

An Empirical Study on Family Bondage in the Pre and Post Lock Down of Covid-19 (with Special reference to Chennai City.)

Dr.K.Selvasundaram,

Associate Professor and Head, Department of Commerce (CS&AF), College of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur-603-203, Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu

Abstract:*The Covid-19 outbreak has struck the human which impacted lot in all spheres of the life of everyone on the earth. This pandemic covid-19 threaded the mankind which also continues still without any medical curing across the world. World claimed to be top on doing research in medicine to disease to cure it but in controlling and stopping the of Covid-19 became terrible day by day. This study depicts the family support during the pandemic Covid-19 to come out who are affected by this pandemic disease. As measures to contain the spread of COVID-19 are being implemented across the globe (movement restrictions/curfews, closure of State borders, quarantine and confinement policies, etc.), the ability of families to maintain contact is negatively impacted. Likewise, the ability of those traditionally providing services aiming at restoring and maintaining family contact (RFL), including the Red Cross and Red Crescent (RCRC) Movement, are sometimes dramatically reduced.*

Key Words: *Covid-19, Family support, Curfew, Red Cross Society, Mankind and Medicine*

I. Introduction:

In the phases of human evolution the risk of protecting the mankind always challenging but time and again it has been tide over by the technological and superficial power of the human inventions and succeeded. On the other hand due to this Covid-19 deeply impacted all walks of human life and it affected in the personal life and working life every individual. The entire world faced crises of unemployment, industry lockdown, and poor economic growth of the nation and still the driven efforts are taken to stop this Covid-19 by invention of medicine to have permanent solution. During this pandemic situation the support and recognition of family is sentimentally parted integral role on every person who is affected by Covid-19 and without which it is proven that impossible to come out from this Covid-19. The study rightly focuses on the role and support of the family how helped in overcoming the disease during pre and post lock down period.

II Review of Literature

Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (2001)¹. revealed that the transmission of marital quality was not mediated by parental divorce, life-course variables, socioeconomic attainment, retrospective measures of parent-child relationships, or psychological distress. Offspring's recollections of parental discord, however, mediated about half of the association between parents' reports of

marital discord and offspring's reports of discord in their own marriages. Anderson, C. (2003)² explores family adaptation within the context of childhood disability. However, closer analysis indicates that the primary focus of this research is concentrated on two-parent family systems. Despite evidence to suggest that single mothers are more likely to be parenting children with disabilities, their experiences have received minimal attention within social science research. Furthermore, when single mothers do become the focus of study, much of the attention is directed toward identifying the deficits within their family systems Belsky, J., & Rovine, M. (1990)³ found that the transition to parenthood marks a significant developmental milestone for many adults. Researchers have spent decades examining whether the birth of an infant spells ruin for the marriage. Perhaps the question is not whether marriages have been compromised with the birth of a child, but how adults make the transition from partners to parents as part of the adult life course .Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Ed.)⁴, Their beliefs in scientific logic, a unitary method, objectivity, and truth legitimized reducing qualities of human experience to quantifiable variables. Thus, positivist methods assumed an unbiased and passive observer who collected facts but did not participate in creating them, the separation of facts from values, the existence of an external world separate from scientific observers and their methods, and the accumulation of generalizable knowledge about this world. Positivism led to a quest for valid instruments, technical procedures, replicable research designs, and verifiable quantitative knowledge. According to Brad Wilcox, a Professor of Sociology and Director of the National Marriage Project at the University of Virginia, people and families when faced with global crisis usually tend to respond by positioning themselves in a less self-centred way and in a more family-centric way. True in every sense! We did respond in the above manner during the outbreak and even during the lockdown. People prioritized the wellbeing and safety of their families over oneself. Family first over the rest was at a huge display. For a change in life functionalities, the lockdown has brought people closer to home and its people but keeps aloof from the wider communities. Some people choose to spend time at home but not with family, they prioritize their time in the company of mobiles, laptops, computer etc. This is due to the void in the cognitive level. So it is evident that when cognition is absent automatically the ability to recognize emotions and the ability to respond to the emotions of the other is neglected. People exhibit some form of attachment in the familial bonding. They are secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissing. The study goes further to identify the bonding style in the pre lock down and post lockdown.

III.Objectives of the study

1. To understand the demographic profiles of respondents
2. To identify the different dominant factors on family bondage during the Covid-19
3. To examine the difference in the factors between the Pre-lock down and Post –lockdown

IV Research Methodology:

The present study is analytical in nature and has survey and has adopted survey method for its findings. This study depends on the primary data collected from the respondents through a well-designed and well-structured questionnaire. However, efforts were taken to collect

information from all available published data, especially from the newspaper, journals and previous researches.

V. Sample Size and Design

Non- probability convenient sampling method was adopted for collecting primary data from the respondents. A total of 350 Questionnaire were issued and the respondents were given sufficient time for filling the questionnaire. 325 of the issued questionnaire were received back from the respondents. On scrutiny of these 25 of them were found incompletely filled and the remaining 300 were taken for the study.

VI Reliability Testing of Data:

The data collected were subjected to Cronach’s alpha test for checking the internal consistency and reliability of the sample. The values are below.

VII Analysis and Interpretation

Table-1

| Types of variables | Numbers of variables | Alpha value |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Pre- Lock Down Variables | 30 | 0.832 |
| Post-Lock Down Variables | 30 | 0.866 |

The table shows that Cronach’s alpha value for variables are higher (nearer to 1). Therefore, there is high consistency in measurement of the different types of variables and the scaling is highly reliable.

| Table-2 Descriptive statistics of age in years | | Age |
|--|---------|---------|
| N | Valid | 300 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 34.55 |
| Median | | 33.00 |
| Mode | | 20 |
| Std. Deviation | | 12.142 |
| Variance | | 147.419 |
| Skewness | | .762 |
| Std. Error of Skewness | | .141 |
| Kurtosis | | .150 |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis | | .281 |
| Range | | 54 |
| Minimum | | 19 |
| Maximum | | 73 |
| Percentiles | 25 | 23.00 |
| | 50 | 33.00 |
| | 75 | 42.00 |

Table-2 The table shows that the mean age of the all respondents 33 years with the standard deviation of 12.142. The age distribution has a slight positive skewness.

| Table-3 Gender | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Male | 159 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| | Female | 141 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table-3 shows that majority of all the respondents 53% belong to the gender

| Table-4 Marital statistics | | Frequency | Per cent | Valid Per cent | Cumulative Per cent |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Valid | Married | 196 | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.3 |
| | Unmarried | 104 | 34.7 | 34.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table 4 shows that the majority of the respondents are married with 65.3%

| Table-5 Education | | Frequency | Per cent | Valid Per cent | Cumulative Per cent |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Valid | School | 8 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | Graduate | 51 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 19.7 |
| | PG | 145 | 48.3 | 48.3 | 68.0 |
| | Professional | 83 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 95.7 |
| | 5 | 13 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 5 shows that the majority of the respondents are post graduates with 48.3%

| Table –Occupation-6 | | Frequency | Per cent | Valid Per cent | Cumulative Per cent |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Valid | Student | 93 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| | Teachers | 45 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 46.0 |
| | Professors | 116 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 84.7 |
| | Executives | 24 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 92.7 |
| | Self employed | 18 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 98.7 |
| | Home makers | 4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 6 shows that the majority of the respondents are professors with the 38.7%

| Table-7- Native place | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Per cent | Cumulative Per cent |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|---------|----------------|---------------------|
| Valid | South India | 94 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 |
| | North India | 176 | 58.7 | 58.7 | 90.0 |
| | East India | 13 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 94.3 |
| | West India | 15 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 99.3 |
| | Outside India | 2 | .7 | .7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table- 7 shows that the majority of the respondents are south Indians with the 58.7%

| Table-8-Types of family | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Nuclear family | 198 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 |
| | Joint family | 91 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 96.3 |
| | Extended family | 11 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table -8 shows that the majority of the respondents are nuclear family with 66%

| Table -9Table -9-Income Level | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Less than Rs.20K | 75 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| | Between Rs.20K - 50K | 104 | 34.7 | 34.7 | 59.7 |
| | Between Rs.50K - 100K | 80 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 86.3 |
| | More than Rs,100K | 41 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table -09 shows that the majority of the respondents are the income group of 20000 to 50000 (34.7%)

Table -10 Number members employed in the family

| Statistics | | |
|------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| | | No. of members employed |
| N | Valid | 300 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 2.14 |
| Median | | 2.00 |
| Mode | | 2 |
| Std. Deviation | | 1.170 |
| Variance | | 1.369 |
| Skewness | | 1.497 |
| Std. Error of Skewness | | .141 |
| Kurtosis | | 2.786 |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis | | .281 |
| Range | | 7 |
| Minimum | | 0 |
| Maximum | | 7 |
| Percentiles | 25 | 1.00 |
| | 50 | 2.00 |
| | 75 | 2.00 |

The table-11 shows that the numbers of the family members employed 2. with the standard deviation 1.170

Table- 11

Away from family

| Table- 11 Away from the family | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Yes | 102 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 |

| | | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| No | 198 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 300 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table -11 shows that the majority of the respondents are with the family and with 66% Part-II –of the study

Descriptive statistics, communalities and MSA of Lock down Variables

Table-2:1

| Lock down Variable | Mean | S.D | Communalities |
|---|------|-------|---------------|
| You added more meaning to your life. | 3.86 | 1.063 | .664 |
| Togetherness of family has increased. | 3.88 | 1.010 | .532 |
| You have nurtured your talents. | 3.69 | 1.057 | .560 |
| You have connected with our inner soul better than before. | 3.60 | 1.004 | .595 |
| You have become closer to God and like religious activities. | 3.46 | 1.174 | .561 |
| Reduced workload led to increased family bonding. | 3.29 | 1.166 | .596 |
| Your participation in social media has increased | 3.48 | 1.044 | .688 |
| Your exercise for wellbeing and fitness. | 3.45 | 1.048 | .641 |
| Cautious food habits and more of homemade food is on the rise | 4.08 | .960 | .482 |
| You dedicate time for playing a sport (indoor/outdoor) | 3.16 | 1.140 | .508 |
| You feel at ease when you are surrounded by family | 3.95 | .862 | .635 |
| You trust you family more and you like it when they rely on you | 4.03 | .878 | .638 |
| You easily connect with immediate and extended family. | 3.79 | .881 | .544 |
| You think family members are now relying more on each other. | 3.80 | .958 | .614 |
| You trust that your family will be there for you always. | 4.12 | 1.005 | .668 |
| You like to be open to family members but can't trust them all. | 3.03 | 1.165 | .701 |
| You have close relationships with only few family members | 3.32 | 1.125 | .679 |
| Your family members do not make efforts to get close with you. | 2.67 | 1.149 | .705 |
| You are afraid to hurt family owing to your openness. | 3.28 | 1.131 | .602 |
| You are afraid of being treated harshly by family members. | 2.90 | 1.159 | .567 |
| You often wonder whether they like you. | 2.95 | 1.123 | .582 |
| You like your family members better than they like you. | 3.56 | 1.018 | .561 |
| You do not cope with daily habits of family e.g.: rising time, etc. | 3.04 | 1.162 | .625 |
| You don't worry whether family members appreciate you. | 3.25 | 1.088 | .509 |
| You find work more interesting than spending time with family. | 2.86 | 1.066 | .587 |
| You prefer family members to be independent. | 3.67 | .946 | .697 |
| You think it is important for you to be independent. | 3.90 | .990 | .781 |
| You like to be self-sufficient. | 3.77 | 1.008 | .681 |
| You prefer being alone despite family members are available. | 2.83 | 1.155 | .612 |
| You don't prefer to be a part of family's activities regularly. | 2.61 | 1.230 | .610 |

Table 2 2

KMO and Bartlett's Test for Factorization of PRE and POST Lock down factors

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .820 | |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 3066.469 |
| | Df | 435 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

Table:2-3

Variance Explained by PRE & POST Lock down Factors

| Component | Eigen Values | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 | 3.582 | 11.940 | 11.940 |
| 2 | 3.086 | 10.286 | 22.226 |
| 3 | 3.085 | 10.283 | 32.509 |
| 4 | 2.349 | 7.829 | 40.338 |
| 5 | 1.910 | 6.368 | 46.706 |
| 6 | 1.756 | 5.852 | 52.558 |
| 7 | 1.585 | 5.282 | 57.840 |
| 8 | 1.331 | 4.436 | 62.277 |

Table-2-4
Pre and Post Lock down Factors

| Factors | Variables | Factor Loading |
|---|---|----------------|
| Factor-1 Family Support Factor | Trust of the family | 0.747 |
| | Meaning fullness of the family | 0.713 |
| | Togetherness of family | 0.656 |
| | Social connection | 0.605 |
| | Loneliness from the family | 0.538 |
| | Staying out of the family | 0.538 |
| | Working more in office than with family | 0.498 |
| | Connection with family | 0.492 |
| Factor-2 Family issues factor | Less trustiness of the family | 0.776 |
| | Close relationship with few members in the family | 0.748 |
| | Family members kept distinct | 0.691 |
| | Likeness of the family | 0.665 |
| | Harsh Behavior of the family members | 0.554 |
| | Openness of the family hurts the family members | 0.426 |
| Factors-3 Self-Development factor | Relying and trust of the family members | 0.668 |
| | Nurturing of the family talents | 0.602 |
| | Appreciation from the family members when upset | 0.597 |
| | Reduced workload increased the family bondage | 0.592 |
| | Playing sports (indoor) | 0.504 |
| Factor-4 Self sufficient factor | Independentness of the family | 0.873 |
| | Self sufficientness | 0.789 |
| | Family members independence | 0.705 |
| Factor -5 Coping habits factor | Time spending with the family | 0.743 |
| | Likeness of the family | 0.653 |
| Factor-6 Health Factor | Relying of family members | 0.742 |
| | Consciousness of home made foods | 0.518 |
| Factor-7 Fitness factor | Increased participation in social media | 0.772 |
| | Excise and fitness care of the health | 0.589 |
| Factor-8 Spiritual factor | Meaningfulness of the family | 0.6.27 |
| | Worship and religious faintness | 0.546 |

The table 2.1 to 2.3 show that with range of communalities of the 30 pre and post lock down factors from KMO Measure of Sample Adequacy value 0.820 and Chi-square value of 3066.469 at d.f of 435 with P-Value of .000.in Barletta Test of Sphericity, the factors analysis is applicable for factorization of the pre and post lockdown variables.

Eight factors have been extracted and they explain 62.277% of the variance in the 30 pre and post lockdown variables. The most dominant one is 11.940% and it has the 8 variables of which is named as **Family Support Factor**.

The second most dominant one is factor 2 with the explained variance of 10.286% which consists of 6 variables and named as the **Family Issues Factor**.

The third most dominant factor is with the explained variance of 10.283% which consists of 5 variables and it named as the **Self Development Factor**.

The fourth dominant factor is with the explained variance of 7.289% which consists of 3 variables and it is named as the **Self Sufficient Factor**.

The fifth dominant factor is with the explained variance of 6.368% which consists 2 variables and it is named as **Coping Habits Factor**.

The sixth dominant factor is with the explained variance of 5.852% which consists of 2 variables and it is named as **Health Factor**.

The seventh dominant factor is with the explained variance of 5.282% which consists of 2 variables and it is named as **Fitness Factor**.

The eighth dominant factor is with the explained variance of 4.436% which consists of 2 variables and it is named as **Spiritual Factor**.

Table 2.5

An attempt has been made to examine the significance of difference between the Pre-lockdown and Post lockdown variables by applying Paired t test. The results are shown in the table.

Significance of difference is Pre and Post Lock down factors:

| Paired t – test Samples Statistics | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------------------|
| Lock Factors | | Mean | N | SD | SEM | t-Value | P-Value | Inference |
| Family support factor | Pre-LF | 27.9897 | 300 | 3.77473 | .27101 | .078 | .938 | Not Significant |
| | Post-LF | 27.9691 | 300 | 3.90152 | .28011 | | | |
| Family issues factor | Pre-LF | 18.1495 | 300 | 4.68083 | .33606 | .078 | .938 | Not Significant |
| | Post-LF | 18.3866 | 300 | 5.15058 | .36979 | | | |
| Self development factor | Pre-LF | 17.0000 | 300 | 3.56436 | .25591 | -2.329 | .021 | Significant |
| | Post-LF | 17.6031 | 300 | 3.30680 | .23741 | | | |
| Self sufficiency factor | Pre-LF | 11.3454 | 300 | 2.41526 | .17341 | 1.329 | .185 | Not Significant |
| | Post-LF | 11.1134 | 300 | 2.48259 | .17824 | | | |
| Coping habits factor | Pre-LF | 6.5928 | 300 | 1.75261 | .12583 | 2.418 | .046 | Significant |
| | Post-LF | 6.5412 | 300 | 1.82693 | .13117 | | | |
| Health Conscious factor | Pre-LF | 7.9536 | 300 | 1.65179 | .11859 | 2.282 | .023 | Significant |
| | Post-LF | 7.7938 | 300 | 1.72418 | .12379 | | | |
| Fitness Conscious | Pre-LF | 6.9330 | 300 | 1.67599 | .12033 | -.084 | .933 | Not |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|--------|-----|---------|--------|--------|------|-------------|
| factor | Post-LF | 6.9433 | 300 | 1.58421 | .11374 | | | Significant |
| Spritual factor | Pre-LF | 7.3144 | 300 | 1.83492 | .13174 | -3.609 | .025 | Significant |
| | Post-LF | 7.3918 | 300 | 1.73687 | .12470 | | | |

VIII Findings of the study

Table 2.5 indicates the **family support factors** which is the combination of variables of (Trust of the family, Meaning fullness of the family, Togetherness of family, Social connection, Loneliness from, the family, Staying out of the family, Working more in office than with family and Connection with family) has no significance difference in the difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is higher value than table value

The second factor, **family issues factor** is the combination of variables of (Less trustiness of the family, Close relationship with few members in the family, Family members kept distinct, Likeness of the family, Harsh Behavior of the family members, Openness of the family hurts the family members) has no significance difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is higher value than table value

The third factor, **self-development factor** is the combination of variables of (Relying and trust of the family members, Nurturing of the family talents, Appreciation from the family members when upset, Reduced workload increased the family bondage and Playing sports (indoor) has significance difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is lower value than table value

The fourth factor, **self-sufficient factor** is the combination of variables of (Independentness of the family, Self-sufficient and Family member's independence) has no significance difference in the difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is higher value than table value

The fifth factor, **Coping habits factor** is the combination of variables of (Time spending with the family and Likeness of the family) has significance of difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is lower value than table value

The sixth factor, **Health Conscious factor** is the combination of variables of (Relying of family members and Consciousness of homemade foods) has significance of difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is lower value than table value.

The seventh factor, **Fitness factor** is the combination of variables of (Increased participation in social media and Excise and fitness care of the health) has no significance of difference in the difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is higher value than table value

The eight factor Spiritual factor is the combination of variables of (Meaningfulness of the family and Worship and religious faintness) has significance of difference in the pre and post down period as its p-value is lower value than table value.

IX Conclusion

The study found that the family support played a vital in overcoming from the pandemic disease Covid-19. Finding of the study revealed that the pre and post lock down created health conscious and searched for the worshipping of god became increasing. Moreover highlighted the savings habits of an individual and impacted in the pattern of running a life to save for future. The study concluded that the Covid-19 increased the awareness for the future ready made a real time experience of every individual to face the any untoward incidents to the mankind.

References

1. Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (2001). The legacy of parents' marital discord: Consequences for children's marital quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(4), 627-638. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/courses/2006spring/spcl/091p/016/ParentDiscord.pdf>
2. Anderson, C. (2003). The diversity, strengths, and challenges of single-parent households. In F. Walsh. (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes: Growing diversity and complexity* (3rd ed., pp. 121-152). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
3. Belsky, J., & Rovine, M. (1990). Patterns of marital change across the transition to parenthood: Pregnancy to three years postpartum. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 52(1), 5-19. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/352833>
4. Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 81-110).