(2) Differences between social values patterns of parents and children in joint families.**

Table (4) shows that there is no significant differences between social value of parents and their children in joint families. For both sex of parents (father and mother) in a joint family and according to "t" value,

- Father and children "t" value is (-1.26)
- Mother and children "t" value is (-1.51)

Null hypothesis number (4) and (5) were accepted at level of 0.05 significance. It could be said that in the joint families, parents and children social value are the same because family is the basic cultural unit which socialization of the child is accomplished.

**Table (4): Mean, standard deviation and t-ratio on father, mother and children social value in joint family.**

Gender of Parents of joint family			
Value	Mean	S.D	T- Value
Father social value	47.77	6.70	- 1.26
Children social value	49.47	7.37	
Mother social value	47.40	6.99	- 1.51
Children social value	49.47	7.37	

The above result could be interpreted according to the focus group discussion findings as follows:

- In joint family, child gets multiple parents and many adult figures for his or her identification. In these families, children are overprotected and sheltered. In a nuclear family, child has a limited set of adult models to emulate. As a result, he or she develops a strong sense of personal bond with the parents, with a greater scope of developing clear-cut self- identity (Sing et al, 1984)
- Joint families are like the first training grounds, where a child learns interpersonal skills. Children in joint families learns lessons of patience, tolerance, cooperation and adjustment.
- When a child lives with his/her grandparents and other older members of the family from the time he/she is born, they grow up appreciating, admiring and loving them. They also learn to adjust more easily with different kinds of people and learn to be more flexible.
- In a joint family a child learns and is reared by a number of people, thus dividing work, saving time and creating a spectrum of exposure and awareness.
- A child learns about relationships, manners, self-esteem, worth and loyalty all by watching and participating in family. It is the most effective informal agency of education which has emerge impact on the future growth and development of a child such as values, consistency and copying skills, relationships, love and affection etc.

**(3) Differences between parents and children social value patterns in nuclear families.**

Table (5) indicates that, significant differences were found between parents and their children in relation to social value patterns, in nuclear families. Father and children ( $t = -2.52, P < 0.05$ ), mother and children ( $t = -2.96, P < 0.01$ ). Thus the null hypothesis number (6) and (7) was rejected at level of significance 0.05 and degrees of freedom (108).

**Table (5): Mean, standard deviation and T-Ratio on father, mother and children social value in nuclear family.**

Gender of Parents Nuclear family			
Value	Mean	S.D	T- Value
Father social value	47.24	8.00	-2.52 *
Children social value	51.19	8.41	
Mother social value	47.43	4.22	-2.96 **
Children social value	51.19	8.41	

\* $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P < 0.01$ .

Parents directly or indirectly influence children to behave same manner, but differences was found in nuclear families of parents and children. This is due to several reasons which are follows: (according to the findings of the focus group discussions)

- In nuclear families most parents give more space for individuality, and more freedom to their children for education, go outside the house, and they have little control on them.
- Nuclear families make the child more self-reliant, as he/she is not as interdependent on a large number of family members to make decisions and take actions.
- Communication channels between child and parent can also be more open and transparent, in the nuclear family, as parents have their attention focused on their child, without having to divide their time with too many household responsibilities.
- Both parents are almost dual earners couples so they have no time to care their children. If both parents are working, they have to leave their children alone with caretakers for given lengths of time. This can mean children being brought up by care centers or domestic help, who may not be as attentive or reliable as family members. Parent thought that money can cover all needs of their children, therefor they spend more time outside the house.
- Children reared in nuclear families tend to be less tolerant and more impatient, as they are not accustomed to dealing with too many people with varied personalities from an early age, and living in a nuclear family does not demand a great deal of flexibility of them.
- Children in nuclear families show high orientation towards achievement. They think that life is full of exciting things. Children are ambitious more capable, intellectual, and competent in nuclear families.
- Children does not obey their parents, their communication skills are very poor. They can't honor and respect for family members. They have not self-discipline in family.

**Conclusion:**

Families are changing all over the world. In Egypt, a few years ago, concept of a family was different. There has been a lot of transition from traditional towards

## ***A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SOCIAL..... 160***

modern families, because of technology, and how people have adapted to different cultures.

The structural differences between extended /joint family and nuclear family lead to different interaction pattern among members of two family types.

Traditional families have an advantage that the family stay close together with a strong bond. But now a days in modern Egyptian families, more is being focused in individuality; people like to think about themselves first and then about significant others.

These changes have influenced to society not only overtly but also have provided alternatives to the existing values and ideas towards the different aspects of society and human behavior. But on the other hand, it is also equally true that, rural Egyptian traditions are so deeply rooted that, these alternatives have been succeeded in Total transformation of the society.

Thus, findings suggest that, social values and unwritten social constructs play a vital role in development of the human beings. All the human functions are governed by the individual and collective values.

### **REFERENCES:**

- 1- **Annamma, A.K. (1984)**, “values and adjustment in development and academic achievement of college students in kerela”. PH.D., kerela university, volume ( i ), fourth survey of research in edu.135, (1984)
- 2- **Anshubhi, B. & Nisha, D., (2008)**, “social values of parents and children in joint and nuclear families”, journal of the Indian academy of applied psychological social issue, April 2008.
- 3- **CAPMAS, Health Demographic and population survey (2014)**, Egypt.
- 4- **Georgas, J. (2003)**, “family: variations and changes across cultures”, International Association for cross- cultural psychology, unit 6 developmental psychology and culture: subunit 3 cultural perspective on families, article 3.
- 5- **Hoch, E. (1966)**. “The changing patterns of family in India”, Christian institute for the study of Religion and society, Bangalore.
- 6- **Krupa B. (2014)**, “Adjustment of joint and nuclear family commerce college students”, the international journal of Indian psychology, volume 2, Issue 1, paper ID: Boo 2508v2112014, Oct to Dec 2014.
- 7- **Linda G.B. & David C. Bell, (2009)**, “Effects of family connection and family individuation”, department of sociology, Indiana University, Indiana USA.
- 8- **Panda, B.N. (1997)**, “impact of values, Adjustment and creativity on academic achievement of secondary level students”. The educational review, val. C 111, No. 11, 1-6, 1997.
- 9- **Padmavati, M. & Malipatil, K.S (2015)**. “Social values of parents and children in changing conditions of Indian family- A comparative study of joint and nuclear families in Gulbarga city”. International multidisciplinary research journal, volume -4, issue -11, May -2015, India.
- 10- **Parsons, Talcott,(1967)**, “sociological theory and modern society”, New York, Free press.
- 11- **Ragini, M. & Shabnam, A. (2012)**, “A comparative study of changing family composition, structure and practices in urban area of kanpur city” ( V.P ), International journal of scientific and research publication, volume 2, Issue 10, October 2012.

***Fayoum J. Agric. Res. & Dev., Vol. 31, No.1, January, 2017***

- 12- **Rahul, S., (2013)**, “The family and the family structure classification redefined for the current times”, journal of family medicine and primary care, 2013 Oct. – Dec , Vol. 2 (4), India.
- 13- **Schaefer, R.T. (2008)**, Sociology Matters, 3rd Edition, New York, Mc Graw Hill press.
- 14- **Schwartz, Shalom, H. (2012)**, “An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values”, International association for cross-cultural psychology, article II.
- 15- **Sing, J, G, &Thapar, G. (1984)**. “Impact of parental values on children”, Indian journal of clinical psychology, India.
- 16- **Tallent, N. (1978)**, “Psychology of adjustment: understanding ourselves and others”, D.Van Nostrand Company, New York.
- 17- **Tsuneo, I. (1975)**, “Family structures and family values in the theory of income distribution”, journal of political economy: vol – 83, No. 5, Oct. 1975, the university of Chicago press, USA.

**Links:**

- \* <http://familyjrank.org/pages/438/Egypt-Defines-Family-in-Egypt>
- \* <http://www.americanvalues.org/search/item.php?id=2040>
- \* <http://www.parentiq.com/news/DefiningYourFamilyValues>.
- \* <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/family-values>

دراسة مقارنة بين القيم الاجتماعية لجيلي الأباء و الأبناء في الأسر الممتدة و النووية بالريف المصرى.  
( دراسة حالة بقرية المنيرة - مركز القناطر الخيرية في محافظة القليوبية).

جاسنت إبراهيم ریحان

قسم المجتمع الريفي والإرشاد الزراعي، كلية الزراعة، جامعة عين شمس، جمهورية مصر العربية.

تعد الاسرة المؤسسة الأولى التي ترعى و تصقل القيم الاجتماعية و السلوك الاجتماعى بين أفرادها، فلقد عاش المجتمع الريفي المصرى لآلاف السنين متماسكا و متناغما بسبب التمسك بالقيم الاجتماعية الاسرية. و لكن مع ظهور التحضر والمدنية بدأت تتحول الأجيال الأصغر من صورة الأسرة الممتدة الى الأسرة النووية. و من الصور اللافتة للنظر في المجتمعات الحديثة ظهور مدى واسع من التغيرات في القيم الأسرية و التي تتراوح ما بين القيم التقليدية في الأسر الممتدة و الأسر النووية الحديثة (المعاصرة). و تستهدف الدراسة الحالية بصفة أساسية تحديد العلاقة بين نمط تركيب الأسرة (ممتدة و نووية) و قيمها الاجتماعية في المجتمع الريفي المصرى المعاصر. و لتحقيق ذلك سحبت عينة غرضية - مكونة من ١١٠ أسرة ريفية نصفها من الأسر النووية و النصف الأخر من الأسر الممتدة و ذلك من قرية المنيرة ، مركز القناطر الخيرية بمحافظة القليوبية . و لقد تم تجميع البيانات الميدانية خلال الفترة من يوليو الى أغسطس ٢٠١٦ من ٣٣٠ مشارك (٢٢٠ من أرباب الأسر -أباء و أمهات - و ١١٠ من الأبناء بواقع أب و أم و ابن من كل أسرة) باستخدام استمارة نموذج شوارتز المقننة لقياس القيم الاجتماعية الأساسية و كذلك باستخدام حلقات النقاش البؤرية لتفسير النتائج.

كما تم تحليل البيانات باستخدام أساليب الاحصاء الوصفي ، و اختبار (ت) . و لقد أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود اختلافات (فروق) معنوية بين القيم الاجتماعية لجيلي الأباء و الأبناء في الأسرة الممتدة. في المقابل ظهر وجود اختلافات معنوية بين جيلي الأباء و الأبناء في الأسر النووية بسبب تأثير التصنيع و التحديث. كما أوضحت نتائج حلقات النقاش البؤرية الى وجود اتجاه سريع للتغير في القيم الأسرية من النمط التقليدي الذى تعكسه الأسر الممتدة التي تتضمن قيم اجتماعية و شبكة قرابة قوية الى النمط الحديث المتمثل في الأسر النووية حيث يتم بروز قيم اجتماعية و شبكة قرابية أقل قوة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الأسر النووية ، الأسر الممتدة ، القيم الاجتماعية.