

1 | **Changes in decision making process and authority inef familiesy in Rural Punjab: A**
2 | **comparative study**

4 | **ABSTRACT**

5 | Family is one of the most fundamental and universal social institution of mankind. It is the family
6 | where social life of the person starts. Its form or feature may vary from society to society, but its
7 | presence is much needed for a smooth and stable society. Family is a group of persons united by ties
8 | of marriage, blood or adoption, constituting a single household interacting and intercommunicating
9 | with each other in their respective social roles of husband and wife, father and mother, son and
10 | daughter, brother and sister, creating a common culture. I suggest you remove it from the abstract
11 | since its the start in the introduction. This study was done in Sangrur and Ludhiana district of Punjab
12 | to analyse the changes occurring in family institution and it was found that structure of family system
13 | have been significantly changed. Living in joint family structure has been declined in the year 2015.
14 | However, the proportion of respondent farmers living in nuclear families has increased significantly.
15 | As reported by the sampled respondents, the proportion of the families having up to 4 members
16 | increased. Overall in the study area, the luxury items like refrigerators, two wheelers (scooter/motor
17 | cycles) televisions, washing machine, food processor, four wheelers (cars/jeeps) etc were rarely
18 | occupied by the sampled respondents in the year 1990. The extent of these items were increased many
19 | folds in the year 2015. Data revealed that total sampled respondents reported that the ownership of
20 | agricultural land has increased over the period of 1990 to 2015. It was observed that the results
21 | indicated that males were remained dominant over females with respect to family head during the
22 | period 1990-2015. It was analyzed that with respect to the family head having age up to 45 years
23 | increased. So far as type of house was concerned, it was is revealed that overall in the study area
24 | majority of the respondents were having *kachamakaan* in year 1990, however with change in time and
25 | better economic condition of the respondent nearly 70 per cent of the total respondents were found to
26 | be living in cemented *paccamakaan* during the survey period i.e. 2015. Data revealed that there is was
27 | significant change in international pattern of rural families as far as topic and duration of family
28 | conversation was concerned.

Formatted: Font color: Red, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

29 | **INTRODUCTION**

30 | Family is one of the most fundamental and universal social institution of mankind. It is the family
31 | where social life of the person starts. Its form or feature may vary from society to society, but its
32 | presence is much needed for a smooth and stable society. Family is a group of persons united by ties
33 | of marriage, blood or adoption, constituting a single household interacting and intercommunicating
34 | with each other in their respective social roles of husband and wife, father and mother, son and
35 | daughter, brother and sister, creating a common culture (Krishna 2007, Burgess and Locke 1953, Bell
36 | 1967). Family can also defined as a unit of two or more persons united by marriage, blood, adoption,
37 | or consensual union, in general consulting a single household, interacting and communicating with
38 | each other (Rao, 2006). Institution of family is said to be the pillar of mankind as well. Since time
39 | immemorial the family has been playing its role in preservice of human race and advancement of
40 | civilization by fulfilling its necessary requirements of human life. History and importance of family,
41 | as a social institution is as old as the human beings started living in tribes, communities and societies
42 | (Shah 1973).

43 | Till last quarter of 20th century, before the green revolution by and large society was traditional. But
44 | after the introduction of industrial era in India, family system also changed. There is a shift from
45 | agriculture to industry to great extent, therefore the ties which held together the joint family have been
46 | loosened (Beteille 1964). Since the family has been the basic social institution of rural social world, it

47 is natural to expect that the whole social organization of agriculture aggregates has been stamped by
48 the characteristics of rural family. However due to variety of factors the institution of family has
49 experienced lot of changes. Many studies are indicative that role, nature and structure of family is
50 changing in our society.[ref?](#)

51 There are some visible factors generating changes in the institution of family. Among these, important
52 are technological changes, mass media, exposure to other cultures, increase in education, lack of
53 family values in Indian families, emerging trend of working women, increase in technology use,
54 increase in materialism, industrialization, urbanization, migration of population from villages to cities,
55 general spread of education, especially among women (female literacy rate was 82.14 per cent in
56 2011 as compared to 54.16 per cent in 2001. Family so far being a divinely instituted “union of souls”
57 is seen to be the product of series of material in modern times (Sonawat 2001). After perusal of
58 literature of family, studies indicate that changes in the family are generating many social, cultural,
59 psychological consequences on the society as a whole. Some other consequences, which should be
60 considered as vital are changing authority system of family, emerging trend of working women,
61 emergence of new types of family, increase in divorce rate, and domestic violence.[ref?](#)

62 MATERIALS AND METHODS

63 The present study titled “Causes and Consequences of Change in Family Institution Among Farm
64 Families in Rural Punjab” was conducted in two districts of Punjab state. In order to achieve
65 stipulated objectives multistage sampling procedure was adopted for selection of districts, blocks,
66 villages and respondents. Ludhiana and Sangrur district of Punjab were purposively selected in this
67 investigation. Ludhiana is one of the highly industrialized and urbanized district in the State of Punjab
68 and hence taken for study as it may bear more influence on social institution. The Sangrur is
69 comparatively less urbanized and mostly having a rural base, hence it was selected for present
70 investigation. To meet the objective of study, one block far from the city and one block near to the
71 city were selected to make this study representative. Following the above mention procedure,
72 Ludhiana 1 and Machiwara blocks were selected from Ludhiana district and Sunam and Dhuri blocks
73 were selected from Sangrur district. From the selected blocks four villages each were selected for
74 collection of data. At the final stage of sampling, from sampled villages of each block, 20 respondents
75 were selected from each village randomly representing various sections of village society. So, 160
76 respondents from Sangrur and 160 respondents from Ludhiana district were selected for the present
77 study making a grand total as 320 respondents. Efforts were made to collect data on changes
78 occurring in family institution overtime. The responses from respondents were taken for two points of
79 time i.e. 1990 and 2015. An interview schedule was prepared and used for collection of relevant data.

80 [What software did you use to analyzed your data? and the version.](#)

81

82

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

83 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

84 **Changes in decision making authority of family regarding education of children**

85 Power and authority in traditional family stood generally in inverse relationship. Authority and
 86 decision making was based upon generation, sex and relative age (Singh 1984). The modern family is
 87 democratic based on equality between husband and wife, with consensus in making decision and with
 88 increasing participation by children as they grow older (Ahuja 2002). Keeping this in view, an effort
 89 was made to observe the changes that took place in decision making process of families in the year
 90 1990 and 2015. Data presented in Table 1 revealed that 30.63 per cent of the respondents said the
 91 decision making authority regarding children education would be, was the husband only in the year
 92 1990, while in the year 2015 about 47 per cent of the total respondents reported that collective
 93 decision by all family members was taken so far education of children is concerned. About 27 per
 94 cent of the sampled respondents reported that the parents were the decision making authority
 95 regarding education in the year 2015. About 8.13 per cent of the total respondents reported that
 96 children were free to take decision as an individual with respect to their education in the family. It
 97 may be concluded that decision making authority has been changing significantly during the period
 98 1990 to 2015. People believed in collective decision more extensively in the recent times than earlier.
 99 Parents were also emerged as important decision making authority in the recent years.

Formatted: Highlight

100 **Table 1: Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority of**
 101 **family regarding education of children, 1990 to 2015**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Education			
Only wife	10 (3.13)	0 (0.00)	42.16*
Only husband	98 (30.63)	57 (17.81)	6.83*
Both (Husband, wife)	55 (17.19)	0 (0.00)	26.91*
Grand parents	10 (3.13)	0 (0.00)	42.16*
Parents	67 (20.94)	87 (27.19)	3.36*
Children	45 (14.06)	26 (8.13)	7.10*
Collective decision	35 (10.94)	150 (46.88)	16.01*

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

104 **Changes in decision making authority regarding family expenditure.**

105 Decision regarding family expenditure affects all members of family. Table 2 shows eds that majority
 106 of the respondents (34.06 per cent) reported that husband was the main authority to take decision
 107 regarding family expenditure in the year 1990. Corresponding to this year, individual either wife

108 (30.31 per cent), or husband (34.06 per cent) was the main decision making authority regarding
 109 family expenditure in 1990. However, in the year 2015, majority of the respondents (35.94 per cent)
 110 reported they take collective decision after discussing with all members. Nearly one-fourth of the total
 111 respondents (25.31 per cent) reported that husband and wife together was the decision making
 112 authority in year 2015. Hence, the people more believed in collective decision regarding family
 113 expenditure in recent years as compared to 1990.

114 **Table 2 : Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority**
 115 **regarding family expenditure.**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Family expenditure			
Only husband	109 (34.06)	14 (4.38)	20.07*
Only wife	97 (30.31)	25 (7.81)	15.34*
Both (Husband, wife)	23 (7.19)	81 (25.31)	14.56*
Grand parents	32 (10.00)	35 (10.94)	1.19
Children	26 (8.13)	25 (7.81)	0.53
Parents	5 (1.56)	25 (7.81)	19.02*
Collective decision	28 (8.75)	115 (35.94)	15.75*

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

118 **Changes in decision making authority regarding profession of children**

119 Agriculture has not been generating remunerative income in the recent years due to one or
 120 another reason in the Punjab state (Kumar *etal*2014). Therefore people engaged in agricultural
 121 profession preferred some other non-farm profession for their children. The information generated
 122 with respect to changes in decision making authority decided profession of children in the year 1990
 123 to 2015 as is given in Table 3. Data regarding this issue showed grandparents and parents were the
 124 main authority to decide profession of the children majority of respondents in the year 1990. This was
 125 reported by nearly 20 and 21 per cent of the total sampled respondents. On contrary to this, majority
 126 of the respondents (41.56 per cent) taking into consideration collective decision while deciding the
 127 profession of children in the year 2015. Children as an individual were also free to decide their
 128 profession in the year 2015, as this was reported by 24.69 per cent of the total respondents in the study
 129 area.

Formatted: Highlight

130
 131

132 **Table 3: Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority**
 133 **regarding profession of children**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Profession of young children			
Only husband	55 (17.19)	10 (3.13)	18.45*
Only wife	14 (4.38)	28 (8.75)	9.16*
Both (Husband, wife)	35 (10.94)	64 (10.00)	7.66*
Grand parents	65 (20.31)	45 (4.06)	4.74*
Children	46 (14.38)	15 (24.69)	13.59*
Parents	67 (20.94)	25 (7.81)	11.97*
Collective decision	38 (11.88)	133 (41.56)	14.33*

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

136 **Changes in decision making authority for agricultural related activities e decisions**

137 Agriculture was the main occupation of farm families and right decision at right time with respect
 138 agriculture may enhance the agricultural production. Table 4 shows that husband as an individual
 139 was the main decision making authority in the year 1990 and 2015, as reported by 35.31 and 30.63 per
 140 cent of the total respondents, respectively. Most of the decision with respect to agriculture decision
 141 was taken by male member of the family, and no significant changes were observed with regard to
 142 this issue.

143 **Table 4: Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority for**
 144 **agriculture decisions. 1990 to 2015**

	1990(n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Agriculture decisions			
Only husband	113 (35.31)	98 (30.63)	1.83 ^{NS}
Only wife	21 (6.56)	16 (5.00)	3.76*
Both (Husband, wife)	43 (13.44)	67 (20.94)	5.69*
Grand parents	37 (11.56)	45 (14.06)	2.57**
Children	10 (3.13)	12 (3.75)	2.13**
Parents	41 (12.81)	33 (10.31)	2.16**
Collective decision	55 (17.19)	49 (15.31)	1.51 ^{NS}

145 *Significant at 1 % of level of significance, **Significant at 5% of levels of significance,
 146 Figures in the brackets indicate per cent to the total

Formatted: Highlight

147 **Changes in decision making authority in marriage of children**

148 Marriage is said to be the major step in one’s life and right decision in this regard ~~is-would be~~
 149 very important **decision**. Table 5 indicated that elders in the family were the main authority to take
 150 decision regarding marriage of children in the year 1990. Majority of the respondents (21.56 per cent)
 151 reported that grandparents were the main authority to take decision of marriage of children in the year
 152 1990, while about 31 per cent of the respondents reported that this decision was taken by husband and
 153 wife together in the year 2015. It **was is** reflected from the data that husband as an individual was also
 154 an important authority of taking decision with regard to marriage of the children in the year 1990 as
 155 reported by 20.94 per cent of the –total respondents, whereas 23.44 per cent of the sampled
 156 respondents reported that collective decision was taken into account with respect to marriage of the
 157 children in the year 2015.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

158 **Table 5 : Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority in**
 159 **marriage of children, 1990 to 2015**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Marriage of children			
Only husband	67 (20.94)	39 (12.19)	6.89*
Only wife	10 (3.13)	26 (8.13)	12.40*
Both (Husband, wife)	47 (14.69)	99 (30.94)	9.21*
Grand parents	69 (21.56)	35 (10.94)	8.54*
Children	35 (10.94)	22 (6.88)	6.12*
Parents	59 (18.44)	24 (7.50)	11.10*
Collective decision	33 (10.31)	75 (23.44)	10.14*

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

162 **Changes in decision making authority in buying and selling of land**

Formatted: Highlight

163 Table 6 indicated that the decision regarding buying and selling of land was mainly taken by
 164 the male members of family in year 1990 as 35 per cent of the total respondents reported that only
 165 husband as an individual take care of buying and selling of land in this year. Only 11.25 per cent of
 166 the respondents reported that only husbands were the main decision making authority for buying and
 167 selling of land in the year in 2015. Corresponding to the year 2015, majority of the respondents (30.31
 168 per cent) said that they take collective decision and 25.31 per cent of the respondents replied that both
 169 husband and wife took decision regarding buying and selling of land. Thus, there exist significant
 170 changes with respect to decision making authority with regard to buying and selling of land in the
 171 recent years.

172

173 **Table 6 : Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority in**
 174 **buying and selling of land, 1990 to 2015**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Buying and selling of land decisions			
Only husband	112 (35.00)	36 (11.25)	13.28*
Only wife	9 (2.81)	26 (8.13)	13.59*
Both (Husband, wife)	23 (7.19)	81 (25.31)	14.56*
Grand parents	47 (14.69)	20 (6.25)	10.72*
Children	50 (15.63)	25 (7.81)	8.82*
Parents	44 (13.75)	35 (10.94)	3.01*
Collective decision	35 (10.94)	97 (30.31)	12.18*

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

177 **Changes in decision making authority in household matters**

178 So far as household decision were concerned, the results presented in Table 7 revealed that 34.38 per
 179 cent of the total respondents reported that only husband took all major

180 **Table 7: Distribution of respondents on the basis of changes in decision making authority in**
 181 **household matters, 1990 to 2015**

	1990 (n=320)	2015 (n=320)	
Decision making members	Number	Number	Z value
Household decisions			
Only husband	110 (34.38)	28 (8.75)	15.39*
Only wife	33 (10.31)	43 (13.44)	3.48*
Both (Husband, wife)	35 (10.94)	78 (24.38)	9.91*
Grand parents	52 (16.25)	25 (7.81)	9.26*
Children	45 (14.06)	53 (16.56)	2.14**
Parents	25 (7.81)	35 (10.94)	4.46*
Collective decision	20 (6.25)	58 (18.13)	12.86*

182 ***Significant at 1 % level of significance, **Significant at 5% level of significance**
 183 **Figures in the brackets indicate per cent to the total**

184 decisions regarding households in the year 1990, however the trends has been changed in the year
 185 2015 and most of the respondents i.e. 24.38 percent reported that all the important decision regarding
 186

187 households were taken by husband and wife together in this year. Children as an individual decision
188 making authority, collective decision by all family members together were also emerged as another
189 important decision making authority in the year 2015 and Z-test indicated the significant changes in
190 this regards.

191 CONCLUSION

192 Family was still considered to be the prime institution but the problems and consequences of changes
193 have changed its value over period of time. Family is **more** becoming **+** less important for its
194 members. There are many factors which led **to** many changes in this prime institution. Introduction of
195 technology, urbanization and industrialization **is has been** said to be the main factors behind changes.
196 These changes **were on** **have changes the** social, economical, psychological and even emotional role of
197 family towards its members. Structure and functions performed by ancient family has changed
198 significantly. But now its high time when the role of family needs to be checked. So people should
199 give more time to their family and family members.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

200 REFERENCES

- 201
- 202 Bell. R R (1967) *Marriage and Family Interactions*.The Parsey Press.HolandIllinois.
- 203 Beteille. A (1991) The family and the reproduction of inequality. *Family,kinship and marriage in*
204 *India*.Oxford University Press, London.
- 205 Burgess E W and Locke H J (1953) *The family: From Institution to Companionship*. 256-66.
206 American Book, New York.
- 207 KrishanG(2007) India: female Headed Households,2001. *Man and Development*.**9**: 161-165
- 208 Lee C Y S, Anderson J R, Horowitz J L and August G R (2009) Family income and parenting: The
209 role of parental depression and Social support. *Family relations* **58**: 417-30.
- 210 Mukarjee R K (1979): *Sociology of Indian sociology* 16-170. Allied Publishers, Delhi.
- 211 Muncie J,Wetherall M, Dallo R (1995).*Understanding the family*. Sage Publications.
- 212 Panda U K (2011) Role conflicts, stress and dual career couples: An empirical study. *The journal of*
213 *family welfare* **57**: 72-88.
- 214
- 215 Shah A M (1973) *The household dimensions of the family in India*.Orient Longman, New Delhi and
216 University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 217 Rao C N (2006) *Rural development in India*. Serials Publications, New Delhi, Pp 121-128
- 218 SonawatR(2001) Understanding Families in India: A Reflection of Societal Changes.*Psicologia:*
219 *Teoria e Pesquisa***17**: 177-186.
- 220