SOCIAL, DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC PROFILE OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN PUNJAB

Naresh Kumar [1], Jasdeep Singh Toor [2], Gian Singh [3]

[1] *Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala-147002, India*
[2] *Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala-147002, India*
[3]*Former Professor, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala-147002, India*

Abstract

Economic and social inequalities can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, leads to social inequalities. In this light, the present study analyses the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the sampled households across the different categories. The analysis is based upon the primary data. The analysis shows that among the sampled households, maximum number of households belongs to the SC category. Three-fourth of total households are from Sikh religion and one-fifth of households are from Hindu religion. Around three-fifth of households are nuclear type of families. In case of nuclear families, the maximum number of households is from non-agricultural labour category. Most of the households are headed by males and only a few households are headed by females. Slightly more than half of the sampled population is male. Sex ratio is found to be highest among artisan household category. Out of the total population more than three-fourth is in working age group. Almost three-fourth persons are literate and one-fourth are illiterate. The percentage of literacy has been worked out to be the highest in large farm households. Out of total family members of the respondent households, one-fifth are earners, more than one-fourth are earning dependents, and a half of them are dependents among the different categories. One-fifth households are Below Poverty Line families. A few households are there whose wards are getting scholarships and three-fourth of the households are not getting any kind of scholarships for their studying children. Only one-sixth households are getting old age/disability/widow pension.

1. INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF LITERATURE

On the eve of the first five year plan (1951-56), agriculture was in a bad and dreadful condition. After independence, one of the main problems faced by Indian economy was increasing demand for food grains and less domestic production of the same. Agriculture production and productivity was very low in India, and as a result the rate of return on factors of production was very low. The reasons were poor farm management practices, lesser use of modern agricultural technology and poor infrastructure including marketing. The adoption of New Agricultural Technology has helped in transforming the subsistence agriculture into commercial one. Punjab is one of the most important states of India from the agricultural point of view. Punjab has only 1.54 per cent geographical area of India. Punjab has around 5036 thousand hectares of total geographical area from which around 4285 thousand hectare is cultivable land. So, about 85 per cent area of Punjab land is under cultivation, which is 2.36 per cent of India's total agricultural area. Adoption of new technologies has increased agricultural production of the state and has also raised the growth rate of the state. Modern agricultural machinery, chemical fertilizers, insecticides/pesticides etc. have benefited the large farmers more [1, 2]. Small and marginal farmers continue to conduct their agricultural activities with the traditional methods. It was also observed that the gains of Green Revolution had been distributed among all the categories of farmers. Absolute and relative gains have a tendency to increase with the increase in the size of holding, level of mechanisation, formal education of the

head of the family and number of earners in the family [3, 4, 5, 6]. On the other hand wage differential increased in some operations such as transplanting and weeding, which are dominated by female labourers. A substantial wage differential between men and women has been found to exist in the Indian labour market [7, 8, 9]. In the pre-reform period, inequality among wage workers declined in rural areas whereas it increased marginally in urban areas. In the post-reform period, inequality increased in both rural and urban areas for regular workers. Wage differential among agricultural and non-agricultural regular labourers decreased, but wages were still higher for non-agricultural workers. Education level and intensity of work were the main factors determining income of wage earners and also determined the level of inequality [10, 8]. Economic and social inequalities can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, leads to social inequalities. Due to less developed industrial sector of the state, the marginal and small farmers, who left the agriculture sector, were not absorbed by industrial sector or non-farm sector of the state. On the other hand, demand for the agricultural labour decreased due to use of machinery Thus, there was an increase in the number of unemployed and poor sections of the state and most of them belonged to the rural areas.

2.OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH METHODOLGY

The main objective of the study is to analyse the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the sampled rural households across the different categories in Punjab. The analysis is based upon the primary data, collected through a detailed schedule, of 591 sampled households involved from the 23 villages belonging to four districts (Mansa, SAS Nagar Mohali, SBS Nagar Nawanshahr and Amritsar) situated in three different regions (Malwa, Doaba and Majha) of the Punjab state. Standard statistical tools like mean values and proportions have been used while carrying out the tabular analysis.

3.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Distribution of sampled households

The table 1 shows that out of 591 households, 74 are marginal farm households, 63 are small farm households, 47 are medium farm households, 17 are large farm households, 124 are agricultural labour households, 145 are non-agricultural labour households, 19 are artisan households and 102 are 'Other' households.

Table 1: Distribution of Sampled Households

Category	Amritsar	Mansa	SAS Nagar (Mohali)	SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr)	Total
Marginal farm households	33 (14.67)	22 (15.49)	8 (7.69)	11 (9.17)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	21 (9.33)	31 (21.83)	4 (3.85)	7 (5.83)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	17 (7.56)	13 (9.15)	12 (11.54)	5 (4.17)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	10 (4.44)	6 (4.23)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.83)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	68 (30.22)	28 (19.72)	11 (10.58)	17 (14.17)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	44 (19.56)	18 (12.68)	29 (27.88)	54 (45.00)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	3 (1.33)	5 (3.52)	5 (4.81)	6 (5.00)	19 (3.21)
Other households*	29 (12.89)	19 (13.38)	35 (33.65)	19 (15.83)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	225	142	104	120	591

	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
Percentage	38.07	24.03	17.60	20.30	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

* Other households- Petty traders, shop owners, government services, private services, etc

Note: The figures shown in parentheses denote the percentages.

Out of 74 marginal farm households, 8 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 22 households from Mansa, 11 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 33 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 63 small farm households, 4 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 31 households from Mansa, 7 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 21 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 47 medium farm households, 17 households from Amritsar district, 12 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 13 households from Mansa and 5 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district have been selected. Out of 17 large farm households, 10 households from Amritsar district, 6 households from Mansa and 1 household from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district have been selected.

Out of 124 agricultural labour households, 11 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 28 households from Mansa, 17 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 68 households from Amritsar

district have been selected. Out of 145 non-agricultural labour households, 29 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 18 households from Mansa, 54 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 44 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 19 artisan households, 5 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 5 households from Mansa, 6 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 3 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 102 'Other' households, 35 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 19 households from Mansa district, 19 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 29 households from Amritsar district have been selected for the purpose of the present study.

3.2. Distribution of Sampled Households according to Caste Status

The caste-wise distribution of the sampled households is given in Table 2. The table shows that the maximum number of households are from the Scheduled Caste category i.e. 354 (59.

Table 2: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Caste Status

Category	GC	SC	BC	Total
Marginal farm households	63 (29.58)	6 (1.69)	5 (20.83)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	60 (28.17)	2 (0.56)	1 (4.17)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	46 (21.60)	0 (0.00)	1 (4.17)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	17 (7.98)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (20.88)
Agricultural labour households	4 (1.88)	120 (33.90)	0 (0.00)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	3 (1.41)	136 (38.42)	6 (25.00)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	0 (0.00)	17 (4.80)	2 (8.33)	19 (3.21)
Other Households	20 (9.39)	73 (37.50)	9 (37.50)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	213	354	24	591

	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	
Percentage	36.04	59.90	4.06	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Note: The figures shown in parentheses denote the percentages.

90 per cent), followed by 213 (36.04 per cent) from General Castes category and 24 (4.06 per cent) from Backward Class category. Out of 213 General Caste households, 63 (29.58 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 60 (28.17 per cent) from small farm households, 46 (21.60 per cent) from medium farm households, 17 (7.98 per cent) from large farm households, 4 (1.88 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 3 (1.41 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households and 20 (9.39 per cent) from 'Other' households. Out of 354 Scheduled Caste households, 6 (1.69 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 2 (0.56 per cent) from small farm households, 120 (33.90 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 136 (38.42 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 17 (4.80 per cent) from artisan households and 73 (37.50 per cent) from 'Other' households. Out of

24 Backward Class households, the maximum number of households i.e. 9 (37.50 per cent) are from 'Other' households, followed by 6 (25.00 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 5 (20.83 per cent) from marginal farm households, 2 (8.83 per cent) from artisan households 1 (4.17 per cent) is a small farm household and 1 (4.17 per cent) is a medium farm household.

3.3. Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of their Religion

Table 3 gives detailed information regarding the religion of the sampled households. Out of 591 households, the maximum number of households follow Sikh religion i.e. 451 (76.31 per cent) households, followed by 128 (21.66 per cent) households follow Hindu religion, 10 (1.69 per cent) households follow Islam religion and 2 (0.34 per cent) households follow

Table 3: Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of their Religion

Category	Sikhism	Hinduism	Islam	Christianity	Total
Marginal farm households	69 (15.30)	5 (3.91)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	61 (13.53)	2 (1.56)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	47 (10.42)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	17 (3.77)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	98 (21.73)	25 (19.53)	1 (10.00)	0 (0.00)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	79 (17.52)	59 (46.09)	5 (50.00)	2 (100)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	12 (2.66)	7 (5.47)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	19 (3.21)
Other households	68 (15.08)	30 (23.44)	4 (40.00)	0 (0.00)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	451 (100)	128 (100)	10 (100)	2 (100)	591 (100)

Percentage	76.31	21.66	1.69	0.34	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Christian religion. Out of 451 households belonging to Sikh religion, 69 (15.30 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 61 (13.53 per cent) from small farm households, 47 (10.42 per cent) from medium farm households, 17 (3.77 per cent) from large farm households, 98 (21.73 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 79 (17.52 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 12 (2.66 per cent) from artisan households and 68 (15.08 per cent) from 'Other' households. From 128 households belonging to Hindu religion, the maximum number of households are from non-agricultural labour households i.e. 59 (46.09 per cent), followed by 30 (23.44 per cent) households from 'Other' households, 25 (19.53 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 7 (5.47 per cent) from artisan households, 5 (3.91 per cent) households from marginal farm households and 2 (1.56 per cent) households are from small farm households. Only 2 households practice Christian religion which are from non-agricultural labour households.

3.4. Distribution of Sampled Households as per Family Structure

Table 4 gives a count of category-wise family structure of households. As many as 344 households are nuclear type of families, which is 58.21 per cent of total 591 households. 247 (41.79 per cent) households are joint families. In case of nuclear families, the maximum number of households is from non-agricultural labour category, i.e. 106 (30.81 per cent) households, followed by 86 (25.00 per cent) households from agricultural labour households,

Table 4: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Family Structure

Category	Nuclear		Joint		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	37	10.76	37	14.98	74	12.52
Small farm households	32	9.30	31	12.55	63	10.66
Medium farm households	13	3.78	34	13.77	47	7.95
Large farm households	2	0.58	15	6.07	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	86	25.00	38	15.38	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	106	30.81	39	15.79	145	24.53
Artisan households	7	2.03	12	4.86	19	3.21
Other households	61	17.73	41	16.60	102	17.26
Grand total	344	100	247	100	591	100
Percentage	58.21		41.79		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

61 (17.73 per cent) household from 'Other' households, 37 (10.76 per cent) household from marginal farm households, 32 (9.30 per cent) household from small farm households, 13 (3.78 per cent) households from medium farm households, 7 (2.03 per cent) household from artisan households and 2 (0.58 per cent) household from large farm households. Out of 247 joint families households, 37 (14.98 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 31 (12.55 per cent) from small farm households, 34 (13.77 per cent) from medium farm households, 15 (6.07 per cent) from large farm households, 38 (15.38 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 39 (15.79 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 12 (4.86 per cent) from artisan

households and 41 (16.60 per cent) from 'Other' households.

3.5. Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Gender of the Household Head

Table 5 shows category-wise gender of the heads of the sampled households. Out of 591 sampled households, 564 (95.43 per cent) households are headed by males and only 27 (4.57 per cent) households are headed by females. In case of male headed households, the maximum number of male headed households is from non-agricultural labour households

Table 5: Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Gender of the Household Head

Category	Gender of the Household Head					
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
Marginal farm households	70	12.41	4	14.81	74	12.52
Small farm households	60	10.64	3	11.11	63	10.66
Medium farm households	45	7.98	2	7.41	47	7.95
Large farm households	17	3.01	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	118	20.92	6	22.22	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	142	25.18	3	11.11	145	24.53
Artisan households	17	3.01	2	7.41	19	3.21
Other households	95	16.84	7	25.93	102	17.26
Grand total	564	100	27	100	591	100
Percentage	95.43		4.57		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

which is 142 (25.18 per cent), followed by 118 (20.92 per cent) households from agricultural labour households, 95 (16.84 per cent) from 'Other' households, 70 (12.41 per cent) from marginal farm households, 60 (10.64 per cent) from small farm households, 45 (7.98 per cent) from medium farm households, 17 (3.01 per cent) from each large farm households and artisan households. Out of total 27 female headed households, 4 (14.81 per cent)

are from marginal farm households , 3 (11.11 per cent) from small farm households, 2 (7.41 per cent) from medium farm households, 6 (22.22 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 3 (11.11 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 2 (7.41 per cent) from artisan households and 7 (25.93 per cent) from 'Other' households.

3.6. Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Gender of Family Members and Sex Ratio

Information regarding distribution of total population among the sampled households and sex ratio is given in Table 6. There are 1456 females against 1620 males in all the sampled households. Male population is 52.67 per cent and female population is 47.33 per cent in the sampled households. The table shows that overall sex ratio is found to be 899 females per

Table 6: Distribution of Sampled Households on the Basis of Gender of Family Members and Sex Ratio

| Category | Gender of Family members | | | | | | Sex Ratio |
| | Males | | Females | | Total | | |
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Marginal farm households	202	12.47	175	12.02	377	12.26	866
Small farm households	176	10.86	150	10.30	326	10.60	852
Medium farm households	157	9.69	129	8.86	286	9.30	822
Large farm households	83	5.12	75	5.15	158	5.14	904
Agricultural labour households	309	19.07	297	20.40	606	19.70	961
Non-agricultural labour households	391	24.14	326	22.39	717	23.31	834
Artisan households	51	3.15	59	4.05	110	3.58	1157
Other households	251	15.49	245	16.83	496	16.12	976
Grand total	1620	100	1456	100	3076	100	899
Percentage	52.67		47.33		100		

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

1000 males. The category-wise sex ratio works out to be 866 among the marginal farm households, 852 among small farm households, 822 among medium farm households, 904 among large farm households, 961 among agricultural labour households, 834 among non-agricultural labour households and 976 among 'Other' households. Sex ratio is found to be highest in artisan households where sex ratio stands at 1157 females per 1000 males.

3.7. Distribution of Sampled Households according to Age of Family Members

Table 7 shows that the highest number of family members i.e. 705 (22.92 per cent) members, are between the age group of 0-14 years, followed by 697 (21.73 per cent) in the age group 20-30 years, 435 (14.14 per cent) in the age group 30-40 years, 383 (12.45 per cent) in the age group 40-50 years, 325 (10.57 per cent) in the age group 60 & above years, 300 (9.75 per

Table 7: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Age of Family Members

Category	0-14	14-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	60 & above	Total
Marginal farm households	77 (10.92)	25 (8.33)	77 (11.05)	59 (13.56)	53 (13.84)	29 (12.55)	57 (17.54)	377 (12.26)

Small farm households	49 (6.95)	34 (11.33)	74 (10.62)	53 (12.18)	46 (12.01)	27 (11.69)	43 (13.23)	326 (10.60)
Medium farm households	56 (7.94)	19 (6.33)	61 (8.75)	51 (11.72)	43 (11.23)	14 (6.06)	42 (12.92)	286 (9.30)
Large farm households	31 (4.4)	17 (5.67)	32 (4.59)	20 (4.60)	19 (4.96)	26 (11.26)	13 (4.00)	158 (5.14)
Agricultural labour households	164 (23.26)	71 (23.67)	126 (18.08)	66 (15.17)	73 (19.06)	48 (20.78)	58 (17.85)	606 (19.70)
Non-agricultural labour households	204 (28.94)	80 (26.67)	164 (23.53)	95 (21.84)	86 (22.45)	38 (16.45)	50 (15.38)	717 (23.31)
Artisan households	32 (4.54)	4 (1.33)	27 (3.87)	23 (5.29)	4 (1.04)	7 (3.03)	13 (4.00)	110 (3.58)
Other households	92 (13.05)	50 (16.67)	136 (19.51)	68 (15.63)	59 (15.40)	42 (18.18)	49 (15.08)	496 (16.12)
Grand total	705 (100)	300 (100)	697 (100)	435 (100)	383 (100)	231 (100)	325 (100)	3076 (100)
Percentage	22.92	9.75	22.66	14.14	12.45	7.51	10.57	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

cent) in the age group 14-20 years, 231 (7.51 per cent) members in the age group 50-60 years, 225 (13.89 per cent) in the age group 30-40 years and 198 (22.66 per cent) in the age group 40-50 years. Almost 23 per cent of total population is in age of 0-14 and 10.57 per cent is in age of 60 and above. Out of 3076 total population, 77.08 per cent are in working age group of is 14-60.

Table 8: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Education Level

Category	Illiterate	Below Study Age	Below Primary	Primary	Middle	Matric	10+2	Graduation	Post-graduation	Professional	Technical	Total
Marginal farm households	95 (11.69)	22 (12.87)	30 (11.41)	60 (12.12)	38 (10.33)	74 (15.78)	42 (12.07)	16 (15.38)	0	0	0	377 (12.26)
Small farm households	89 (10.95)	18 (10.53)	9 (3.42)	41 (8.28)	41 (11.14)	69 (14.71)	35 (10.06)	17 (16.35)	2 (6.25)	0	5 (62.50)	326 (10.60)
Medium farm households	60 (7.38)	14 (8.19)	23 (8.75)	43 (8.69)	34 (9.24)	45 (9.59)	46 (13.22)	11 (10.58)	9 (28.13)	1 (20.00)	0	286 (9.30)
Large farm households	20 (2.46)	6 (3.51)	16 (6.08)	18 (3.64)	8 (2.17)	32 (6.82)	37 (10.63)	15 (14.42)	4 (12.50)	1 (20.00)	1 (12.50)	158 (5.14)
Agricultural labour households	246 (30.26)	40 (23.39)	48 (18.25)	102 (20.61)	76 (20.65)	54 (11.51)	34 (9.77)	6 (5.77)	0	0	0	606 (19.70)
Non-agricultural labour households	190 (23.37)	42 (24.56)	78 (29.66)	148 (29.90)	93 (25.27)	93 (19.83)	56 (16.09)	12 (11.54)	5 (15.63)	0	0	717 (23.31)

Artisan households	20 (2.46)	9 (5.26)	16 (6.08)	19 (3.84)	19 (5.16)	15 (3.20)	9 (2.59)	2 (1.91)	1 (3.13)	0	0	110 (3.58)
Other households	93 (11.44)	20 (11.70)	43 (16.35)	64 (12.93)	59 (16.03)	87 (18.55)	89 (25.57)	25 (24.04)	11 (34.38)	3 (60.00)	2 (25.00)	496 (16.12)
Grand total	813 (100)	171 (100)	263 (100)	495 (100)	368 (100)	469 (100)	348 (100)	104 (100)	32 (100)	5 (100)	8 (100)	3076 (100)
Percentage	26.43	5.56	8.55	16.09	11.96	15.25	11.31	3.38	1.04	0.16	0.26	100

Source: Field Survey, 2016

3.8. Distribution of Sampled Households according to Education Level

Table 8 shows education level of household members. Out of 3076 family members of the sampled households, 813 (26.43 per cent) persons are illiterate; 171 (5.56 per cent) are below study age; 263 (8.55 per cent) are below primary; 495 (16.09 per cent) are primary pass, 368 (11.96 per cent) middle pass, 469 (15.25 per cent) matric pass, 348 (11.31 per cent) 10+2 pass, 104 (3.38 per cent) graduates, 32 (1.04 per cent)

post-graduates, 5 (0.16 per cent) professional educated and 8 (0.26 per cent) have some technical education.

3.9. Distribution of Sampled Households as per Literacy Rate

Table 9 highlights that out of total 2905 persons, 2090 persons (72.01 per cent) are literate and 813 persons (27.99 per cent) are illiterate. The percentage of literacy has been worked out to be the highest in large farm households i.e. 86.84 per cent, followed by 80.46 per cent in 'Other'

Table 9: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Literacy Rate

Category	Illiterate		Literate		Total		Literacy rate
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Marginal farm households	95	26.76	260	73.24	355	100	73.24
Small farm households	89	28.90	219	71.10	308	100	71.10
Medium farm households	60	22.06	212	77.94	272	100	77.94
Large farm households	20	13.16	132	86.84	152	100	86.84
Agricultural labour households	246	43.46	320	56.54	566	100	56.54
Non-agricultural labour households	190	28.15	485	71.85	675	100	71.85
Artisan households	20	19.80	81	80.20	101	100	80.20
Other households	93	19.54	383	80.46	476	100	80.46
Grand total	813	27.99	2092	72.01	2905*	100	72.01

*This does not include the family members (children) aged from 0-6 years as Census of India does not include this age group for literacy rate.

households, 80.20 per cent in artisan households, 77.94 per cent in medium farm households, 73.24 per cent in marginal farm households, 71.85 per cent in non-agricultural labour households, 71.10 per cent in small farm households and 56.54 per cent in agricultural labour households.

3.10. Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Earning Status

The economic profile of sampled rural households is provided in Table 10. The data showing the number of earners, earning dependents and dependents reveals that out of total 3076 family members of sampled households, 593 (19.28 per cent) are earners, 835 (27.15 per cent) are

Table 10: Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Earning Status

Category	Earning		Earning Dependent		Dependent		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	76	12.82	122	14.61	179	10.86	377	12.26
Small farm households	63	10.62	115	13.77	148	8.98	326	10.60
Medium farm households	47	7.93	129	15.45	110	6.67	286	9.30
Large farm households	18	3.04	66	7.90	74	4.49	158	5.14
Agricultural labour households	125	21.08	161	19.28	320	19.42	606	19.70
Non-agricultural labour households	146	24.62	137	16.41	434	26.33	717	23.31
Artisan households	19	3.20	22	2.63	69	4.19	110	3.58
Other households	99	16.69	83	9.94	314	19.05	496	16.12
Grand total	593	100	835	100	1648	100	3076	100
Percentage	19.28		27.15		53.58		100	

earning dependents, and 1648 (53.58 per cent) are dependents among the different categories. In the case of earners, the highest number of earners is in agricultural labour households i.e. 146 (24.62 per cent). In earning dependents and dependents, the highest number of persons is in non-agricultural labour households i.e. 161 (19.28 per cent) and 434 (26.66 per cent) respectively.

3.11. Distribution of Sampled Households according to Economic Status

Economic status of the sampled households is revealed through the data given in Table 11. This table depicts information regarding BPL (Below Poverty Line), APL (Above Poverty Line), AAY (Antyodaya Anna Yojana) and other households who do not have any type of ration card. Out of total 591 households, 17 (2.88 per cent) households are BPL families, 237 (40.10 per cent) households are APL families, 287 (48.56 per cent) households are AAY families and 50 (8.46 per cent) households are Other families. Out of 17 BPL households, 1 (5.88 per cent) is the marginal farm household, 4 (23.53 per cent) are from agricultural

labour households, 7 (41.18 per cent) are from non-agricultural labour households and 5 (29.41 per cent) are from 'Other' households.

In case of APL Households the maximum numbers of APL households are from marginal farm households i.e. 59 (24.89 per cent), followed by 47 (19.83 per cent) from 'Other' households, 40 (16.88 per cent) from small farm households, 39 (16.46 per cent) from medium farm households, 24 1(0.13 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 16 (6.75 per cent) from large farm households, 10 (4.22 per cent) from agricultural labour households and 2 (0.84 per cent) from artisan households.

Table 11: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Economic Status

Category	BPL	APL	AAY	Other	Total
Marginal farm households	1 (5.88)	59 (24.89)	12 (4.18)	2 (4.00)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	0 (0.00)	40 (16.88)	14 (4.88)	9 (18.00)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	0 (0.00)	39 (16.46)	0 (0.00)	8 (16.00)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	0 (0.00)	16 (6.75)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.00)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	4 (23.53)	10 (4.22)	98 (34.15)	12 (24.00)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	7 (41.18)	24 (10.13)	104 (36.24)	10 (20.00)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	0 (0.00)	2 (0.84)	14 (4.88)	3 (6.00)	19 (3.21)
Otherhouseholds	5 (29.41)	47 (19.83)	45 (15.68)	5 (10.00)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	17 (100)	237 (100)	287 (100)	50 (100)	591 (100)
Percentage	2.88	40.10	48.56	8.46	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Out of total 287 AAY households, 12 (4.18 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 14 (4.88 per cent) from small farm households, 98 (34.15 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 104 (36.24 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 14 (4.88 per cent) from artisan households and 45 (15.68 per cent) from 'Other' households. Out of total 50 Other economic status families, 2 (4.00 per cent) are from marginal farm households, 9 (18.00 per cent) from small farm households, 8 (16.00 per cent) from medium farm households, 1 (2.00 per cent) is the large farm household, 12 (24.00 per cent) from agricultural labour households, 10 (20.00 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 3 (6.00 per cent) from artisan households and 5 (10.00 per cent) from 'Other' households.

3.12. Distribution of Sampled Households according to Scholarship

Table 12 shows category-wise households where students belonging to the families of sampled households are getting any scholarship. Out of total 591 households, only 4.23 per cent household are there whose wards are getting scholarships and 60.41 per cent households are not getting any kind of scholarships for their studying children.

Table 12: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Scholarship

Category	Yes		No		No child studying		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	2	8.00	45	12.61	27	12.92	74	12.52
Small farm households	2	8.00	33	9.24	28	13.40	63	10.66
Medium farm households	2	8.00	29	8.12	16	7.66	47	7.95
Large farm households	0	0.00	15	4.20	2	0.96	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	9	36.00	71	19.89	44	21.05	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	7	28.00	91	25.49	47	22.49	145	24.53
Artisan households	0	0.00	13	3.64	6	2.87	19	3.21
Other households	3	12.00	60	16.81	39	18.66	102	17.26
Grand total	25	100.00	357	100.00	209	100.00	591	100.00
Percentage	4.23		60.41		35.36		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Around 35.36 per cent of total 591 households are there whose no child is studying. In case of households getting scholarships for students, the maximum number of households is from agricultural labour households i.e. 9 (36.00 per cent), followed by 7 (28.00 per cent) from non-agricultural labour households, 3 (12.00 per cent) from 'Other' households and 2 (8.00 per cent) from each marginal farm, small farm and medium farm households.

3.13. Distribution of Sampled Households as per Availability of Old/Disability/Widow Pension

The distribution of households according to old age/disability/widow pension is shown in Table 13. In case of 591 households, 100 (16.92 per cent) households are getting old age/disability/widow pension and 145 (24.53 per cent) households are not getting any type of pension although these households have eligible person for such pension. Around 59 per cent households of total 591 households are not eligible for any type of pension.

Table 13: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Availability of Old/Disability/Widow Pension

Category	Yes		No		Not eligible		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	10	10.00	28	19.31	36	10.40	74	12.52
Small farm households	5	5.00	30	20.69	28	8.09	63	10.66
Medium farm households	5	5.00	22	15.17	20	5.78	47	7.95
Large farm households	0	0.00	8	5.52	9	2.60	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	32	32.00	17	11.72	75	21.68	124	20.98

Non-agricultural labour households	21	21.00	20	13.79	104	30.06	145	24.53
Artisan households	4	4.00	5	3.45	10	2.89	19	3.21
Other households	23	23.00	15	10.34	64	18.50	102	17.26
Grand total	100	100	145	100	346	100	591	100
Percentage	16.93		24.53		58.54		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

4.SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Economic and social inequalities can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, leads to social inequalities. In this light, the main objective of the present study is to analyse the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the sampled households across the different categories. The analysis is based upon the primary data, collected through a detailed schedule, of 591 sampled households involved from the 23 villages belonging to four districts (Mansa, SAS Nagar Mohali, SBS Nagar Nawanshahr and Amritsar) situated in three different regions (Malwa, Doaba and Majha) of the Punjab state. The analysis shows that out of 591 households, 74 are marginal farm households, 63 are small farm households, 47 are medium farm households, 17 are large farm households, 124 are agricultural labour households, 145 are non-agricultural labour households, 19 are artisan households and 102 are 'Other' households. Among the sampled households, maximum number of households belongs to the SC category. Three-fourth of total households are from Sikh religion. One-fifth of households are from Hindu religion, around 2 per cent households are from Muslim religion and only 0.34 per cent households are from Christian religion. One-fifth households are Below Poverty Line families, two-fifth households are Above Poverty Line families, every second household belong to Antyodaya Anna Yojna families and around 8 per cent households are Other families who do not have any type of ration card.

Among the sampled households, ninety-five per cent of the households are headed by males and only five per cent households are headed by females. Slightly more than half of the population is Male persons and remaining are female population from the sampled households. Overall, sex ratio is found to be 899 females per 1000 males. Sex ratio is found to be highest among artisan household category, where sex ratio was 1157 females per 1000 males. Out of total family members of the respondent households, one-fifth are earners, more than one-fourth are earning dependents, and a half of them are dependents among the different categories. Out of total 2905 persons, almost three-fourth persons are literate and one-fourth are illiterate. Thus, the field survey shows that a major portion of population is literate.

Based on the results of the present study, some of the policy implications have been presented for the betterment of the rural households. The findings of the present study clearly indicate that more than a half of the rural population lives Below Poverty Line as per the economic status of the household. The proportion of Below Poverty Line and Antyodaya Anna Yojana covered households is higher among agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisan, 'Other' households, marginal farm and small farm households. Lack of gainful employment opportunities, small and uneconomic size of landholdings etc. are some of the main factors contributing towards the poverty of such households. Therefore, proper implementation of government employment generation and poverty alleviation programmes is necessary to improve the condition of these poor rural households.

The findings of the present study clearly indicate towards a distressing difference in the sex-ratio of males and females among the rural households in Punjab. The females stand less in numbers than the males, which is an issue of great concern for the society and the government as well. The government needs to take immediate measures to improve the sex-ratio. These measures may include betterment of health facilities for the expecting mothers and effective implementation of the blanket ban on female feoticide or sex

determination test of the unborn child. The defaulters need to be punished sternly for the sake of justice to women.

It has been found that the average literacy rate is low among agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, marginal farm and small farm households as compared to medium farm, large farm, artisan and 'Other' households. In order to improve the literacy rate, there should be investment in human capital in the form of better availability of quality education and healthcare. The quality of education needs to be improved which may lead to improvement in their standard of living.

REFERENCES

[1] Chowdhary, B.K. (1970). Disparity in income in the context of HYV. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 5(39), A90-A96.

[2] Das, P. (2012). Wage inequality in India: Decomposition by sector, gender and activity status. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(50), 58-64.

[3] Junankar, P.N. (1975). Green revolution and inequality. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 10(13), A15-A18.

[4] Krishnamurty, S. (1988). Wage differentials in agriculture by caste, sex and operations. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 23(50), 2651-2657.

[5] Nandal, D.S. (1972). Pattern of income, investment and saving of selected demonstration Farms in Haryana. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 27(4), 11-19.

[6] Paul, S. (1989). Green revolution and income distribution among farm families in Haryana, 1969-70 to 1982-83. *Economic and Political Weekly,* 24(51-52), A154-A158.

[7] Saini, G.R. (1976). Green revolution and distribution in farm incomes. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 11(13), A 17-A 22.

[8] Sarkar, S. & Mehta, B.S. (2010). Income inequality in India: Pre- and post-reform periods. *Economic and Political Weekly,* 45(37), 45-55.

[9] Sengupta, A. & Das, P. (2014). Gender wage discrimination across social and religious groups in India: Estimates with unit level data. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(21), 71-76.

[10] Singh, S & Toor, M.S. (2005). Agrarian crisis with special references to indebtedness among Punjab Farmers. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics,* 60(3), 345-347.