



Research Article

SOCIO- ECONOMIC CHARACTERIZATION OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS: A VILLAGE LEVEL ANALYSIS IN TELANGANA

VIJAYA LAKSHMI V.¹ AND GAYATHRI DEVI M.²

¹Principal scientist (FRM), AICRP-H.Sc., Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Rajendranagar mandal, Hyderabad, 500030, Telangana

²College of Home Science, Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Rajendranagar mandal, Hyderabad, 500030, Telangana, India

*Corresponding Author: Email - gdevi6789@gmail.com

Received: July 21, 2018; Revised: July 26, 2018; Accepted: July 27, 2018; Published: July 30, 2018

Abstract: Socio economic status is the essential factor in the modern world, especially for the developing nations. Socio economic status in rural areas is gradually increasing over a period of time. Developmental programmes and policies have to be implanted to improve the socio economic status of rural population. In this research paper an attempt made to study the rural population economic status and housing conditions. This study is entirely depending on primary data which have been collected door to door survey with suitable interview schedule. The major occupation of the study group is farming activity and their income also greatly depends on agriculture. Majority of the respondents having pukka house but which lacking in furnishings.

Keywords: Literacy level, Land Ownership, Fuel Expenditure, Housing Conditions

Citation: Vijaya Lakshmi V. and Gayathri Devi M. (2018) Socio- Economic Characterization of Rural Households: A Village Level Analysis in Telangana. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 10, Issue 14, pp.- 6742-6744.

Copyright: Copyright©2018 Vijaya Lakshmi V. and Gayathri Devi M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction

The present situation of the society in developing nations is rapidly moving from poor economy to develop economy with the development of social condition. But these changes are not equal to all places. Ultimately rural areas are very less developed as compared to urban areas in terms of social, cultural and economic aspects [1]. Socio-economic status refers to the position of individuals, families, households, or other aggregates on one or more dimensions of stratification [2]. Socio-economic status is considered as a personal demographic variable; however, Socio-economic status can also reflect aspects of an individual's broader environment. As a result, it can be measured at the individual level or the area level [3]. Villages are mirror of the nation as per this line one village have been selected to analyze the socio economic condition and housing conditions.

Methodology

The research design followed for this study is exploratory and 35 samples were selected purposively for the collection of relevant data. Data were collected through interview schedule. The study covers the aspects like socio-economic condition, fuel expenditure and its management and housing conditions. The survey was conducted in Amdapur village, Moinabad Mandal of Ranga Reddy district Telangana. The total population of the village is around 2600 among this 60 percent of people are male and the remaining 40 percent is the female category. When comes to literacy level 89 percent of males were literate and 60 percent female were literate. There are 620 houses in this village. The major occupation of the villagers is agriculture. This village is lacking in basic conveniences like community health centre, market, post office and bank.

Results and Discussion

Socio Economic profile

Family size: Out of the thirty-five families that were interviewed 57percent of the families were small in size *i.e.*, they have between 0-3 members and only 43percent have medium sized families with 4 or more members.

Literacy level: Education is one of the key components of human capital and a

critical asset determining household ability to access higher return activities and escape poverty [4]. The data revealed that 43percent respondents were illiterate, 31 percent were having education up to secondary level, twenty percent of respondents were graduate and only 6percent of respondents were having education up to intermediate level.

Land ownership: Land is the most important asset in rural area. Land is the asset that has historically been most closely linked to rural development. Policies for promoting rural development have often centred on providing access through a variety of types of land reform, under the assumption that land access is critical for agricultural production and thus food security and income generation for rural households [5].

Table-1 Socio Economic Background, n=35

SN		Frequency	Percentage
1	Family size		
a	Small(0-3 members)	20	57.1
b	Medium (4-6 member)	15	42.8
2	Educational level		
a	Illiterate	15	42.8
b	Up to secondary	11	31.4
c	Up to intermediate	02	5.7
d	Up to graduation	07	20.0
3	Ownership of land		
a	Owned	22	62.8
b	Not owned	13	37.1
4	Source of income		
a	Business	18	51.8
b	Farming	21	60.0
c	Others	05	14.2
5	Crops cultivated		
a	Vegetables	20	57.1
b	Flowers	09	25.7
c	Others	13	37.1

Around 63 percent of the respondents own the land they farm on whereas the remaining 37 percent of respondents do farming on others land.

Source of income: Farming is the most common source of income, is farming as 60 percent of the people indulged in it. This was because, even though some of them did not own land, they were hired by others to work on their fields 51.8 percent of respondents earned their income from business and only 14.2 percent of respondents owned petty shops and worked as laborers to earn. Crops cultivated: Fifty-seven percent of the respondents cultivated vegetables like green leafy vegetables and tomatoes. Around 26 percentage of the population surveyed cultivated flowers like chandine and marigold and thirty-seven percentages of the respondent's cultivated other crops like paddy and fruit crops.

Fuel expenditure and its management

It was found that LPG was the most commonly used fuel, mainly used for cooking. Fire wood was the second most used source fuel due to its local availability. Twenty percent of respondents were using fire wood.

Table-2 Fuel expenditure and management details, n=35

SN	Frequency	Percentage
1	Types of fuel used	
a	07	20.0
b	01	2.8
c	05	14.2
d	20	57.1
e	02	5.7
2	Place of procurement	
a	30	85.7
b	05	14.2
3	Method of procurement	
a	27	77.1
b	08	22.8
4	Mode of communication	
a	23	65.7
b	12	34.2

The energy source was both locally purchased and procured from the city. Almost 86 percent of respondents purchased fuel from the city and the remaining 14 percent of respondents purchased fuel such as kerosene, firewood, coal and dung locally. Seventy-seven percent of respondents were purchase fuel such as LPG and firewood. Twenty three percent of respondents used own resources as fuel such as dung and fire wood. Almost 66 percent of respondents used public transport and 34 percent of the respondents used private transport facilities like two wheelers, cycles etc.

Possession of consumer durables

Television is the most commonly found electronic gadgets found in all the houses that were surveyed. The televisions were also equipped with the cable connection that telecast both regional and national channels. This shows the impact of media on the people of the village. Around 23 percent of respondent's own refrigerator. Forty percent of the houses having the electric rice cooker and 25 percent of the respondents were having mixer grinder.

Table-3 possession of consumer durables, n=35

SN	Frequency	Percentage
1	35	100.0
2	08	22.8
3	14	40.0
4	09	25.7

Housing conditions

The bedroom concept was commonly seen in the houses, with almost all houses having a separate, distinct sleeping area. Seventy-two percentages of households having double bedrooms and around 29 percent of households having the single bedroom. Majority of the households were having both toilet and bathrooms outside of the houses and only 12 percentages of the household having attached

bathroom and toilets. Almost 63 percent of the houses were made of concrete and the remaining 37 percent of the houses are semi pukka. The most commonly used flooring material is unpolished stone. Stone is being used in both interior and exterior areas. Cement is the second most commonly used, having been used in around 38 percent of the houses and rest of the three percentage was occupied by other flooring materials such as vitrified tiles, marbles etc. Majority of households having RCC as ceiling material, around 29percent of households having tin as ceiling material and other materials like Mangalore tiles also used as the ceiling material. Majority of the walls of the houses have been finished by using lime and almost 37 percent of houses walls have been finished by using distemper due to their economic conditions. The colour of the houses was white, in all those where the walls have been finishes using lime and colour (pink, purple etc.) in walls that have been finished with distemper. Almost 66 percent of houses having exterior landscape features like stone edging, small plants, trees and 60percent of houses having stone flooring, the remaining 31 percent of houses were having unfinished flooring.

Table-4 Housing conditions, n=35

SN	Frequency	Percentage
1	No. of rooms	
a	10	28.5
b	25	71.4
2	Location of bathroom/toilet	
a	13	37.2
b	22	62.8
3	Type of house	
a	13	37.2
b	22	62.8
4	Flooring material	
a	21	60.0
b	13	37.5
c	01	2.8
5	Ceiling material	
a	10	28.5
b	24	68.7
c	01	2.8
6	Walls	
a	Finish	
	13	37.2
	22	62.8
b	Colour	
	22	62.8
	13	37.1
7	Extension features	
a	23	65.7
b	21	60.0
c	11	31.4

Table-5 Kitchen Details, n=35

SN	Frequency	Percentage
1	Height of kitchen platform	
a	17	48.6
b	18	51.4
c	-	-
2	Width of platform	
a	19	54.2
b	11	31.4
c	05	14.2
3	Built in storage	
a	35	100.0
b	-	-
4	Shape of kitchen platform	
a	16	45.7
b	19	54.2
c	-	-

* All the work centres in the kitchen were directed from left to right.

*All the houses were furnished with only plastic chairs and a wooden plank.

Kitchen details

The height of kitchen platform was 3' in the majority of the houses and around 49 percent of the houses having kitchen platform at 2'6" height. The height was higher than the standard measurement as since the respondents are not aware of ergonomics, they left with the masonry worker to design. The most common width of the kitchen platform was observed to 1'6" (almost 55 percent houses). The width was found that 2'6" in nearly 15percent houses and 2' in 31 percent of the houses. Cent percent of households were having open storage in the kitchen. Fifty-four percent of the household were having L shaped kitchen platform. Almost forty-six percentage of the household were having single walled. Almost all houses were not having any furniture due to lack of economic resources. They were using only plastic chairs and wooden tables. They didn't use the mattress for sleeping.

Conclusion

The above analysis shows that the majority of families belong to small family size and the main source of income is farming activity but surprisingly farming is not the major occupation which shows that people want to change their profession from agriculture to other occupation because of various reasons like unsteady income, crop failure etc. When comes to housing conditions majority of respondents having pukka house with RCC as a ceiling material and the houses are lacking in furnishings. The village is still underdeveloped with respect to agriculture, education, economic status and infrastructures. However, a scope of improvement exists in the village which needs institutional intervention for a faster development of the village.

Application of research: Policy making

Research Category: Rural development, Energy conservation

Abbreviations:

LPG- Liquid petroleum gas
RCC-reinforced concrete cement
BHK= bed room, Hall, Kitchen

Acknowledgement / Funding: Author thankful to Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Rajendranagar mandal, Hyderabad, 500030, Telangana

*Principle Investigator: V. Vijaya Lakshmi

University: Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Rajendranagar mandal, Hyderabad, 500030, Telangana
Research project: Short term trial

Author Contributions: All author equally contributed

Author statement: All authors read, reviewed, agree and approved the final manuscript

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Ethical approval: This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

- [1] Patra H.S., Meher M.K and Mohan S.K. (2015) *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(6), 31-39.
- [2] Bollen A.K., Glanville L.J. and Stecklov G. (2001) *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 27, 153-185.
- [3] Lynch J. and Kaplan G. (2000) *Socio-Economic Position. in Social Epidemiology. L. F. Berkman, and I. Kawachi (Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press*, 13-35.
- [4] Singh K.M., Meena M.S., Kumar Abhay and Singh R.K.P. (2014)

<https://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/59681/> MPRA Paper No. 59681, posted 4 November 2014.

- [5] Singh K.M., Meena M.S., Kumar Abhay and Singh R.K.P. (2011) *Socio-Economic Determinants of Rural Poverty: An Empirical Exploration of Jharkhand State, India*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2017593>.