Socio-Economic Status Index of Backward Caste Hostel Students in Rayalaseema Region

Dr. B. Sivaiah

ABSTRACT

Government has taken numerous steps for improving the socio-economic and educational conditions of the Backward Castes of the Society. These, inter-alia, includes reservation in education and employment. Our study reveals that the socio-economic status of the resident students is characterized by overall low socio-economic status (52.3 percent). It is found that 55.7 percent of their families earn poor incomes-(Rs 6000-19999)' and another large percentage (34.3 percent) earn less than Rs. 18000; 27.3 percent are land less; and 30.7 percent are marginal land holdings; 21.7 percent are small farmers; and a high majority (73.7 percent) are manual workers. It is observed that none of the resident students represent Very Poor category (less than Rs. 6,000 income per annum). This finding supports the view that without a minimum level of income genuine universal elementary education may remain out of reach.

Key Words: Former Project Fellow, Department of Sociology, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapuramu.

INTRODUCTION

Education is an essential tool for the advancement of mankind. It works as a catalyst for the socio-economic changes in society. Encyclopaedia of Britania viewed education as 'transmission of the values and accumulated knowledge of society'. Education is designed to guide the child in learning a culture, mounding his behaviour in the ways of adulthood., and guiding him towards his eventual role in society. It is conscious social function, which began when man started interacting with material reality with the purpose of mounding or changing it to satisfy his needs.

Thus, education embraces a multi-process by which culture and values are transmitted from generation to generation. According to a well known sociologist R.K. Mukherjee, every education, whatever means and methods it uses, aims at fitting the growing individual for his special role and position in society so as to elicit the best out of him, and at the same time socializing him, through development of proper habits, attitudes and values, so that he enriches and strengthens the cultural pattern.

The most fundamental benefit of education not cited often enough, is its intrinsic value to the well being or effective freedom of a person.

While there can be many arguments, in favour of universal education, two are most compelling. The first is that literacy can empower people who have so far been denied this opportunity, politically and economically. The second is that universal basic education will facilitate economic development by creating an effective workforce and enabling many people to exploit economic opportunity many people to exploit economic opportunities. Both these are stated to be national goals as well as being intrinsically valuable.

In India, Universalization of Basic Education (UBE) has been recognized as crucial input for nation building since independence. The founding fathers of our Constitution had given a prominent place to educational endeavors when they made provision for free and compulsory education for children up to 14 years of age within a period of 10 years in the Directive principles of state policy.

Though the country has not realized vision of the constitution, the picture is not all-dismal. Impressive expansions in accessing the infrastructure, and enrolment and equality of opportunity have been achieved. The decade 1990 has seen the issue of universal basic education (6-14 years) in India acquire urgency as never before. A near consensus has built up about the need to ensure that all children attend school and become literate. But this agreement across a wide spectrum of opinion rarely includes a comprehensive and pragmatic strategy. Thus there exists a painful gap in terms

non-enrolment, non-retention (drop-out) wastage and stagnation and gender disparity; and incases to quality and effective schooling.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kishori Kalpesh Kumar K., and Manoj C. Shastry, (2019) conducted a study to decide the problems faced by pre-adulthood in adjusting with hostel life. According to authors there are four factors which impact this issue, to be specific: gender, social economic status, guardians' dimension of instruction and furthermore the quantity of kin who further study at more elevated amount foundations. The study employed grounded hypothesis to investigate the impacts of hostel life on the behavior, and personality of the understudies. Sample comprised ten hostel understudies, five male and five female hostel understudies, and age range was twenty to twenty-five. The study shows that the hostels have extraordinary significance in the educational voyage of Pakistani understudies. Hostel life expands the social hover of the hostel understudies, since hostel is a combination of multicultural social gathering.

Prakash S. Chougule et.al. (2021) conducted a study with the objective of ascertaining the adequacy of the hostels and other general facilities provided to the students and investigate the level of satisfaction of the students to the available facilities. The study revealed that respondents were dissatisfied with the adequacy and functionality of some facilities such as purity of drinking water, lack ness of mess facility, health center facilities and internet facility provided in college campus. The study further declares that most students in boy hostel are dissatisfied with purity of drinking water and it was observe that the hostel has no mess facility. Maximum number of students would like to have some other skill oriented courses and to do the interdisciplinary courses. As well as students are not fully satisfied with facility provided at health center and with internet facility provided in college campus.

Sunil Kumar Doddaiah et.al. (2022) undertaken on online cross-sectional study among 172 medical students residing in the hostel facility of a medical college in urban Mysore. The study reveals that out of the 172 study participants who filled the questionnaire, the majority of them were females (56.98%). 70 (40.69%) students belonged to the second year, 31(18.04%) were from the first year while 24 (13.95%) participants were in internships. The authors concluded that the students had moderate satisfaction with the hostel facilities and the campus. However, both the boys and girls were dissatisfied with the hostel canteen's hygiene and facility.

Sunita Agarwal, Kamlesh Haritwal and Jyoti Meena, (2023) for their study selected two out of seven girls hostels of Rajasthan University namely Mahi and Savitri hostel were selected randomly with the help of random number table. The study revealed that the majority of leftover from thali in the breakfast of mahi hostel 61.00 per cent as well as Savitri hostel 75.90 per cent in the range of 1.0 to 3.0 kg. Whereas the study also concluded that the majority of leftover from thali in the lunch of mahi hostel 39.00 per cent and from Savitri hostel 89.70 per cent in the range of 3.1 to 6.0 kg and 1.0 to 3.0 kg respectively. In the context of dinner majority of leftover from thali in mahi hostel 46.3 per cent and Savitri hostel 51.70 per cent in the range of 3.1 to 6.0 kg was found on the basis of the results. The authors concluded that a lot of food is wasted in each hostel per day. It is a serious issue but less talked about. To combat this problem, the authors suggest both the staff and the students aware about the issues and also make them realize the outcomes of food wastage.

Index of Socio-Economic Status (SES INDEX)

To understand the overall socio-economic status of the Backward Caste students under reference, a socio-economic status index (referred as SES Index here after) is constructed. The variables considered for this purpose are caste, Size of family, Income, Parents literacy level, Occupation, Land holding and Type of dwelling (House). This SES Index comprises seven items. Three levels of socio-economic status viz. Poor, Low and Middle status are considered. Accordingly, Castes are grouped into three categories, based on their hierarchical rank, and weighted scores are given. Castes belonging to Vulnerable and Nomadic castes are assigned a score of one; Traditional Service oriented castes are assigned a score of two; and the Traditional Vocation Oriented castes and the Artisan castes were given a score of three.

Based on the number of members in the family, the size of family is categorized into Small, Average size and Large families. The Large families comprise more than seven members and are assigned a score of one; Small families comprise four and less number of members and are assigned score of three. Income levels are categorized as below poverty line; Low level of income and Middle and above levels of income. Incomes less than 12,000 per annum is considered as Below Poverty Line (BPL); annual income between Rs. 12,000 – 18000 is considered as Low level of income; and above Rs. 18,000 income per annum is considered as Middle and Above levels. B.P.L income is assigned a score of one; a Low level of income is assigned a score of two; and Middle level income is given a score of three. Parents Literacy Level is categorized as illiterates and carries a score of one; Literates with less than 10 years of schooling are referred as Literates and are given a score of two; and parents with more than ten years of schooling are referred as Matriculates and are given a score of three. The student's fathers are referred as parents in this context. The parent's occupations are categorized as Manual, Semi-Manual and Non-Manual & Medium & Large agriculturists.

Manual occupations are given a score of one; Semi-manual a score of two; and Non-manual & Medium, Large agriculturists score of three. Land holdings are categorized as landless and carries a score of one; Marginal and small farmers (holdings less than five acres) are given a score of two medium and large holdings (above 5 acres are given a score of three. The dwellings are grouped as hut, which carries a score of one; tiled house which carries a score of two and Pucca houses carry a score of three.

Table 1: Class of Study & Socio-Economic Status Index

Class	Socio-Economic Status Index				Total
	Percentage	Poor	Low	Middle	
6th		13	15	1	29
	% within Class	44.8%	51.7%	3.4%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	15.9%	9.6%	1.6%	9.7%
	% of Total	4.3%	5.0%	.3%	9.7%
7th		17	39	14	70
	% within Class	24.3%	55.7%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	20.7%	24.8%	23.0%	23.3%
	% of Total	5.7%	13.0%	4.7%	23.3%
8th		17	25	13	55
	% within Class	30.9%	45.5%	23.6%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	20.7%	15.9%	21.3%	18.3%
	% of Total	5.7%	8.3%	4.3%	18.3%
9th		26	40	6	72
	% within Class	36.1%	55.6%	8.3%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	31.7%	25.5%	9.8%	24.0%
	% of Total	8.7%	13.3%	2.0%	24.0%
10th		9	38	27	74
	% within Class	12.2	51.4	36.5%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	11.0	24.2	44.3%	24.7%
	% of Total	3.0	12.7	9.0%	24.7%
Total		82	157	61	300
	% within Class	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%

Source: Field Data

Thus Socio-Economic Status Index comprises seven items, and each item graded in to three levels and is assigned scores ranging from 1 to 3. The minimum score of the index is 7 and the maximum score is 21. Scores between 1-11 are considered as Poor; scores between 12-16 are reckoned as Low SES status; and those who scored between 17-21 are considered to be with Middle and above Socio-Economic Status. The details of the SES Index are presented in table 2.

Table-2: Caste & Socio-Economic Index

Caste	Socio-Economic Index				Total
	Percentage	Poor	Low	Middle	
Vulnerable/ Nomadic		13	17	5	35
	% within Caste	37.1%	48.6%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	15.9%	10.8%	8.2%	11.7%
	% of Total	4.3%	5.7%	1.7%	11.7%
Traditional Services		33	53	16	102
	% within Caste	32.4%	52.0%	15.7%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	40.2%	33.8%	26.2%	34.0%
	% of Total	11.0%	17.7%	5.3%	34.0%
Vocational Services		29	66	34	129
	% within Caste	22.5%	51.2%	26.4%	100.0%
	% within SES Index	35.4%	42.0%	55.7%	43.0%
	% of Total	9.7%	22.0%	11.3%	43.0%
Artisans		7	21	6	34
	% within Caste	20.6%	61.8%	17.6%	100.0%

	%within SES Index	8.5%	13.4%	9.8%	11.3%
	%of Total	2.3%	7.0%	2.0%	11.3%
Total		82	157	61	300
	%within Caste	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	%of Total	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%

Source: Field Data

Our data shows that majority (52.3 percent) of the B.C. students under reference are of Low socio-economic status; and only 27.3 percent of the students are of Poor SES. The data also indicates that within SES index, more number of 10th class students belong to Middle & Above SES. This suggests that to sustain schooling even up to 10th class, one must need a reasonable level of socio-economic status. On the other hand the analyses of SES within the class of study reveals that most of the students belong to low level of SES; and this implies that the provision of Backward Caste Welfare Hostels could offset the constraints of SES in schooling. This is reflected, as Poor Socio-economic Status is present in each class from 6th to 10th. These details are presented in table-3.

Table 3: Class of Study & Socio-Economic Status Index

Class	Socio-Economic Status Index				Total
	Percentage	**Poor**	**Low**	**Middle**	
6th		13	15	1	29
	%within Class	44.8%	51.7%	3.4%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	15.9%	9.6%	1.6%	9.7%
	%of Total	4.3%	5.0%	.3%	9.7%
7th		17	39	14	70
	%within Class	24.3%	55.7%	20.0%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	20.7%	24.8%	23.0%	23.3%
	%of Total	5.7%	13.0%	4.7%	23.3%
8th		17	25	13	55
	%within Class	30.9%	45.5%	23.6%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	20.7%	15.9%	21.3%	18.3%
	%of Total	5.7%	8.3%	4.3%	18.3%
9th		26	40	6	72
	%within Class	36.1%	55.6%	8.3%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	31.7%	25.5%	9.8%	24.0%
	%of Total	8.7%	13.3%	2.0%	24.0%
10th		9	38	27	74
	%within Class	12.2	51.4	36.5%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	11.0	24.2	44.3%	24.7%
	%of Total	3.0	12.7	9.0%	24.7%
Total		82	157	61	300
	%within Class	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%
	%within SES Index	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	%of Total	27.3%	52.3%	20.3%	100.0%

The matching of caste categories with SES levels reveals and supports the caste and class nexus. None of the Artisan caste has Poor Socio-economic Status where as majority of the Vulnerable and Service castes are of Poor and Low socio-economic status; and the poor are however, more among the Vulnerable and Nomadic castes (43.2 percent). These details are presented in table-5.19. Majority of Artisan and Vocational castes belong to Low levels of SES (71.4 and 63.4 percent respectively).

CONCLUSION

It may be concluded that the educational deprivation related to high school education is neither limited to high school education is neither limited to supply –demand factors nor merely to socio-economic factors. For a meaningful insights it is necessary to combine both the approaches.

REFERENCES

[1]. Kishori Kalpesh Kumar K., and Manoj C. Shastry, "Problems and Challenges Faced by Hostel Students in Adjustment", *Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education*, *Vol.* 16, No.5, April 2019, pp.99-102.

[2]. Padhi, S.R., " Overcoming Exclusion and Marginalization in Education through Inclusive Approaches: Challenges and Vision of Arunachal Pradesh in India", *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity,* Vol. 6, No.4, 2016, pp.23-34.

[3]. Prakash S. Chougule, Suresh T.Salunkhe, Suresh V.Patil, Vikas V. Kolhe, and Ganesh T. Patil, "A Review of Hostel Students Regarding Facilities Provided By the College, Using Statistical Measures", *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, Vol. 11, No.2, (Series-IV), February 2021, pp. 28-36.

[4]. Ramesh, "Levels of education of the marginalized people in India" *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research.* Vol. 2, No.3, 2013, pp.142-148.

[5]. Sunil Kumar Doddaiah, Deepak Anil, Vadaga Vijaylakshmi Rao,Arun Gopi, Mysore Ramakrishnaiah Narayana Murthy, *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, Vol.9, No.4, 2022 April, pp.1858-1864.

[6]. Sunita Agarwal, Kamlesh Haritwal and Jyoti Meena, "Food Waste Audit in Selected Hostels of Rajasthan University, Jaipur, India ", *Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition*, Vol. 2, No.1, 2023, pp. 6-13.