

# Changing Structural and Interactional Aspects of Family-A Study of Rural Punjab

Neha Wasal\* and Sukhdev Singh\*\*

Corresponding author email id: neha\_wasal@yahoo.com

Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 18/02/2018

**Abstract** – Socio-Cultural transformation in the rural society emerging due to a many factors is yielding lot of changes in various socio-economic institutions. Rural society of Punjab is facing many changes in last few decades. Introduction of interaction in society is the base of any social system. It keeps society alive. Family is the one of the prime source of interaction. Indian society also give sufficient importance to family life and it is the family in which the minds of humanity are shaved. Till last quarter of 20<sup>th</sup> century family interaction was quite intensive among family members. But in the last about 40 years profound changes have occurred among other interaction pattern. Punjab has also experience a lot of changes in last 3-4 decades and family is also experiencing lot of changes generating a variety of consequences. In this paper an effort is made to highlight changes occurring in the interactional and structural pattern of family. The present study was conducted in the rural areas of Punjab. Sample of 320 respondents were selected. The study showed that there is an increase in the socio- economic status of rural people from year 1990 to 2015. There is increase in material possession and change in type of family from joint to nuclear from year 1990 to 2015. Many functional changes have also taken place like change in marriage rituals, religious changes, change in authoritative aspect, interactional changes among family members, change in death rituals, changed occupational preference.

**Keywords** – Family Changes, Interactional Structural.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Family is one of the most fundamental and universal social system of mankind. It is the family where social life of person starts. It is the primary institution of society. Its form or feature may vary from society to society, but its presence is much needed for a smooth and stable society. Family is a group of persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption, constituting a single household interacting and intercommunicating with each other in their respective social roles of husband and wife, father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister, creating a common culture (Burgess and Locke 1945, Bell 1967). History and importance of family, as a social institution is as old as the human beings started living in tribes, communities and societies (Sonawat 2001, Shah 1973).

In societies where the nuclear family is important, this structure acts as a primary arena for sexual, reproductive, economic, and acculturative functions. Married couple's family is that type of family where newly married couple moves to new place to form a new family. Step family is the blended type of family. A gay or lesbian family is the family system where parents being a women or a man, the parents would be a man or a man and a women or a women. Two parents are families headed by two parents. One-parent

families are formed through separation, divorce, death of a spouse, births to unwed mothers, or adoption by unmarried individuals. The parent may be a mother or a father (Muncie et. al 1995). Another type of family which is prevalent these days among Indian society is the DINK (double income no kid) family. In changing time, in Indian society women have also started earning; close door family has also come into existence. In the earlier times, number of family members was more but with the introduction of new family types, number of family members has decreased significantly. According to Indian census 2011, 24.9 per cent of all households in the country had a size of six to eight members as against 22.7 per cent with four members and 18.8 per cent with five members. In contrast, there were only 13.7 per cent households with three members, 9.7 per cent with two members and 3.7 per cent with a single member. Today, the Indian family is subjected to the effects of changes taking place in the economic, political, social and cultural spheres of our society. These changes are not taking place only in urban areas, rather taking place at village level as well. Traditional family type is undergoing rapid transformation and older joint family is being replaced by a simpler structure. In an agrarian economy, the family constituted uniting factor when. Families in India are undergoing vast changes like increasing divorce rate and separation rates, domestic violence, inter-generational conflicts, social problems of drug abuse, juvenile delinquency etc (Sonawat 2001). The term "alternative family patterns" suggests that family patterns which resulted from personal circumstances outside one's control (death of a partner, infertility) or from socio-economic conditions (male migration, work participation of women). In the One of the abstract changes in family is changing in the authority of family. Once the authority within the family was primarily in the hands of family elders. Yet another interesting fact about the change in authority structure within the family is that about nine per cent of all the households are headed by women, while the NFH Survey-1 (1995) gives a slightly higher figure (about 10 per cent). Nearly 20 million out of 193 million households in India or 10.35 per cent of the total are female headed as per the Census of India 2001(Krishan, 2007). Most of the female household heads are usually independent and gainfully employed. In recent past, working women concept have been emerged in our society. These types of families are known as dual earning families. In these types of families women has to handle dual stress and pressure because it is obvious that without man's sharing in domestic chores, no family harmony and peace can be retained in family (Panda, 2011).

Table 1: Per cent and number of households by size, India, 2001 and 2011

	Per cent of household		Number of households, millions	
	2001	2011	2001	2011
One member	3.6	3.7	6.8	9.04
2 members	8.2	9.7	15.7	23.9
3 to five members	48.8	55.1	93.7	135.9
6 to 8 members	28.1	24.9	53.9	61.4
9 and above members	11.3	6.6	21.8	16.4

Source: Census data from 2001 and 2011 censuses.

## II. METHODOLOGY

Present study was conducted in two districts of Punjab state i.e. Ludhiana and Sangrur. These district were selected as Ludhiana being most urbanized district of Punjab and Sangrur being less urbanized district of Punjab. Further 2 blocks from each district were selected and 4 villages from each block were selected for data collection. Total number of respondents were 320 covering the whole study area.

## III. RESULTS

### 1. Structural Changes

Structural changes are the visible changes that are taking place in the society with regard to family institutions, ownership of durable goods and land holdings etc. Over the last few decades numerous structural changes has been observed especially in the rural society of Punjab state. In this section, efforts have been made to explore these changes at two point of time (1990 and 2015) and discussed as under:

#### 1.1 Change in Family Type

Type of family is an important social institution which largely shapes the behavior of people. Distribution of respondents on the basis of type of family during the year 1990 to 2015 is given in Table 1.1. As perceived by the sampled respondents, overall in the study area, the proportion of sample respondents living in joint family

structure has been declined from 68.13 per cent in the year 1990 to 35.94 per cent in the year 2015. However, the proportion of respondent farmers living in nuclear families has increased significantly from 31.88 per cent to 64.06 per cent during these corresponding years, respectively and these changes were statistically highly significant. Results showed that the proportion of the sampled respondents living in joint family structure has declined considerably from 71.88 per cent to 38.75 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015 in Sangrur district and with regard to Ludhiana district, the same was declined from 64.38 per cent to 33.13 per cent during the respective period, respectively. On contrary, the percent share of sampled respondent living in nuclear families had shown a significant increase during this particular period in both the selected district. In nutshell, it is indicated that family structure has been passing through significant changes and the trends of nuclear family system is being more prevalent than joint family structure in the recent years. The findings of the study brought out that joint family system has been substantially reduced or is found in its fragmented form. Some joint families have fragmented into several nuclear families, while others have taken the form of extended families (Son with wife and kids living with Father and mother). Extended family is in fact a transitory phase between joint and nuclear family system. The results reveals that that the joint family is on its way out in rural areas too (Singh, 2004).

Table 1.1: Distribution of sample respondents with respect to family type, 1990 to 2015

Type of family	Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
	Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
Joint	115 (71.88)	62 (38.75)	5.41*	103 (64.38)	53 (33.13)	5.79*	218 (68.13)	115 (35.94)	5.68*
Nuclear	45 (28.13)	98 (61.25)	6.70*	57 (35.63)	107 (66.88)	5.51*	102 (31.88)	205 (64.06)	6.35*
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b> (100.00)	<b>160</b> (100)	--	<b>160</b> (100.00)	<b>160</b> (100.0)	--	<b>320</b> (100.00)	<b>320</b> (100)	--

\*Significant at 1 % of level of significance

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

#### 1.2 Change in family size

The perusal of Table 1.2 highlighted the status of family size during the year 1990 and 2015. Due to change in family structure as discussed above, a significant change was also observed in the case of family composition. The results revealed that overall in the study area, there were a significant rise in small size families during the period 1990 to 2015. As reported by the sampled respondents, the

proportion of the families having up to 4 members increased to 44.06 per cent in the 2015 from 9.06 per cent in 1990, however, the proportion of families having 4-7 members and more than 7 members decreased to 41.25 and 14.69 per cent in the year 2015 from 72.50 and 18.44 per cent, respectively.

District-wise, the sampled respondents reported that the proportion of small size families (up to 4 members) has

increased from 7.50 to 41.88 per cent in Sangrur district and 10.63 to 46.25 per cent in Ludhiana district during the period 1990 to 2015. Corresponding to the period 1990 to 2015, the respondents having family size between 4-7 members declined significantly from 68.75 to 40.63 per cent in Sangrur district and from 76.25 to 41.88 per cent in Ludhiana district, respectively. Significant declined was also observed with respect to large family size i.e. more than 7 members as it was declined from 23.75 to 17.50 per cent in the case of Sangrur district, while the marginal declined was seen in the case Ludhiana district. On the whole, it was

depicted that the family institution with respect to family structure and family has been undergoing enormous changes in the last few decades. The small size families and nuclear families have been emerging immensely in the rural society. Overtime development of industrializations, adults migrations from rural to urban areas for seeking jobs, better opportunities of livelihoods in the cities, increasing pressure of population on limited land resources were some of major reasons for changing family institutions in the study area.

Table 1.2: Distribution of sample respondents with respect to family size, 1990 to 2015

Size of family	Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
	Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
up to 4	12 (7.50)	67 (41.88)	12.71*	17 (10.63)	74 (46.25)	11.63*	29 (9.06)	141 (44.06)	12.11*
4-7	110 (68.75)	65 (40.63)	4.52*	122 (76.25)	67 (41.88)	5.25*	232 (72.50)	132 (41.25)	5.12*
Above 7	38 (23.75)	28 (17.50)	2.78*	21 (13.13)	19 (11.88)	0.93 <sup>NS</sup>	59 (18.44)	47 (14.69)	2.78*
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b> (100.00)	<b>160</b> (100.00)	--	<b>160</b> (100.00)	<b>160</b> (100.00)	--	<b>320</b> (100.00)	<b>320</b> (100.00)	--

\*Significant at 1 % of level of significance

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

### 1.3 Possession of Luxury Goods

Material possession of people indicates his/her economic status in the society. Table 1.3 highlighted the position of sampled respondents with regard to possession of luxury items in the year 1990 and 2015. Overall in the study area, the luxury items like refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles) televisions, washing machine, food processor, four wheelers (cars/jeeps) etc were rarely occupied by the sampled respondents in the year 1990. The extent of these items were increased many folds in the year 2015. On the basis of the information given by respondent farmers, the items like refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles), four wheelers (cars/jeeps), televisions, washing machine, food processor and VCR/VCD/DVD was possessed by 5.63, 22.19, 5.31, 13.44, 3.44, 2.50 and 3.44 per cent of the total sampled households in the year 1990 and the same was increased to 97.19, 59.69, 21.56, 99.38, 50.94, 24.06 and 50.94 per cent, respectively in the year 2015. The high value of Z score indicated that the change with respect to possession of luxury good at two points of time i.e. 1990 and 2015 is statistically highly significant. Merely 3.75, 18.75, 4.38, 7.50, 1.88, 2.50 and 2.5 per cent of the sampled households

possessed refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles), four wheelers (cars/jeeps), televisions, washing machine, food processor and VCR/VCD/DVD during the year 1990, however, the proportion of sampled households occupied these items in the year 2015 increased significantly to the tune of 96.25, 41.88, 20.00, 98.75, 40.63, 20.00 and 41.88 in sangrur district. Compared with sangrur district, the sampled households in Ludhiana district was relatively more resourceful in terms of material possessiveness. In 1990, the proportion of sampled household had refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles), four wheelers (cars/jeeps), televisions, washing machine, food processor and VCR/VCD/DVD estimated as 7.50, 25.63, 6.25, 19.38, 5.00, 2.50 and 6.88 per cent which increased to 98.13, 77.50, 23.13, 100.00, 61.75, 28.13 and 60 per cent in the year 2015 in Ludhiana district. It was noted here that due to fast technological development in the field of communication, all the respondents were possessed mobile phones in the year 2015, while none of the households had mobile phones in the year 1990. On the whole, it may be concluded the possession of luxury items has increased many times during the period of 1990-2015 in the study area.

Table 1.3: Distribution of sample respondents with respect to possession of luxury items, 1990 to 2015

Items	Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
	Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
Refrigerator	6 (3.75)	154 (96.25)	16.71*	12 (7.50)	157 (98.13)	15.50*	18 (5.63)	311 (97.19)	16.09*
Scooter/Motor Cycle	30 (18.75)	67 (41.88)	6.94*	41 (25.63)	124 (77.50)	9.09*	71 (22.19)	191 (59.69)	8.30*
Car/Jeep	7 (4.38)	32 (20.00)	11.97*	10 (6.25)	37 (23.13)	10.65*	17 (5.31)	69 (21.56)	11.24*
Television set	12	158	15.54*	31	160	11.59*	43	318	13.56*

Items	Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
	Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
	(7.50)	(98.75)		(19.38)	(100.00)		(13.44)	(99.38)	
Mobile phone	0 (0.00)	160 (100.00)	18.07*	0 (0.00)	160 (100.00)	18.07*	0 (0.00)	320 (100.00)	18.07*
Washing machine	3 (1.88)	65 (40.63)	16.71*	8 (5.00)	98 (61.25)	15.42*	11 (3.44)	163 (50.94)	15.92*
Food processor	4 (2.50)	32 (20.00)	14.58*	4 (2.50)	45 (28.13)	15.48*	8 (2.50)	77 (24.06)	15.10*
VCD/VCR/DVD	4 (2.50)	67 (41.88)	16.24*	11 (6.88)	96 (60.00)	14.43*	11 (3.44)	163 (50.94)	15.92*
Cycle	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	0.00	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	0.00	320 (100.00)	320 (100.00)	0.00

\*Significant at 1 % of level of significance

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

#### 1.4 Possession of Agricultural Equipments and Implements

Most of our sampled households were from farm families therefore it was very important of look into the resource availability with respect to agricultural machinery in the year 1990 and 2015. The distribution of sampled respondents with respect to possession of agricultural equipments and implements is given in Table 1.4. The results showed that overall in the study area, 12.81, 12.50, 12.81, 9.06, 57.50 and 21.25 per cent of total sampled respondents had tractors, trolley, cultivators, seed cum fertilizers drills, tube wells and sprayers in the year 1990 which has increased to 49.06, 46.56, 46.25, 30.63, 93.44 and 93.44, respectively in the year 2015. Corresponding to the period 1990-2015, the proportion of sampled

households had tractors, trolley, cultivators, seed cum fertilizers drills, tube wells and sprayers increased from 11.25, 13.75, 11.25, 6.88, 70.00, 21.88 per cent to 45.63, 44.38, 45.63, 27.50, 95 and 95 per cent in Sangrur district, while in Ludhiana district, the percent share of sampled households having above said implements increased from 14.38, 11.25, 14.38, 11.25, 45 and 20.63 per cent in the year 1990 to 52.50, 48.75, 46.88, 33.15, 91.88 and 91.88 per cent in the year 2015, respectively. Technological development in the field of agriculture like introduction of high yielding varieties, chemical fertilizers, improved seeds etc has enhanced the productivity of wheat and paddy many times which resulted into increase in the demand of agricultural machinery over the period of time.

Table 1.4: Distribution of sampled respondents with respect to possession of agricultural equipments and implements, 1990 to 2015

Material possession	Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
	Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
Tractor/H.P	18 (11.25)	73 (45.63)	11.01*	23 (14.38)	84 (52.50)	10.35*	41 (12.81)	157 (49.06)	10.65*
Trolley	22 (13.75)	71 (44.38)	9.59*	18 (11.25)	78 (48.75)	11.37*	40 (12.50)	149 (46.56)	10.50*
Bullock cart	56 (35.00)	23 (14.38)	7.63*	49 (30.63)	26 (16.25)	5.61*	105 (32.81)	49 (15.31)	6.64*
Cultivator/ Plough	18 (11.25)	73 (45.63)	11.01*	23 (14.38)	75 (46.88)	9.65*	41 (12.81)	148 (46.25)	10.30*
Seed cum fertilizer drill	11 (6.88)	44 (27.50)	11.06*	18 (11.25)	54 (33.75)	9.15*	29 (9.06)	98 (30.63)	9.97*
Tube well (submersible, shallow)	112 (70.00)	152 (95.00)	2.73*	72 (45.00)	147 (91.88)	6.17*	184 (57.50)	299 (93.44)	4.29*
Sprayers	35 (21.88)	152 (95.00)	11.29*	33 (20.63)	147 (91.88)	11.43*	68 (21.25)	299 (93.44)	11.36*

\*Significant at 1 % of level of significance

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

#### 1.5 Ownership of Agricultural Land

Agriculture is the main source of livelihood for rural people and the holding of agricultural land is the real wealth of a rural people. His/ her future pertains on size of his land holdings. Table 1.5 indicated that overall in the study area 20 per cent of the total sampled respondents reported that

the ownership of agricultural land has increased over the period of 1990 to 2015, while approximately half of the respondents reported decrease in land over this period. Rest of respondents in the study area reported no change in land holdings during this period. About 33 per cent of the total respondents in Sangrur district and 26 per cent of the total

respondents from Ludhiana district reported that there was no increase in their land holding from year 1990 to 2015. On the other hand 48.13 per cent of the respondents in Ludhiana district, and more than half of the total respondents (53.13 per cent) in Sangrur district reported that there was decrease in their land holding during this period. Only 13.75 per cent and 26.25 per cent of the respondents in Sangrur and Ludhiana districts reported that their land holding increased from 1990 to 2015. Overall it is indicated that the operational agricultural land holdings

have been decreasing over the period of time due to the fragmentation of joint families, fragmentations of land, urbanization, investment made on some non-farming occupation, due to regular crop failure and loss from agriculture, no more interest in agriculture etc. However, increase in income level, social status and more value attachment with land, foreign remittance etc. were some of the important reasons of increase in owned land as perceived by the sampled respondents.

Table 1.5: Structural changes with respect to ownership of agricultural land, 1990 to 2015

Change	Sangrur (n=160)	Ludhiana (n=160)	Overall (n=320)
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
Increased	22 (13.75)	42 (26.25)	64 (20.00)
Decreased	85 (53.13)	77 (48.13)	162 (50.63)
Remained same	53 (33.13)	41 (25.63)	94 (29.38)
<b>Total</b>	<b>160 (100.00)</b>	<b>160 (100.00)</b>	<b>320 (100.00)</b>

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

### 1.6 Structural Changes Occurring in Family Institutions

Family institution constituted certain important characteristics like gender of head of family, age of head of family and type of housing which are assumed to be important variables that affecting the functioning of family institution in the study area. The informations with respect to changes taking place in this regard were collected from the sampled respondents and presented in Table 1.6. Overall in the study area, the results indicated that males were remained dominated over females with respect to family head during the period 1990-2015. As perceived by the respondents, 66.25 per cent of the total households were headed by males during the year 1990 which steadily increased to 75.31 per cent during 2015. On contrary, female headed families significantly declined from 33.75 per cent 24.69 per cent in the period 1990 to 2015, respectively. In Sangrur district, the proportion of families having male member as head of the family marginally declined from 68.75 to 62.50 per cent, while the families having female member as family head gradually increased from 31.25 to 37.50 during the period 1990 to 2015. Considering this period, the proportion of families had male member as head of the family increased from 63.75 per cent, 88.13 per cent, while the families had female head came down significantly from 36.25 to 11.88 per cent in Ludhiana district, respectively.

With the emerging of nuclear families systems in the recent years, some prominent changes was also observed with respect to age of the family head in the rural society. Results presented in Table 4.2.6 indicated that overall in the study area the proportion of families with respect to the family head having age up to 45 years increased significantly from 8.12 per cent to 25.63 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015. However, the proportion of farm families with regard to family head having age more than 55 years significantly declined from 81.25 per cent to 49.37 per cent during this period. While the families having head of the family aged between 45 to 55 years have also shown significant increase during this period. The farm families

having family head up to the age of 45 years increased remarkably from 5 per cent to 25 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015 in Sangrur district, while the same was increased from 11.25 to 26.25 per cent in Ludhiana district during the same period. The proportion of farm families having family head above 55 years old was significantly declined, while the proportion of farm families having head aged between 45 to 55 years registered significant growth during the study period in both the selected districts, respectively. The transformation of the society in terms of fragmentations of joint families and emergence of nuclear family system was the main cause of decline in the age of the head of the family over the last two and half decades. Earlier the authority of the family was primarily in the hands of the elder family members (grandfather, father, elder brother etc.). All the important decision with respect to building a house, buying and selling of property and arranging marriages, etc. was taken by the family head and other members respect their decisions. Now the people of younger generation do not seem to show the same respect which their fathers had for their parents or elders.

An attempt was also made to collect data about the physical appearance of their house. So far as type of house was concerned, it is revealed that overall in the study area majority of the respondents i.e. 32.81 percent were having *kacha makaan* in year 1990, however with change in time and better economic condition of the respondent nearly 78.13 per cent of the total respondents were found to be living in cemented *pacca makkam* during the survey period i.e. 2015. It was found that nearly 1.56 per cent of the total respondents was still living in *kacha makaan* in the study area. Nearly 17.50 per cent of the total respondents were having *semi-pacca* type house in the year 2015 and only 19.38 per cent of the total respondents were residing in this type of house in the year 1990. About three per cent of the total respondents in the year 2015 was relatively economically better off than all other respondents as they have afford *kothi/bungalow* type accommodation in the study area.

In Sangrur district, the proportion of respondents having *kaccha makkam* came down significantly from 39.38 per

cent to 1.25 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015, whereas the proportion of sampled respondents having *pacca* type house went up from 46.88 to 81.88 per cent during this corresponding period. During the survey, it was found that nearly 14.38 per cent of the total respondents were found to be lived in the *semi-pacca* type *makkan*, and about three percent were living in *kothi* type accommodation, as however, this type of accommodation was occupied by less than one percent of the total respondents in the year 2015, respectively.

Similarly in Ludhiana district the proportion of respondents having *kaccha makkan* came down significantly from 26.25 to 14.38 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015, whereas the proportion of sampled respondents having *pacca* type house increased considerably from 48.75 to 61.88 per cent during this corresponding period. During the survey i.e. in the year 2015, it was found that nearly 21 per cent of the total respondents were found to be lived in the *semi-pacca* type *makkan*, and about three percent were living in *kothi* type accommodation, respectively. The value of z score indicated that the changes taking place with respect to type of house in the study area was highly significant during the period 1990 to 2015.

#### 1.7 Interactional Changes Took Place in Families

The information with respect to interaction pattern of the family members were collected from the sampled respondents and efforts were made to compare the various aspects of family interaction at two point of time i.e. 1990 and 2015. The degree of responses was measured in terms of three scales i.e. always, sometimes and never and on the basis of these scales, means score was calculated to compare the interaction pattern of family at 1990 and 2015. The results presented in Table 1.7 indicated the mean score came to be highest in the case of agriculture (2.52) and village disputes (2.52) which clearly showed that the main topic of the family discussion was agriculture and village disputes in the year 1990. The Corresponding to this year, other important topic of discussion were related to children, households, education and occupation and the mean score with respect to these discussion estimated as 2.51, 2.43, 1.92 and 1.79, respectively in the 1990. The value of mean score with respect to family interactions regarding children and households issues clearly indicated that the degree of responses are lying somewhere between the scale 'sometimes and always'. This further indicated that the topic of discussion with respect to above said issue was more common in the year 1990. The education and occupation was the least preferred topic of discussion of farm families as the value of mean score with respect to these topic estimated as 1.92 and 1.79. However, in the year 2015, education was most important topic for discussion among family members as the mean score in this case came to be 2.20. This indicated the majority of the respondents (46.25 per cent) reported 'always, as the scale of responses with respect to this issue. The next most important issues of discussion were village's disputes/old stories, agriculture, children, households and occupation and the mean score with respect to these calculated to be 2.08, 1.96, 1.92, 1.92 and 1.82, respectively. Overall, it may be concluded that

though, the topic of family interaction are same in the year 1990 and 2015, but the importance of the topic of interaction or discussion among family members observed to be changed over this period. The scale of the responses revealed that agriculture was the most important issue of family interaction in the year 1990, however, the important topic of family interaction was replaced by education in the year 2015.

The family members preferred for discussion also an important aspect of family interaction which seems to be changed over the time period. Based on the degree of responses, majority of respondents (90.31 per cent) reported that elders were 'always' preferred for family interaction in the year 1990 and the mean score in this regard was calculated as 2.87. However, children as a part of family interaction were the mostly preferred members in the year 2015, as reported by the sampled respondents. The mean score in this case worked out 2.10 indicating that scale of responses are lying somewhere between 'sometimes and always' but more towards sometimes side.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Structure of family system have been significantly changed. Living in joint family structure has been declined in the year 2015. However, the proportion of respondent farmers living in nuclear families has increased significantly. As reported by the sampled respondents, the proportion of the families having up to 4 members increased Overall in the study area, the luxury items like refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles) televisions, washing machine, food processor, four wheelers (cars/jeeps) etc were rarely occupied by the sampled respondents in the year 1990. The extent of these items were increased many folds in the year 2015. Data revealed that total sampled respondents reported that the ownership of agricultural land has increased over the period of 1990 to 2015. It was observed that the results indicated that males were remained dominated over females with respect to family head during the period 1990-2015. It was analyzed that with respect to the family head having age up to 45 years increased. So far as type of house was concerned, it is revealed that overall in the study area majority of the respondents were having *kacha makaan* in year 1990, however with change in time and better economic condition of the respondent nearly 70 per cent of the total respondents were found to be living in cemented *pacca makaan* during the survey period i.e. 2015. Data revealed that there is significant change in international pattern of rural families as far as topic and duration of family conversation was concerned. There is a great shift in topic of discussion among families over time.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bell. R R (1967) *Marriage and Family Interactions*. The Parsey Press. Holand Illinios.
- [2] Beteille. A (1991) *The family and the reproduction of inequality. Family, kinship and marriage in India*. Oxford University Press, London.
- [3] Burgess E W and Locke H J (1953) *The family: From Institution to Companionship*. 256-66. American Book, New York.

- [4] Krishan G (2007) India: female Headed Households, 2001. *Man and Development*.9: 161-165
- [5] Lee C Y S, Anderson J R, Horowitz J L and August G R (2009) Family income and parenting: The role of parental depression and Social support. *Family relations* 58: 417-30.
- [6] Mukharjee R K (1979): *Sociology of Indian sociology* 16-170. Allied Publishers, Delhi.
- [7] Muncie J, Wetherall M, Dallo R (1995). *Understanding the family*. Sage Publications.
- [8] Panda U K (2011) Role conflicts, stress and dual career couples: An empirical study. *The journal of family welfare* 57: 72-88.
- [9] Shah A M (1973) *The household dimensions of the family in India*. Orient Longman, New Delhi and University of California Press, Berkeley.
- [10] Rao C N (2006) *Rural development in India*. Serials Publications, New Delhi, Pp 121-128
- [11] Sonawat R (2001) Understanding Families in India: A Reflection of Societal Changes. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa (Psychology: Theory and Research)* 17: 177-186.

Table 1.6: Distribution of respondents with respect to structural changes occurring in family institutions, 1990 to 2015

Particulars		Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
		1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score	1990	2015	Z score
		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency		Frequency	Frequency	
Gender of head of family	Male	110 (68.75)	100 (62.50)	0.86	102 (63.75)	141 (88.13)	2.89*	212 (66.25)	241 (75.31)	2.15
	Female	50 (31.25)	60 (37.50)	1.65	58 (36.25)	19 (11.88)	9.25*	108 (33.75)	79 (24.69)	2.82*
	Total	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	-	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	-	320 (100.00)	320 (100.00)	-
Age of head of family	Up to 45 years	8 (5.00)	40 (25.00)	12.34*	18 (11.25)	42 (26.25)	7.35*	26 (8.12)	82 (25.63)	9.56*
	45-55 years	22 (13.75)	40 (25.00)	5.33*	12 (7.50)	40 (25.00)	9.94*	34 (10.63)	80 (25.00)	7.43*
	Above 55 years	130 (81.25)	80 (50.00)	4.49*	130 (81.25)	78 (48.75)	4.51*	260 (81.25)	158 (49.37)	4.50*
	Total	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	-	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	-	320 (100.00)	320 (100.00)	-
Type of housing	Kacha makaan	63 (39.38)	2 (1.25)	14.65	42 (26.25)	3 (1.88)	5.36	105 (32.81)	5 (1.56)	10.18
	Pakka makaan	75 (46.88)	131 (81.88)	4.58	78 (48.75)	119 (74.38)	2.14	153 (47.81)	250 (78.13)	3.44
	Semi-pakka makaan	22 (13.75)	23 (14.38)	0.41	40 (25.00)	33 (20.63)	1.75	62 (19.38)	56 (17.50)	0.94
	Kothi	0 (0.00)	4 (2.50)	40.00	0 (0.00)	5 (3.13)	29.81	0 (0.00)	9 (2.81)	33.28
	Total	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)		160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)		320 (100.00)	320 (100.00)	

\*Significant at 1 % of level of significance

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

Table 1.7: Distribution of respondents on the basis of interactional changes took place over time in family, 1990 to 2015

Topic of family discussion	1990							2015						
	Always		Sometimes		Never		Mean score	Always		Sometimes		Never		Mean score
	f	%	F	%	f	%		f	%	f	%	f	%	
Agriculture	230	71.88	26	8.13	64	20.00	2.52	37	11.56	233	72.81	50	15.63	1.96
Village disputes/Old stories	230	71.88	25	7.81	65	20.31	2.52	60	18.75	225	70.31	35	10.94	2.08
Children related talk	228	71.25	26	8.13	66	20.63	2.51	50	15.63	195	60.94	75	23.44	1.92
Household talk	220	68.75	19	5.94	81	25.31	2.43	44	13.75	207	64.69	69	21.56	1.92
Education	90	28.13	115	35.94	115	35.94	1.92	148	46.25	87	27.19	85	26.56	2.20
Old stories/ gossiping	34	10.63	184	57.50	102	31.88	1.79	37	11.56	187	58.44	96	30.00	1.82
<b>Duration of family interaction with different members</b>														
With children	226	70.63	27	8.44	67	20.94	2.50	87	27.19	179	55.94	54	16.88	2.10
With youth	155	48.44	137	42.81	28	8.75	2.40	60	18.75	187	58.44	73	22.81	1.96
With elders	289	90.31	21	6.56	10	3.13	2.87	57	17.81	217	67.81	46	14.38	2.03