# International Journal of Research in Academic World

# Exploring the Socio-economic Status of Rural Households: A Case Study of Zhapur Village in Kalaburagi District

**\*1Dr. Devindrappa Mallikarjun**

\*1Faculty, Department of Social Work, Ramanagara Post-Graduation Centre, Bangalore University, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

**Abstract**

The present research paper has seven parts: Abstract, Introduction, Review of literature, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestions, followed by references. In India, farmland is measured by family status; those who have medium and large landowners have a better status than small and marginal landowners. However, the majority of farmers in India are small and marginal landowners. Those who have come from marginal and small landholding families also belong below the poverty line and they are also working as agricultural labourers. Even the majority of the landless families are working as agricultural laborers and landless families are also increasing decade by decade due to the impacts of farmland fragmentation. This study was conducted using a survey of 146 respondents (households) in this village. This village was a fully rain-fed area for farming and the majority of the farmers are not getting enough agricultural income for their family livelihood. The utilization of farmland also decreased from generation to generation due to the fragmentation of the farmland, which led to the farmers becoming agricultural laborers.

**Keywords:** Farmland, Landless, Status, landowners, laborers, and households.

## Introduction

According to the Indian constitution, Agriculture, Land including farmland, Water irrigation, and canals are the state subjects under the state list of the seventh schedule in the constitution of India. Agriculture is the backbone of India. The majority of the rural population depends on the agricultural sector for their livelihood, and everyone needs survival food. Hence, farming is essential for the world.

The UN General Assembly has adopted the Sustainable Development Goals, consisting of 17 SDGs and 169 targets. The SDGs came into force on 1st January 2016. The SDGs address the Social, Economic, and Environmental dimensions of development. The SDGs are universal for all nations, including India. However, Governments are putting a lot of effort into achieving the SDGs, but it will take more time

According to the Karnataka State Agricultural Census, 2015-16 Part-I, the Marginal and small landholdings category of farmers increased from 30.44 percent to 54.9 percent and from 23.65 percent to 25.5 percent. At the same duration, semi-medium, medium, and large size categories of landholding farmers decreased from 22.20 percent to 13.7 percent, from 17.54 percent to 5.2 percent, and from 6.17 percent to 0.7 percent, respectively, from the first agricultural census 1970-71 to the recent agricultural census 2015-16.

**Statement of the Problem:** There is a lot of gap between tribal communities, rural communities, and urban communities. The government of India and the government of Karnataka implemented many programs to fill the gap among the communities, but still, there is a gap in access to health, education, job opportunities, infrastructure, and other basic facilities.

## Objectives of the Present Study

i). To know the socio-demographic profile of the respondents (Rural Households)
ii). To know the socioeconomic status of the respondents
iii). To provide suggestions to concerned stakeholders

**Limitations:** The present study opted for only one village for the primary data collection with the census survey sampling method and covered all the households; therefore, the study findings can't be generalized due to the small size of the sample.

## Review of Literature

The data is based on secondary sources. The researcher reviewed the literature based on this research paper's key indicators, and the most important and relevant reviews are listed as follows.

Chaya Deogankar carried out a baseline survey in the undivided Gulbarga district. The researcher identified eight key indicators, such as education, occupation, and so on. This report revealed that the majority of the population engaged in agricultural occupations, and they were facing unemployment during the summer season. The majority of the rural households do not have safe drinking water

An exploratory research study was conducted on 120 sample size in both rural and urban areas. In their study, they found that households below the poverty line were higher in urban compared to rural households

Professors Mohan Pawar and Abye Tassein expressed their views in their research paper, highlighting that the lack of collective political will is also a major cause of people's poverty. The policy and programs related to the alleviation of poverty failed to be properly implemented

Researchers carried out a research study in the Hassan district, and they collected data from 182 households in their study. They pointed out that the majority of the households living in Kaccha houses, which are in rural areas, do not have proper housing facilities.

Researchers Parish and others wrote a paper and they covered data from 2019 to 2022 from different secondary sources. The total net irrigated area has a strong correlation with higher agricultural productivity. Irrigation facilities of agricultural land

## Methodology

The present study adopted a descriptive research design. The probability sampling method was followed, and census sampling was adopted for primary data collection from each household in the Zhapur village. This village is located in the Kalaburagi Taluka and District, Karnataka State in India. Sample size: There were 146 respondents considered for the present study. The respondents were those who had reached the age of 18 and he or she was head of their household.

Source of the data collection: The present study collected both data primary and secondary. The primary data was collected

from 146 respondents with structured interview schedules through door-to-door visits. The secondary source of data was collected through digital libraries such as the National Digital Library, Google Scholar, JSTOR, J-Gate, Elsevier data source, Research Gate, and government websites for the annual reports, census reports, etc. Data analysis: A codebook was prepared for primary data, and entered the same in SPSS 26, with the help of SPSS, the data was analyzed.

## Results

Based on both primary and secondary data, which were analyzed systematically with 11 key indicators to measure the socio-economic status of the Zhapur village households. There were 146 respondents who participated in this study.

## Socioeconomic Status of Households in Zhapur Village

**Table 1:** Demographic Profile of the Zhapur Village

| Size of Population | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Below 18 Age Male Children | 170 | 20 |
| Below 18 Age Female Children | 148 | 19 |
| Above 18 Age Male | 255 | 31 |
| Below 18 Age Female | 245 | 30 |
| Total | 818 | 100 |

**Table 2:** Socio-Economic Profile of the Respondents

| Education level of the Respondents | | | Caste/Category of Respondents | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | Frequency | Percent | Variables | Frequency | Percent |
| Illiterate | 73 | 50.0 | SC | 67 | 45.9 |
| Literate | 28 | 19.2 | ST | 22 | 15.1 |
| Primary | 27 | 18.5 | Cat-I | 15 | 10.3 |
| Secondary | 13 | 8.9 | Cat-II A | 19 | 13.0 |
| PUC/Diploma | 2 | 1.4 | Cat-IIB | 3 | 2.1 |
| UG | 2 | 1.4 | Cat-III A | 0 | 0 |
| PG | 1 | 0.7 | Cat-IIIB | 20 | 13.7 |
| Total | 146 | 100 | Total | 146 | 100.0 |
| **Occupation of the Respondents** | | | **Family Annual Income** | | |
| Agriculture | 32 | 21.9 | Below 25,000 | 58 | 39.7 |
| Self-Employment | 7 | 4.8 | From 26,000 to 50,000 | 55 | 37.7 |
| Agricultural Labour | 20 | 13.7 | From 51,000 to 75,000 | 18 | 12.3 |
| Both Agriculture and Agricultural Labour | 34 | 23.3 | From 76,000 to 1,00,000 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Caste Based Occupation | 8 | 5.5 | From 101,000 to 2,00,000 | 6 | 4.1 |
| Senior Citizen | 18 | 12.3 | From 2,01,000 and above | 7 | 4.8 |
| Government Employee | 1 | 0.7 | Total | 146 | 100.0 |
| Private-Employment | 13 | 8.9 | **Was the family income enough for your children's educational expenditure?** | | |
| Building and other construction workers | 8 | 5.5 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle drivers. | 5 | 3.4 | No | No | No |
| Total | 146 | 100.0 | Total | Total | Total |
| **Size of Land Owned by the Household** | | | **Type of the Family** | | |
| Marginal Below 1 Hectare | 66 | 45.2 | Joint | 55 | 37.7 |
| Small 1 to 2 hectares | 19 | 13.0 | Nuclear | 91 | 62.3 |
| Semi Medium 2 to 4 hectares | 16 | 11.0 | Total | 146 | 100.0 |
| Medium 4 to 10 hectares | 5 | 3.4 | | | |
| large 10 hectares above | 2 | 1.4 | | | |
| Land was sold | 3 | 2.1 | | | |
| Landless | 35 | 24.0 | | | |
| Total | 146 | 100.0 | | | |

*Source: Primary Data*

< 67 >

**Table 3:** Basic Amenities of the Zhapur Village

| Type of House | | | Source of Drinking Water | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Katcha or Hut or Steel Shed | 12 | 8.2 | Purified water | 12 | 8.2 |
| Semi-pucca (tin sheet room/Partial cement structure) | 91 | 62.3 | Public Tap | 134 | 91.8 |
| RCC | 26 | 17.8 | Total | 146 | 100.0 |
| RCC with Granite | 12 | 8.2 | **Type of Toilets Used by Households** | | |
| Rented House | 5 | 3.4 | Self or House attached Toilet | 17 | 11.6 |
| Total | 146 | 100.0 | Open defecation | 129 | 88.4 |
| **Number of Rooms in the House** | | | Total | 146 | 100.0 |
| One room | 27 | 18.5 | | | |
| Two rooms | 86 | 58.9 | | | |
| One BHK | 25 | 17.1 | | | |
| Two BHK | 8 | 5.5 | | | |
| Total | 146 | 100.0 | | | |

*Source: Primary Data*

**The Population of the Zhapur Village:** There were 146 households in this village and a total of 818 people living with an average of 5 persons in each household. There were 170 male children belonging to below 18, and there were 148 female children belonging to below 18 age groups. 255 Male persons belonged to the above 18 age group, and 245 female persons belonged to the above 18 age group. The majority of the population (20 percent and 31 percent, respectively) belonged to the male gender among both children and adults.

**Educational Level of the Respondents:** Education was the key indicator to measure the socio-economic status. The majority of the respondents (50 percent) were illiterates followed by 19.2 percent of the respondents were literate, 18.5 percent of the respondents had got primary level of education, 8.9 percent of respondents got a secondary level of education, 1.4 percent of the respondents PUC/Diploma, 1.4 percent of the respondents got under graduation level education and remaining only 0.7 percent of the respondents got Post graduation level education.

**Social Category:** The majority (45.9 percent) of the respondents belonged to the schedule Caste in this village followed by 15.1 percent of the respondents who belonged to the Schedule Tribe, 13.1 percent of respondents belonged to Category IIIB, 13 percent of respondents belonged to category IIA, 10.3 percent of the respondents belonged to Category I, and remaining only 2.1 percent of the respondents belongs to IIB. Other than SC and ST all the categories refer to other backward classes and minorities.

**Occupation of the Respondents:** The majority (23.3) of the respondents' occupations were both agriculture and Agricultural labour, followed by 21.9 percent of the respondents doing only agriculture, 13.7 percent of the respondents identified as agricultural laborers, and 12.3 percent of the respondents identified as senior citizens but they were also working in their farmlands. 8.9 percent of the respondents identified as private employees, 5.5 percent of the respondents identified as building and other construction workers, 5.5 percent of the respondents still practicing their caste-based occupation, like priests and all, 4.8 percent of the respondents were self-employed, 3.4 percent of the respondents were identified as vehicle drivers and the remaining only 0.7 percent of the respondents were government employees.

**Family Annual Income:** The majority of the respondents (39.7 percent) belong to the below 25 thousand family annual income, which indicates majority of the houses fall the below poverty line followed by 37.7 percent of the households belonging 26 thousand to 50 thousand their family annual income, 12.3 percent of the households belongs to 51 thousand to 75 thousand of their family annual income 01.4 percent of the households belongs to 76 thousand to 1 lakh of their family annual income, 4.1 percent of the households belongs to 1,01,000 to 2,00,000 of their family annual income, remaining only 4.8 percent of the households belongs to the 2,01,000 and above category of their family annual income.

The majority of the households (69.2 percent) are unable to manage their children's educational expenses and only 30.8 percent of the households manage their children's educational expenditure from their family income.

**Type of the Family:** The joint family was one of the characteristics of the rural community but the present study statistics revealed that the majority of households (62.3 percent) belong to the Nuclear family, and only 37.7 percent of the households belong to the joint family. It means rural communities are taking a paradigm shift concerning the type of family,

**Type of Toilets Used by Households:** the majority of the households (88.4 percent) still use open defecation and only 11.6 percent of the households were using house-attached Toilets (within the premises of the house ground). Most of the households built toilets for grants from the panchayat, but they were not yet all used.

**Source of Drinking Water:** The majority of the households (91.8 percent) were using public tap water (unfiltered water) for drinking, which was provided by the gram panchayat and only 8.2 percent of the households were using purified water; they installed small RO machines in their house.

**Size of the Land Owned by the Households:** agricultural land plays a vital role in determining the household's economic as well as social status in the rural area. The medium and large land owners have better status than marginal and small land owners however, in this study area the majority (45.2 percent) of the households belong to the Marginal Land (below 1 hectare) owners category followed by 13 percent of the household owned small size of land (1 to 2 hectares), 11 percent of the households owned Semi Medium (2 to 4 hectares) size of land holdings, 3.4 percent of the households owned Medium size (4 to 10 hectares) of land holdings, and only 1.4 percent of the households owned large size (10 hectares above) of landholdings. In this study, 2.1 percent of the households sold their land for livelihood, 24 percent of the households didn't have any land, and they were landless households.

**Type of House Owned by Households:** The majority of the households (62.3 percent) owned Semi-pucca (tin sheet room/Partial cement structure) houses, followed by 17.8 percent of the households owning RCC houses, 8.2 percent of the households owning the RCC with Granite houses. Still, 8.2 percent of households do not have proper houses; they live in hut/tin shed houses and 3.4 percent of households, even if they don't have houses, were residing in rented houses in this study area.

**The Number of Rooms in Respondents' House:** The majority of the households (58.9 percent) owned two rooms in their house, followed by 18.5 percent of the households that owned only a single room in their house, 17.1 percent of

< 68 >

the households owned one BHK and 5.5 percent of the households owned Two BHK (One Bedroom One Hall and One Kitchen room).

## Discussion

- The majority of the population (20 percent and 31 percent, respectively) belongs to the male gender among both children and adults.
- The majority of the respondents (50 percent) were illiterate and only 0.7 percent of the respondents got post-graduation level education
- The majority (45.9 percent) of the respondents belonged to the Scheduled Caste and only 2.1 percent of the respondents belonged to IIB.
- The majority (23.3) of the respondent's occupations were both farming and agricultural laborers and only 0.7 percent of the respondents were government employees.
- The majority of the respondents (39.7 percent) belong to the below 25 thousand rupees of their family annual income, which indicates the majority of the households fall below the poverty line, and only 4.8 percent of the households belong to the 2,01,000 and above category of their family's annual income. It means there is a greater economic gap between poor households and rich households.
- The majority of households (62.3 percent) belong to the Nuclear family, and only 37.7 percent of the households belong to a joint family. It means joint families were decreasing in the rural community.
- The majority of the households (88.4 percent) still use open defecation in this village, and only 11.6 percent of the households were using house-attached Toilets.
- The majority of the households (91.8 percent) were using public tap water (unfiltered water) for drinking, which was provided by the gram panchayat, and only 8.2 percent of the households used purified water.
- The majority of the households owned marginal and small landholdings and only 1.4 percent of the households owned large size of landholdings. Even nearly ¼ of the households don't have any land.
- The majority (63.2 percent) of the households owned a house with a partially cement-structured/tin shed and very less households (8.2 percent) owned RCC with a granite-structured house.
- There 17.1 percent and 5.5 percent of the households owned one BHK and Two BHKs respectively and the remaining majority of the families lived in one or two rooms in the house.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study has three objectives: first, to know the socio-demographic profile of the respondents (rural households), second, to know the Socio-economic status of the rural households and third, to provide suggestions to concerned stakeholders based on study findings.

The male population was higher than the female population in the case of both children and as well as adults. Half of the respondents were illiterate, and the majority of the respondents were also pall under functionally literate, with primary level education, secondary level education, and graduates were very less. Most of the households still depended on agriculture and agricultural labour work. There were a lot of differences in their family annual income, but most of the households came under the below poverty line group. Even the majority of them are unable to manage their livelihood as well as their children's educational expenditures. The farmland was the main income source in rural areas where nearly ¼ of the households were landless. In the land-owned category, most of them owned only small and marginal land ownership; the household's economic and social status was not in a good situation.

State and Central Governments initiated many programs to eradicate open defecation, but still, in this study area, the majority of the households use open defecation. The government further took new policies to eradicate open defecation.

The purified drinking water facility has to provide instead of public tap water here, most of the households use public tap water for drinking.

Most of the households owned kacch and semi pucch (houses without RCC, like sheds/huts) with one or two rooms, and even though they don't have proper housing facilities. Gram panchayats have to identify the houseless families and provide them with proper housing facilities under various government housing schemes.

## References

1. Deogankar C (2008). *Baseline Survey on Minority Concentration Districts of India (Gulbarga, Karnataka).* New Delhi: Institute for Human Development. Retrieved from https://www.icssr.org/sites/default/files/districts/Gulbarga%20final[1].pdf
2. Directorate of Economics and Statistics and State Agricultural Census Commissioner. (2019). *Agricultural Census 2015-16 Part-I Report on Operational Holdings in Karnataka.* Bengaluru: Government of Karnataka.
3. Government of India. (Reprint 2015). *The Constitution of India.* New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice. Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/coi-4March2016.pdf
4. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2021). *Sustainable Development Goals National Indicator Framework Progress Report.* New Delhi: Government of the National Statistical Office.
5. N.R. Ramesh Masthi, G.P. An Exploratory Study on Socio-Economic Status Scales in a Rural and Urban Setting. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care.* 2013; 2(01):69-73.
6. Nichitha Kumari, S.K. Assessment of the Socio-Economic and the Health Status of Kallarekoppalu Village of Goruru, Hassan District, Karnataka State. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology.* 2024; 12(01):102-109. DOI: 10.25215/1201.009
7. Parash K Rajak, S.R. Assessing the level of Agricultural Development among the hill States of India. *South India Journal of Social Sciences.* 2024; 22(03):81-95.
8. Tasse, M.P. Poverty Alleviation and Policy: A Reflective Dialogue. *The International Journal of Community and Social Development.* 2023; 05(02):224–228. DOI: 10.1177/25166026231172875.

< 69 >