

# ISSN: 2230-9926

# International Journal of **DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH**



International Journal of Development Research Vol. 06, Issue, 12, pp.10893-10896, December 2016

# Full Length Research Article

# SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS OF SCHEDULED TRIBES IN MYSURU DISTRICT – KARNATAKA

\*1Akash Raj, D.P. and 2Mahesh, T. M.

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Institute of Development Studies, University of Mysore, Mysuru, Karnataka, India <sup>2</sup>Professor, Institute of Development Studies, University of Mysore, Mysuru, Karnataka, India

#### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 17th September, 2016 Received in revised form 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2016 Accepted 13<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 Published online 30th December, 2016

#### Key Words:

Tribes, Socio Economic, Mysuru, Karnataka

#### ABSTRACT

The paper was aimed to assess the socio economic status of tribes of the Mysuru district of the Karnataka state. Three taluks of the Mysuru district were selected for the study based on their highly Schedule tribe populous status; H D Kote, Periyapatna and Hunsur. Primary survey of 500 households was carried out and the different socio economic statuses assessed were; caste, income, educational level, occupational structure, size of landholding, types of crop cultivation. The study revealed that there are six different scheduled tribes (Nayaka, JenuKuruba, DongriGaracia, Yarava, Soliga, Hakkipikki ) residing in the selected study area with maximum percentage of 68 % of the 500 households belonging to Nayaka tribe followed by Jenuuruba (18.6 %) out of the total 50 different tribes found across the Karnataka. Further, 94% of the 500 households were found to have Below Poverty Line (BPL) income, only 4.35% was found to have received the higher education. Occupational structure of the study area discovered that only 5.70% of the sample number is involved in business and mere 2.64% of the total number work as Government contract daily wages. Among the population, major proportion is engaged in agricultural labour with only 44.4% of the population having the cultivation land while as 55 % are landless.

Copyright©2016, Akash Raj and Mahesh. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## INTRODUCTION

Tribes are indigenous people of India, and living in various ecological and geo-climatic conditions ranging from plains, forest to hills and remote areas (Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 2013). Tribes are one of the vulnerable sections in the country, both the Central and the state governments have executed policies directed at the socio-economic empowerment of tribes (Karnataka Human Development Report 2005) but they have not received the full benefits of developmental processes undertaken over the past six decades (Ministry of Tribal Affairs, India, 2014). They are isolated from main stream population and forest occupies a central position in the tribal economy and society (Tribal Health Bulletin, 2014). Scheduled tribes are economically weakest and historically subjected to discrimination and deprivation. Disparities of living condition between tribes and non-tribes are still existing, the policies and rural development programs developed by government has not raised the living standards of tribes (Kijima Y, 2006). Their socio economic status is deprived and living with lack of education, poor sanitation and health

\*Corresponding author: Akash Raj, D.P.,

Research Scholar, Institute of Development Studies, University of Mysore, Mysuru, Karnataka, India.

condition, poor life style and poverty (Mandal, J and Sengupta, P, 2016). Tribes are much behind the mainstream population with respect to literacy rate and educational attainment (Suresh P R and Cheeran M T, 2015). Food insecurity is another big issue among tribal community (Xaxa J, 2014). Due to lack of income, tribes are unable to get sufficient nutritious food that causes malnutrition and other health problems (Chaudhary, 2012). Undernutrition is high among the tribes than non-tribes which is caused by the low economic status of tribe population (Tagade N, 2012). The assessment of socio economic status of scheduled tribes through the field survey brings out the real condition of tribe's status of an area. Hence the present study was taken up to assess the socio economic condition of tribes ofMysuru district in Karnataka.

#### Study Area

Mysuru district is located in the southern part of Karnataka, which comprises of around 11.1 % of scheduled tribes with respect to total Mysuru district population (Census, 2011). For the present study, among the seven taluks of Mysuru district, three taluks with higher concentration of primitive tribes were selected for field survey and analyzed (Department of Tribal Welfare, Mysore, 2014). The selected taluks were; H D Kote, Periyapatna and Hunsur. As per the census of India, the scheduled tribe population in the district has been growing continuously, as the total population of tribes during the year 1961 was 16,805 and it has been increased to 3,34,547 in 2011.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was based on the primary survey which was conducted among the 500 households (1,998 individuals)of selected three taluks. To identify the socio economic status of tribes, the following criteria were assessed; a) Social Composition of Tribes b) income of household, c) educational level, d) occupational structure, e) size of landholding, f) types of crop cultivation, were collected. The data collected was statistically analysed by using SPSS.

#### RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### **Social Composition of Tribes**

According to Ministry of Tribal Affair, Government of India, there are 50 different scheduled tribes living in Karnataka state and six schedule tribes were found in the study area; DongriGaracia, JenuKuruba, Yarava, Nayaka, Soliga, Hakkipikki. The assessment of selected 500 households revealed that, 9 (1.8 %) households belong to Soliga tribe; 18 (3.6 %) belongto Yarava tribe; 19 (3.8 %) belong to DongriGaracia tribe; 21 (4.2 %) belog to Hakkipikki tribe; 93 (18.6 %) belong to JenuKuruba tribe and 340 (68 %) belong to Nayakatribe.

**Table 1. Social Composition of Tribes** 

| Tribal Communities | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Soliga             | 9                  | 1.8     |
| Yarava             | 18                 | 3.6     |
| DongriGaracia      | 19                 | 3.8     |
| Hakkipikki         | 21                 | 4.2     |
| JenuKuruba         | 93                 | 18.6    |
| Nayaka             | 340                | 68      |
| Total              | 500                | 100     |

#### Income of the household

Income of the household is a major factor which determines all aspects of a household. The Government of India has classified the households as Above Poverty Line or Below Poverty Line based on their annual income. The benchmark to determine which family belongs to BPL and APL keeps on changing depending upon the experts of planning commission and the Central Government policies (Reddy G K, 2015). According to The Hindu, 13 November 2011, families which earn below or equal to Rs 27,000 per year are considered as Below Poverty Line. In the present study, the total income of each household was collected as presented in Table 2. The study revealed that among the 500 households 497 (99.4 %) are living in below poverty line while only 3 (0.6 %) households are living in above poverty line. From the study it is clear that the annual income of the major proportion of households lie below than Rs 5,000 per annum which indicates the poor income status of selected tribes of the study area.

#### **Educational Level**

Education is an important factor that determines the earning capacity of a person, it is generally known that, well educated

can get better job, higher income and better social status (Houthakker, 1959). Hence the educational level of individuals in the households was collected and classified into 6 groups as; a) Illiterate; those who do not know to write and read in any language, b) Primary; It represents the population which obtained the education between 1<sup>st</sup> std. and 5<sup>th</sup> std., c) Upper primary; It represents the population which obtained the education up to 8<sup>th</sup> std., d) High school; It represents the population which received the education up to 10<sup>th</sup> std., e) Preuniversity; It indicates the population which obtained the education up to 12 std., and f) Higher education; It indicates the population which studied above 12th std. (Table 3). The survey revealed that among the total population around 35.6 % are illiterate, which is higher than state's (24.64 %) and country's illiteracy rate (25.96 %), 52.86%have studied up to high school level and11.56 % havereceived higher than high

Table 2. Distribution of sample households on the basis of income

| Level of Income | No. of Respondent | Percent to Total<br>Respondent |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| < 5000          | 317               | 63.4                           |
| 5000-10000      | 134               | 26.8                           |
| 10000-15000     | 29                | 5.8                            |
| 15000-20000     | 11                | 2.2                            |
| 20000-25000     | 4                 | 0.8                            |
| 25000-27000     | 2                 | 0.4                            |
| 27000 - 30000   | 2                 | 0.4                            |
| 35000-40000     | 0                 | 0                              |
| > 40000         | 1                 | 0.2                            |
| Total           | 500               | 100                            |

**Table 3. Educational Level** 

| Level of Education | Tribal population | Percent |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Illiterate         | 711               | 35.59   |
| Primary            | 383               | 19.17   |
| Upper Primary      | 300               | 15.02   |
| High School        | 373               | 18.67   |
| Pre- University    | 144               | 7.21    |
| Higher Education   | 87                | 4.35    |
| Total              | 1998              | 100     |

# **Occupational Structure**

Occupational structure of a region determines the socio economic characteristics of that particular population (Deshmukh M U and Khadke P A, 2015). There is a high relationship between occupational structure on one hand and economic development on the other (Banu N S, 2015). Hence, it is important to understand the occupational structure to determine the socio economic status of any household. The data representing the occupational structure of the selected tribes of the study area is presented in the Table 4.

**Table 4. Occupational Structure** 

| Occupation                     | Tribal population | Percent |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Cultivator                     | 164               | 17.98   |
| Agricultural Labour            | 508               | 55.70   |
| Non Agricultural Labour        | 120               | 13.16   |
| Business                       | 52                | 5.70    |
| Government Contract Daily Wage | 24                | 2.64    |
| Private Employee / NGO         | 44                | 4.82    |
| Total Working population       | 912               | 100.00  |

The survey revealed that 45.65% (912 individual) are working population and 54.35 % (1,086 individual) are dependent

which includes children, elderly people and housewives. Among the working population major proportion are engaged as agriculture labours (55.70 %), followed by cultivators (17.98 %) and Non-agricultural labours (13.16). The overall revelation of the study is that the selected tribes are engaged in the low profile jobs.

### Size of Landholding

Land is an assert of human being and is the one of the main sources of income in India. In the present study, information about size of land owned by each household was collected and assessed. Among the 500 households only 222(44.4 %) households own the cultivation land while 278(55.6 %) are landless. According to agricultural profile of Karnataka, 2013, the farmer with agricultural land below 1 ha. are considered as marginal farmers, between 1 and 2 ha. are considered small farmers, between 2 and 4 ha. are semi medium farmers, between 4 and 10 are medium farmers and more than 10 ha. are considered large formers. Thus, the collected information has been grouped based on the classification given by state government as shown in the Table 5. The survey revealed that among 221 land holders 184 (82.88 %) are marginal farmers, who own less or equal to an acre of land; 37 (16.67 %) are small farmers, who have between 1 and 2 acres; and only one (0.45 %) is semi medium farmer who has between 2 and 4 acres of land. From the information collected about the landholding, it is inferred that more than half of the total study population is landless and major proportion of landholders are marginal farmers. The Table 5 also illustrates that the size of land holding by sample households are 148.3 hectare in which 94.9 ha. are hold by 0-1 ha. farmers; 51 ha. are hold by 1-2 ha. farmers and 2.4 ha. hold by 2-4 ha. farmers.

Table 5. Size of Land Holding

| Size (Ha.) | No. of HH | Total Size (Ha.) | No .HH (%) |
|------------|-----------|------------------|------------|
| 0 - 1      | 184       | 94.9             | 82.88      |
| 1 - 2      | 37        | 51               | 16.67      |
| 2 - 4      | 1         | 2.4              | 0.45       |
| Total      | 222       | 148.3            | 100.00     |

#### **Source of Irrigation**

Irrigation is an important factor for the process of cultivation, if the land is sufficiently irrigated throughout year then profit is higher compared to the land which depends on seasonal rainfall. Hence, the information of irrigation facility of land owners was collected and assessed.

**Table 6. Water Source for Irrigation** 

| Water Source | No. of HH | Size of Land (ha.) | No. of HH (%) |
|--------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| Rain fed     | 180       | 114.62             | 81.08         |
| Canal        | 27        | 14.66              | 12.16         |
| Bore Well    | 15        | 19.02              | 6.76          |
| Total        | 222       | 148.3              | 100.00        |

From the Table 6, it is clear that, among the 222 land owners 180 (81.1 %) are depending on rainfall, 27 (12.2) are using canal water and 15 (6.8) are using bore-well for irrigation purpose. The data also describes that among the total land holding, 114.62 ha. are rain fed, 14.66 ha. are irrigated using canals and 19.02 ha. are irrigated using bore well.

## Types of crop cultivation

To know the money value of the crops cultivated in their land, the information about it was collected and it was found that

77.03% of farmers cultivateRagi which is financially less valued followed by paddy 8.56%, cotton 5.41% and Maize 3.15%.

Table 7. Major Crops

| Major Crops | No. HH | Percent |
|-------------|--------|---------|
| Ragi        | 171    | 77.03   |
| Paddy       | 19     | 8.56    |
| Cotton      | 12     | 5.41    |
| Maize       | 7      | 3.15    |
| Flowers     | 5      | 2.25    |
| Tobacco     | 3      | 1.35    |
| Sugarcane   | 2      | 0.90    |
| Banana      | 1      | 0.45    |
| Coconut     | 1      | 0.45    |
| Vegetables  | 1      | 0.45    |
| Total       | 222    | 100.00  |

#### **Household Amenities**

To understand the available household's amenities in sample houses, the number of general amenities was listed in a questionnaire and data was collected (Table 8).

**Table 8. Household Amenities** 

| HH Amenities      | Yes | No  | Yes (%) | No (%) |
|-------------------|-----|-----|---------|--------|
| Electricity       | 420 | 80  | 84      | 16     |
| Television        | 275 | 225 | 55      | 45     |
| Fridge            | 3   | 497 | 0.6     | 99.4   |
| Bike              | 69  | 431 | 13.8    | 86.2   |
| Bicycle           | 66  | 434 | 13.2    | 86.8   |
| Car               | 3   | 497 | 0.6     | 99.4   |
| Mobile            | 364 | 136 | 72.8    | 27.2   |
| Tailoring Machine | 3   | 497 | 0.6     | 99.4   |

The survey confirmed that among the 500 households only 84 % avail electricity, 55 percent use television, 0.6 percent use fridge, 13.2 %have motor cycles, 0.6 %has cars, 72.8 % population has mobile phones, 0.6 %have tailoring machine. The data indicates that less than a percent of household are having expensive amenities like fridge and car, while almost half of sample households do not have television and bike which is consider as one of the basic amenities of present time. The worst situation is that around 16 percent households of the study population do not have electricity facility.

#### Conclusion

The study presents a socio economic status of tribals of selected taluks of the Mysuru district. The survey revealed the pathetic conditions of the study area, with 99% of the population living under below poverty line, high illiteracy rate, lack of basic and essential amenities like electricity. The main occupational structure is agricultural labour and 56% of the population is landless. The present survey brings forth the conditions and facilities available to the selected scheduled tribes and it can be concluded that the socio economic conditions of tribe population living in the Mysuru district are quite poor and needs to be addressed on both State level and central level.

### **REFERENCES**

Balachand, K. and Sunderarajan, P. 2011. You Will be on BPL List if Your Annual Income is Rs, 27,000. The Hindu, 18 August 2016

- Banu, S. N. 2015. Changing Occupational structure and Economic Condition of Farmlabourers in India: A Study. socio economic voices, Indiastat, May June, 2015
- Chaudhary, S. N. 2012. Tribal Health and Nutrition. *Rawat Publications*, ISBN: 978-81-316-0512-7
- Deshmukh, M. U. and Khadke, P. A. 2015. Study of Occupational Structure in Nanded City. Scholarly Research *Journal for Humanity Science and English Language* 2 (10), 2620-2626
- Houthakker, H. S., 1959. Education and Income. The Review of Economics and Statistics, The MIT Press 41 (1), 24-28
- Kijima, Y, 2006. Caste and Tribe Inequality: Evidence from India, 1983–1999. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 54 (2), 369-404
- Mandal, J. and Sengupta, P. 2016. Socio-Economic Status of Tribe: A Case Study of Porobusty, Alipurduar, West Bengal. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* 2 (5), 536-541
- Reddy, G. K. 2015. Handbook of Journalism and Media: India, Bharat, Hindustan, Vikas Publishing
- Report of The High Level Committee On Socio-Economic, Health and Educational Status of Tribal Communities of

- India, Ministry of Tribal Affairs Government of India, May, 2014
- State Agriculture Profile Karnataka, October 2013
- Statistical Profile of Scheduled Tribesin India 2013, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Statistics Division, Government of India
- Status of Scheduled Castes in Karnataka, Karnataka Human Development Report 2005
- Suresh, P. R. and Cheeran, M. T. 2015. Education Exclusion of Scheduled Tribes in India. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development* 4 (10), 135-138
- Tagade, N. 2012. Food Insecurity in TribalRegions of Maharashtra: Explaining Differentials between the Tribal and Non-Tribal Communities. Working Paper 280, The Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, ISBN 978-81-7791-136-7
- Tribal Health Bulletin, January 2014, Vol. 10 Special Issue, Regional Medical Research Centre for Tribals, Jabalpur and World Health Organization
- Xaxa, J, 2014. Problem of Food Security: A brief Analysis of Tribal Area in India. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications* 4 (11), 1-4

\*\*\*\*\*