

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

Neha Wasal* and Sukhdev Singh**

ABSTRACT

Socio-Cultural transformation in the rural society emerging due to many factors is yielding a 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. The Indian society gives sufficient importance to family life and it is the family in which the minds of humanity are shaped. Till last quarter of 20th 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 was made to highlight changes occurring in the interactional and structural pattern of family. The present study was conducted in the rural areas of Punjab. A sample of 320 respondents were selected. The study showed that there was 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 had 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.

Key Words: Family, Changes, Interactional and Structural aspects
Jel Classification: J62, Z10, Z12

INTRODUCTION

Family is one of the most fundamental and universal social system of mankind. It is the family where social life of a 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 inter- communicating 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

* Research Scholar and ** Professor of Sociology,
Punjab and Agricultural University, Ludhiana.

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 taking place not only in urban areas but also

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. 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' suggest that family patterns result from personal circumstances outside one's control (death of a partner, infertility) or from socio-economic conditions (male migration, work participation of women). One of the abstract changes in family is changing in the authority of family head. In earlier times, the authority within the family was primarily in the hands of family elders. 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 has 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

TABLE 1: NUMBER AND PER CENT OF HOUSEHOLDS BY SIZE, INDIA, 2001 AND 2011

Particulars	Number of households, millions		Per cent of households	
	2001	2011	2001	2011
One member	6.8	9.04	3.6	3.7
2 members	15.7	23.9	8.2	9.7
3 to 5 members	93.7	135.9	48.8	55.1
6 to 8 members	53.9	61.4	28.1	24.9
9 and above members	21.8	16.4	11.3	6.6

Source: Census data from 2001 and 2011 censuses.

because it is obvious that without man's sharing in domestic chores, no family harmony and peace can be retained in family (Panda, 2011).

METHODOLOGY

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

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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 have 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:

Change in Family Type

Type of family is an important social institution which largely shapes the behaviour of people. Distribution of respondents on the basis of type of family

during the year 1990 to 2015 is given in Table 2. As perceived by the sampled respondents, overall in the study area, the proportion of sample respondents living in joint family structure 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 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 declined considerably from 71.83 per cent to 38.75 per cent during the period 1990 to 2015 in Sangrur district and with regard to Ludhiana district, the same declined from 64.38 per cent to 33.13 per cent during the respective period, respectively. On contrary, the per cent share of sampled respondent living in nuclear families had shown a significant increase during this particular period in both the selected districts. In nutshell, it was indicated that family structure had been passing through significant changes and the trend of nuclear family system was being more prevalent than joint family structure in the recent years. The findings of the study brought out that the joint family system has been substantially reduced or was found in

TABLE 2: 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		Z score	2015		Z score	1990		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*
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 indicate per cent to the total.

TABLE 2a: 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*
7-Apr	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)	0.93NS	59 (18.44)	47 (14.69)	2.78*
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.

its fragmented form. Some joint families had fragmented into several nuclear families, while others had taken the form of extended families (son and 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 revealed that the joint family was on its way out in rural areas too (Singh, 2004).

Change in Family Size

The perusal of Table 2a highlighted the status of family size during the year 1990 and 2015. Due to changes in family structure as discussed earlier, a significant change was also observed in the case of family composition. The results revealed that overall in the study area, there was a significant rise in small size families during the period 1990 to 2015. 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, proportion of small size families (up to 4 members) 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. Significant decline was observed with respect to large family size i.e. more than 7 members as it declined from 23.75 to 17.50 per cent in the case of Sangrur district, while the marginal decline was seen in the case of Ludhiana district. On the whole, it was found 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 had 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.

Possession of Luxury Goods

Material possession of people indicated his/her economic status in the society. Table 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 owned by the sampled respondents in the year 1990. The extent of these items increased many folds in the year 2015. On the basis of 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 were 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 respectively and the same increased to 97.19, 59.69, 21.56, 99.38, 50.94, 24.06 and 50.94 per cent, respectively in the year 2015 respectively. The high value of Z score indicated that the change with respect to possession of luxury goods at two points

of time i.e. 1990 and 2015 was 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 respectively 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 respectively. Compared with Sangrur district the sampled households in Ludhiana district were relatively more resourceful in terms of material possessiveness. In 1990, the proportion of households having refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor

TABLE 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 (7.50)	158 (98.75)	15.54*	31 (19.38)	160 (100.00)	11.59*	43 (13.44)	318 (99.38)	13.56*
Mobile phone	0 0	160 (100.00)	-18.07*	0 0	160 (100.00)	18.07*	0 0	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)		160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)		320 (100.00)	320 (100.00)	

*Significant at 1 % of level of significance.
Figures in the brackets indicate per cent to the total.

cycles), four wheelers (cars/jeeps), televisions, washing machine, food processor and VCR/VCD/DVD was estimated as 7.50, 25.63, 6.25, 19.38, 5.00, 2.50 and 6.88 per cent respectively which increased to 98.13, 77.50, 23.13, 100.00, 61.75, 28.13 and 60 per cent respectively 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 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 from the study that the possession of luxury items increased many times during the period of 1990-2015 in the study area.

Possession of Agricultural Equipments and Implements

Most of sampled households were from farm families, therefore, it was very important to 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 has been given in Table 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 respectively 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 the households having 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 respectively to 45.63, 44.38, 45.63, 27.50, 95 and 95 per cent respectively in Sangrur district, while in Ludhiana district, the per cent share of sampled households having above said implements increased from 14.38, 11.25, 14.38, 11.25, 45 and 20.63 per cent respectively in the year 1990 to

TABLE 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		1990	2015		1990	2015	
	Frequency	Frequency	Z score	Frequency	Frequency	Z score	Frequency	Frequency	Z score
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

TABLE 5: STRUCTURAL CHANGES WITH RESPECT TO OWNERSHIP OF AGRICULTURAL LAND, 1990 TO 2015

	Sangrur (n=160)	Ludhiana (n=160)	Overall (n=320)
Change	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)
Total	160 (100.00)	160 (100.00)	320 (100.00)

Figures in the brackets indicates per cent to the total

52.50, 48.75, 46.88, 33.15, 91.88 and 91.88 per cent respectively in the year 2015. 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.

Ownership of Agricultural Land

Agriculture is the main source of livelihood for rural people and the holding of agricultural land was the real wealth of rural people. Their future pertains on size of land holdings. Table 5 indicated that overall, in the study area, 20 per cent of the total sampled respondents reported that the ownership of agricultural land had increased over the period of 1990 to 2015, while approximately half of the respondents reported a decrease in land over this period. Rest of respondents in the study area reported no change in land holdings during the 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 a decline in their land holding during the 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 was indicated that the operational agricultural land holdings had been decreasing over the period of time due to the fragmentation of joint families, fragmentation of land, urbanization, investment made on some non-farming occupation, regular crop failure and loss in agriculture, lack of 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.

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 affected the functioning of family institution in the study area. The information with respect to changes taking place in this regard were collected from the sampled respondents and presented in Table 6. Overall, in the study area, the results indicated that males 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 the 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 the period, the proportion of families with male member as head of the family increased from 63.75 per cent, 88.13 per cent, while the families with 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 were observed with respect to age of the family head in the rural society. Results presented in Table 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 had 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 increased from 11.25 to 26.25 per cent in Ludhiana district during the same period. The proportion of farm families having family head of above 55 years significantly declined, while the proportion of farm families having head aged between 45 to 55 years registered a 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 decisions with respect to building a house, buying and selling of property and arranging marriages, etc. were taken by the family head and other members respect their decisions. Now, the people of younger generation do not show the same respect which their fathers had been showing for their parents or elders.

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

In Sangrur district, the proportion of respondents having *kaccha* house 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 living in the *semi-pacca* house and about three per cent were living in *kothi* type accommodation, as

however, this type of accommodation was occupied by less than one per cent of the total respondents.

Similarly, in Ludhiana district, the proportion of respondents having *kaccha* house 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, it was found that nearly 21 per cent of the total respondents were living in the *semi-pacca* house, and about three per cent were living in *kothi* type

accommodation. The value of z-score indicated that the changes with respect to type of house in the study area were highly significant during the period 1990 to 2015.

Interactional Changes in Family

The information with respect to interaction pattern of the family members was 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. On the basis of these scales, means score was calculated to compare the interaction

TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH RESPECT TO STRUCTURAL CHANGES OCCURRING IN FAMILY INSTITUTIONS, 1990 TO 2015

1990 TO 2015										
Particulars		Sangrur (n=160)			Ludhiana (n=160)			Overall (n=320)		
		1990		2015	1990		2015	1990		2015
		Frequency	Frequency		Z score	Frequency		Frequency	Z score	
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)
Age of head of family	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	63 (39.38)	2 (1.25)	14.65	42 (26.25)	3 (1.88)	5.36	105 (32.81)	5 (1.56)
Type of housing	Pakka	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	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)	4 (2.5)	40	0 (0)	5 (3.13)	29.81	0 (0)	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 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
Duration of family interaction with different members														
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

pattern of family at 1990 and 2015. The results presented in Table 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. Other important topic of discussion was related to children, households, education and occupation. The mean score with respect to these factors was estimated as 2.51, 2.43, 1.792 and 1.79, respectively in the 1990. The value of mean score with respect to family interactions regarding children and household issues clearly indicated that the degree of responses were 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 that the majority of the respondents (46.25 per cent) reported 'always', at the scale of responses with respect to this issue. The next most important issues of discussion were disputes/old stories, agriculture, children, households and occupation. The mean score with

respect to these was 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 was the 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 were preferred for discussion and this was an important aspect of family interaction which had under gone changes 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 year 1990 and the mean score in this regard was calculated as 2.87. However, children as a part of family interaction were the preferred members in year 2015, as reported by the sampled respondents. The mean score in this case worked out to be 2.10 indicating that scale of responses were lying somewhere between 'sometimes' and 'always' but more towards sometimes side.

CONCLUSION

Structure of the family system had significantly changed. Living in joint family system had declined in year 2015. However, the proportion of respondent farmers, living

in nuclear families had increased significantly. The proportion of the families having up to 4 members had increased. The luxury items like refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor cycles) televisions, washing machine, food processor, four wheelers (cars/jeeps) etc were rarely owned in year 1990 but increased many fold in year 2015. The ownership of agricultural land increased over the period. Males remained dominating over females during the period. With change in time and economic conditions, nearly, 70 per cent of the respondents were found to be living in cemented *pacca* house during the survey period i.e. 2015. There was a significant change in international pattern of rural families as far as topic and duration of family conversation was concerned. There was a great shift in topic of discussion too among the families over time.

REFERENCES

- Bell, R R (1967) *Marriage and Family Interactions*. The Parsey Press. Holand.
- Beteille, A (1991) The family and the reproduction of inequality. *Family, kinship and marriage in India*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Burgess, E W and Locke, H J (1953) *The family: From Institution to Companionship*. 256-66. American Book, New York.
- Krishan G (2007) India: Female headed households. *Man and Development*.9: 161-165.
- 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.
- Mukharjee, R K (1979) *Sociology of Indian society* 16-170. Allied Publishers, Delhi.
- Muncie J, Wetherall, M and Dallo, R (1995) *Understanding the family*. Sage Publications, Delhi.
- Panda, U K (2011) Role conflicts, stress and dual career couples: An empirical study. *The journal of family welfare* 57: 72-88.
- Shah, A M (1973) *The household dimensions of the family in India*. Orient Longman, New Delhi and University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Rao, C N (2006) *Rural development in India*. Serials Publications, New Delhi, Pp 121-128.
- Sonawat, R (2001) Understanding Families in India: *A Reflection of Societal Changes*. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa* 17: 177-186.

Received: October 21, 2015

Accepted: December 4, 2015