

Assessment of Impact of Distributed Land on Socio-Economic Condition of Scheduled Castes

Dr. Lokesh Kumar
Faculty of Geography
Government College, pipalrawan,
Dewas, M.P. India

Abstract: - *The Present study seeks Impact of distributed Land on socio-economic condition of scheduled caste. Stratified random sampling is used for selection of respondents. Proportionate number of respondents has been selected from each tahsil and year by using random number table. 300 respondents selected by using random number table from five tahsils namely Koil, Khair, Gabhana, Atrauli and Iglas of the study area Aligarh district of Uttar Pradesh. It is found that majority 41.3 per cent of the respondents could not find impact yet, while 37.7 found that their respect in the society has enhanced after having a piece of land. Employment generation reveals that majority 56 per cent of the respondents who said that their employment enhanced less than 50 days followed by enhanced 50 days employment comprised 33.7 per cent. There are 5 per cent respondents reported that their employment has enhanced in a range of 50-100 days while only 3.7 respondents found to have 100-150 days' employment after allotment of land. It is found that majority 36 per cent of the respondents who said that allotment of land is less success while 31.7 per cent respondents replied that allotment of land is unsuccessful towards crossing poverty line. The dimension of social mobility are education, job, expenditure and social power. Participation in politics brings political status. Political participation is the extent of political awareness and participation in the political process of village, district, state and country level. Respondents said that their economic development has improved positively after allotment of land.*

Key Word: - Socio-Economic Condition, Social Status, Economic Status, Social Mobility, Scheduled Castes, Land Distribution and Occupational Mobility

Introduction: - An important problem that emerged over time is the inequitable distribution of land. Land is closely associated with the caste system. A socially and economically dominant caste owns most of the land and socially disadvantaged people belonging to the Scheduled Castes own less or no land. **Ramaiah** stated that the Govt. of Indian have so far enacted 277 legislations regarding land reforms. He estimated that about 30 million hectares' surplus land is available in India but only 75 lakhs acres have been declared surplus so far. Out of this, it has taken the government 50 years to take possession of a mere 6.4 lakhs acres and redistribute 5.2 lakhs acres of it. And, still about 10 lakhs acres remain in ineligible hand. Since 1961, despite a host of land reforms, a great many Scheduled Caste people lost even the little land they had and had no choice but to join the rank of landless agricultural labourers. In 1961, 38 per cent of Scheduled Caste's people were cultivators but today only 25 per cent are cultivators. Today over 86 per cent of Scheduled Caste households are landless or near landless and 63 per cent are wage-labour households. Most studies indicate that inequalities have increased, rather than decreased. The number of landless people has

risen, while some land is distributed to the landless people including Scheduled Castes during the last three decades to empower them socially and economically. On the one hand, this land was not fertile enough and workable, secondly most of the recipient of this land could not get possession thereof. Where ever they were given possession most of them have been thrown out by the powerful illegal occupants. In spite of it they have failed to get the possession till today. Hence the present study is excitable so as to examine implementation of land reform policies, programme identify barriers in its effective implementation and access the overall impact on the socio-economic life of Scheduled Castes beneficiaries of land distribution programme. It also aims to bring out the factual position of the problem so as to contribute to generation of new knowledge for making headway towards its solution. It is also relevant for effective policy interventions.

Review of Literature: - India has adopted two ways to develop land: (1) reclamation of land and (2) land reforms, Land Reforms are approaches which have been high priority in land development. Land Reforms include Abolition of intermediaries, Tenancy reforms and imposition of ceiling and Redistribution of ceiling surplus land among the landless (**Thakur 2000**). Ownership and control of land remains central to economic and social well-being in the county. The success in redistributing ceiling surplus land, abolishing or regulating tenancy, allocating surplus cultivable government land to the landless, and preventing land alienation from tribal and other socially vulnerable landholders was, however much more limited. It is hardly surprising therefore that the cumulative impact of all the measures of land reforms on rural landlessness is negligible (**Mander 2013**). Skewed distribution of land in India is especially important because of its association with the caste system. Land is concentrated mostly in the hands of the upper castes and the dominant peasant castes to the exclusive of lower castes and Scheduled Castes (**Nancharaiah 1989**). People have high level of psychological stratification due to allotment of land but so far as economic impact is concerned in many of the cases, it has to show its impact because they have just started improving their economic condition is much better than the past (**Chaudhary 2007**). Scheduled Cates groups continue to be disadvantaged section with respect to land and there is no substantial improvement in their land holdings position over the years (**Mohanti 2001**). Surplus land distribution scheme as poverty alleviation scheme has no doubt significantly contributed in enhancing the socio-economic status of Scheduled Castes, however, the benefits of land could not be availed due to poor quality land, inability to cultivate the land and poor access to institutional support (**Singh 2001**). Allotment of pattas, especially to SCs, significantly enhanced from landless to land owners. The people of the Scheduled Castes are still socially degraded and wherever the interest of the dominant group, irrespective of his casts and religion, is undermined by any policy measure are created and the SCs are pressurized (**Joshi 2007**).

Need for the present Study: - The available literature revealed that it concentrated only on explaining and describing the problem of land reforms especially land distribution to landless people in India. The literature either dealt with the historical aspects, or presents an apparent spectrum of this problem of paramount importance in India, or the conclusions are too old to be relevant in the present scenario. Moreover, the problem of land distribution particularly for Scheduled Castes is so fiercely prevalent in India, that it requires special comprehensive and in-depth study and concentrated attention of academicians, researchers

and social activists. So as to find out the root causes of unfair implementation of land distribution programme, distributive justice, immediate action on allotment of land, legislation enacted for development of rural society in the study area and its impact on socio-economic life of Scheduled Castes. This may further lead to have policy impact and concrete solution to the problem. Therefore, the proposed study is to be an attempt in this regard.

Selection of the research problem: - In India possession of a plot of agricultural land, howsoever small, carries with it high psychological and social value. It helps to raise the status of the weaker sections of the society and give them a sense of belonging to the hub of social life. Thus, the land reform programme is rightly viewed as not only an economic development but also as a measure of social uplift. The main Socio-Economic problems affecting the bulks of the SC population are landlessness; lack of education; forced labour; lack of employment; low wages and the problem of child labour. In the above circumstances, the present study is mainly concentrated to know the impact of land reforms on socio-economic characteristics of Scheduled Castes in research area.

Objective of the Study: - To assess the impact of the allotted agriculture land on the socio-economic condition of the Scheduled Castes.

Universe of the study: - The total 1072 number of Scheduled Castes households were allotted a piece of land (patta) during 2007-2012 under land reforms programme in Aligarh district of Uttar Pradesh is considered as universe of the study.

Unit of analysis: - The individual (male and female) member of Scheduled Caste families who got allotment of land (patta) during 2007-2012 under land reforms constituted the unit of analysis.

Sampling frame of the Study: - The data of allotted agriculture land to Scheduled Caste's beneficiaries collected from the office of Registrar kanungo from each tahsil viz. Koil, Atrauli, Khair, Gabhana and Iglas of the district Aligarh. Collected data arranged and computed for drawing the sample size as under: -

Table 1.1 District Aligarh: Agriculture Land Allotment to Scheduled Castes (2007-2012)

Years	Tahsils					Total
	Koil	Atrauli	Khair	Gabhana	Iglas	
2007-08	121	101	21	98	46	387
2008-09	23	15	20	26	28	112
2009-10	106	65	25	56	51	303
2010-11	33	23	24	37	30	147
2011-12	38	9	18	36	22	123
Total	321	213	108	253	177	1072

Source- District Land Record and Registrar Kanoongo Office, Tahsil Koil, Gabhana, Atrauli, Kahir, Iglas, Aligarh district, 2015

Tahsil wise and year wise distribution of the beneficiaries of Scheduled Castes received piece of land (patta) under land reform programme in Aligarh have been presented in Table 2.1. This is considered as sampling frame. From the total 1072 beneficiaries sample size is decided as under: -

Sample Size of the Study: - Sample size is drawn by using **Taro Yamane's** formula $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$. Where n is the sample size, N is population size, and e is level of precision. According to the formula $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$ the sample size for the above sampling frame came 291.3. Therefore, as per the calculation of the formula, 300 beneficiaries of Scheduled Castes have been selected as frame of sample size for the study and this is 27.98 per cent of the sampling frame i.e. of 1072 beneficiaries of district. The year and tahsil wise proportionate number of beneficiaries have been selected as follows: -

Table 1.2 District Aligarh: Sample size of the study (2007-2012)

Years	Tahsils					Total
	Koil	Atrauli	Khair	Gabhana	Iglas	
2007-08	34	28	6	27	13	108
2008-09	6	4	6	7	8	31
2009-10	30	18	7	16	14	85
2010-11	9	6	7	11	8	41
2011-12	11	3	5	10	6	35
Total	90	59	31	71	49	300

Source: Computed from the table 1.1

Selection of the Respondents: - Stratified random sampling is used for selection of respondents. Proportionate number of respondents has been selected from each tahsil and year by using random number table.

Sources of Data Collection: - Primary data is collected directly from study area through direct interview with respondents, and also enacted field observation and group discussion with respondents. The secondary data is collected from the concerned agencies, documented literature, research reports, Maps, Toposheets, statistical documents (Census based upon 2011, National sample survey book, Annual Reports of public organizations), gazetteers, newspaper, magazines, books, journals, internet and visited various libraries.

Analysis of data and Interpretation: - The collected data is processed, tabulated and analysed. Keeping the objective in view a list of cross and simple tables prepared for analysis.

Social and Economic Status: - The origin of the term 'Status', a level or position within a structure of reciprocal behaviour is ancient. Society holds out a range of social position and are variously assigned to or make choice among which of these we will inhabit. While we are occupying a particular status or social position shaped by internalized norms in relation to that status and by social pressure. Landlessness is the indicator which indicates poverty of Scheduled Caste's family in India. Poverty, hunger, unemployment, down nutrition, bad health, illiterateness, inequality, discrimination and social protection all are linked to land ownership. Land redistribution programmes have had limited success for several seasons. In India reform is at all the level of the states and emphasized peaceful and compensatory method. Hence the results have varied from one state to another state. In the above circumstances, the present study is mainly concentrated to know the impact of land reforms on socio-economic characteristics of Scheduled Castes.

Table 1.3 Impact on Social Relation

Sub-Castes	Impacts				Total
	No impact	social prestige Enhance	Good relation for children	Enhance respect in society	
Jatav	59 (36.6)	37 (23.0)	3 (1.9)	62 (38.5)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	15 (35.7)	9 (21.4)	1 (2.4)	17 (40.5)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	35 (53.8)	7 (10.8)	0 (0.0)	23 (35.4)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	3 (18.8)	4 (25.0)	1 (6.2)	8 (50.0)	16 (100.0)
Kori	11 (73.3)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	124 (41.3)	58 (19.3)	5 (1.7)	113 (37.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Impact on social status after allotment of land reveals that majority 41.3 per cent of the respondents could not find impact yet, while 37.7 found that their respect in the society has enhanced after having a piece of land. There are 19.3 per cent respondents who replied that their social prestige is enhanced and very few respondents 1.7 per cent are able to make relation for their children in good families.

Table 1.4 Quality Food for Children

Sub-Castes	Quality Food				Total
	<i>Good</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Not Improve</i>	
Jatav	70 (43.5)	34 (21.1)	11 (6.8)	46 (28.6)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	15 (35.7)	11 (26.2)	2 (4.8)	14 (33.3)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	18 (27.7)	12 (18.5)	6 (9.2)	29 (44.6)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	8 (50.0)	5 (31.2)	1 (6.3)	2 (12.5)	16 (100.0)
Kori	4 (26.7)	1 (6.7)	2 (13.3)	8 (53.3)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	115 (38.3)	63 (21.0)	23 (7.7)	99 (33.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Quality food for children and family member of the respondents revealed that majority of the respondents 38.3 per cent who said that they have good quality of food while 21 per cent said that they have moderate quality of food for their children. There are 33 per cent respondents said that there is no improvement in their food and 7.7 per cent said that their children are getting poor quality of food.

Table 1.5 Good Cloths for Children

Sub-Castes	Quality of Cloths					Total
	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>	
Jatav	33 (20.5)	31 (19.3)	37 (23.0)	21 (13.0)	39 (24.2)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	10 (23.8)	7 (16.7)	9 (21.4)	6 (14.3)	10 (23.8)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	11 (16.9)	10 (15.4)	9 (13.8)	12 (18.5)	23 (35.4)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	9 (56.2)	2 (12.5)	2 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	3 (18.8)	16 (100.0)
Kori	1 (6.7)	1 (6.7)	2 (13.3)	4 (26.7)	7 (46.7)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	64 (21.3)	51 (17.0)	59 (19.7)	43 (14.3)	83 (27.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

It is found that there are 21.3 per cent respondents reported to have very good cloths followed by 17 per cent found to have good cloths is available for their children and family members. There are 19.7 per cent respondents who said that their children have moderate quality of cloths, they also said that their children have only one pair for schooling and other one pair of cloths for wearing in functions. It is shows that there are 14.3 per cent found to have poor quality of cloths. Rest of the respondents found to have very poor quality of cloths for their children.

Table 1.6 Quality Education for Children

Sub-Castes	Quality Education					Total
	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>	
Jatav	32 (19.9)	26 (16.1)	29 (18.0)	30 (18.6)	44 (27.3)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	10 (23.8)	3 (7.1)	8 (19.0)	4 (9.5)	17 (40.5)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	9 (13.8)	6 (9.2)	12 (18.5)	11 (16.9)	27 (41.5)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	5 (31.2)	3 (18.8)	3 (18.8)	3 (18.8)	2 (12.5)	16 (100.0)
Kori	2 (13.3)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	7 (46.7)	4 (26.7)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	58 (19.3)	40 (13.3)	52 (17.3)	56 (18.7)	94 (31.3)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in the table reflects that there are 19.3 per cent respondents found to have very good quality followed by 13.3 per cent respondents are found to have good quality of education for children. There are 17.3 per cent respondents who said that their children have moderate quality of education and 18.7 respondents who said that their children have poor quality education because the respondents are still poor so that they are unable to make effort for good quality education. The respondents accounted for 31.3 per cent found to have no improvement in their children's education.

Table 1.7 Good Health Facilities

Sub-Castes	Heath Facilities					Total
	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very poor</i>	
Jatav	28 (17.4)	24 (14.9)	41 (25.5)	25 (15.5)	43 (26.7)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	11 (26.2)	5 (11.9)	8 (19.0)	3 (7.1)	15 (35.7)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	10 (15.4)	12 (18.5)	19 (29.2)	6 (9.2)	18 (27.7)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	3 (18.8)	3 (18.8)	5 (31.2)	0 (0.0)	5 (31.2)	16 (100.0)
Kori	0 (0.0)	1 (6.7)	6 (40.0)	6 (40.0)	2 (13.3)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	52 (17.3)	45 (15.0)	79 (26.3)	40 (13.3)	84 (28.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in above table reflects facts about good health facilities for the family of the respondents. It is found that 17.3 per cent respondents accounted to have very good health facilities followed by 15 per cent found to have good health facilities for their children and family. There are 26.3 per cent respondents who said that they have moderate health facilities and 13.3 respondents who said that they have poor health facilities. 28 per cent respondents did not have health facilities in their villages.

Table 1.8 Impact on Participation and Political Awareness Among the Respondents

Sub-Castes	Participation and Political Awareness					Total
	<i>Not aware</i>	<i>Pre-political aware</i>	<i>Even today politically strong</i>	<i>Not participate on behalf of caste</i>	<i>Not participation behalf of economic status</i>	
Jatav	37 (23.0)	36 (22.4)	11 (6.8)	33 (20.5)	44 (27.3)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	12 (28.6)	4 (9.5)	2 (4.8)	16 (38.1)	8 (19.0)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	14 (21.5)	15 (23.1)	4 (6.2)	14 (21.5)	18 (27.7)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	4 (25.0)	6 (37.5)	1 (6.2)	4 (25.0)	1 (6.2)	16 (100.0)
Kori	2 (13.3)	4 (26.7)	0 (0.0)	4 (26.7)	5 (33.3)	15 (100.0)
Nat	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	70 (23.3)	65 (21.7)	18 (6.0)	71 (23.7)	76 (25.3)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data reveals that 25.3 per cent are not participate in political activities because their economic status did not allow them. They had to involve in early economic activities for their livelihood and to support their family. There are 23.7 per cent respondents did not participate in political activities on behalf of castes because they belong to downtrodden and lower castes of the society. There are 23.3 per cent respondents did not aware about political participation, they depend only on their work. It is accounted that there are 21.7 per cent respondents found pre-political aware and they participate in political activities for their development, rest of the respondents reported politically strong under study they played role in making decision for development of their area and community.

Table 1.9 Status of Participation in Religious Activities

Sub-Castes	Status of Participation					Total
	<i>Participate</i>	<i>Not participate</i>	<i>Sometimes participate</i>	<i>Depend on other castes</i>	<i>Highly participate</i>	
Jatav	44 (27.3)	53 (32.9)	41 (25.5)	14 (8.7)	9 (5.6)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	11 (26.2)	10 (23.8)	19 (45.2)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	14 (21.5)	22 (33.8)	14 (21.5)	10 (15.4)	5 (7.7)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	5 (31.2)	6 (37.5)	4 (25.0)	1 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	16 (100.0)
Kori	1 (6.7)	6 (40.0)	3 (20.0)	5 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	75 (25.0)	98 (32.7)	81 (27.0)	31 (10.3)	15 (5.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data presented in above table reflects that there are 5 per cent respondents reported high participation in religious activities while 27 per cent reported some time participated and some time, they did not participate in religious activities followed by 25 per cent reported to participate in religious activities. There are 10.3 per cent respondents who said that they want to participate but upper caste people do not allow them to participate and 27.6 per cent said that they did not participate in any religious activities of the study area.

Table 1.10 Participation in Community Function

Sub-Castes	Community Function						Total
	<i>Highly Participate</i>	<i>Some Times</i>	<i>Don't have time</i>	<i>Don't go because of caste</i>	<i>Economic condition not support</i>	<i>Want participate but no efforts</i>	
Jatav	10 (6.2)	29 (38.5)	30 (18.6)	42 (26.1)	5 (3.1)	12 (7.5)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	3 (7.1)	14 (33.3)	7 (16.7)	10 (23.8)	4 (9.5)	4 (9.5)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	3 (4.6)	25 (38.4)	10 (15.4)	19 (29.2)	4 (6.2)	4 (6.2)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	0 (0.0)	4 (25.0)	3 (18.8)	6 (37.5)	1 (6.2)	2 (12.5)	16 (100.0)
Kori	0 (0.0)	10 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	16 (5.3)	115 (38.3)	51 (17.0)	79 (26.3)	14 (4.7)	25 (8.3)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in above table reflects that there are 5.3 per cent respondents found to have high participation in community function because they are very strong within the society while 38.3 per cent said that sometimes they participate in community functions. There are 26.3 per cent respondents did not go to participate in community function because they belong to lower caste and upper caste people oppose them to participate. There are 17 per cent respondents did not had time to participate followed by 8.3 per cent respondents want to participate but they did not make any effort to participate in community function. Rest of the respondents 4.7 per cent are reported that their economic condition does not allow them.

Table 1.11 Impact on Social Relation within the Castes

Sub-Castes	Social Relation						Total
	<i>No relation</i>	<i>Get together with castes</i>	<i>Food with others Castes</i>	<i>Much Expenses on festivals</i>	<i>Self-respect Enhanced</i>	<i>Getting strengthen</i>	
Jatav	35 (21.7)	27 (16.8)	22 (13.7)	24 (14.9)	35 (21.7)	18 (11.2)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	7 (16.7)	8 (19.0)	8 (19.0)	10 (23.8)	5 (11.9)	4 (9.5)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	19 (29.2)	12 (18.5)	7 (10.8)	9 (13.8)	11 (16.9)	7 (10.8)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	3 (18.8)	3 (18.8)	2 (12.5)	4 (25.0)	3 (18.8)	1 (6.2)	16 (100.0)
Kori	8 (53.3)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)	1 (6.7)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	72 (24.0)	52 (17.3)	40 (13.3)	48 (16.0)	56 (18.7)	32 (10.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Social relation within the caste reveals that there are 17.3 per cent respondents who replied that their get-together within castes has enhanced followed by 13.3 per cent found to eat food with other sub-castes. Self-respect is being increasing of 18.7 per cent while 10.7 per cent are getting strengthen after having a piece of land. There are 16 per cent respondents who said that their expenses on festivals has enhanced and 24 per cent did not have any social relation within the castes and society.

Table 1.12 Impact on Social Relation with other Castes

Sub-Castes	Social Relation						Total
	<i>Social discrimination decreases</i>	<i>Caste based discrimination Decrease</i>	<i>Food with other Castes</i>	<i>Entry in Temple</i>	<i>Allow to take water</i>	<i>Allow for voting</i>	
Jatav	63 (39.1)	70 (43.5)	9 (5.6)	1 (0.6)	13 (8.1)	5 (3.1)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	16 (38.1)	16 (38.1)	7 (16.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.8)	1 (2.4)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	17 (26.2)	38 (58.5)	4 (6.1)	0 (0.0)	6 (9.2)	0 (0.0)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	2 (12.5)	10 (62.5)	1 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	3 (18.8)	0 (0.0)	16 (100.0)
Kori	6 (40.0)	7 (46.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	104 (21.3)	142 (47.3)	21 (7.0)	1 (0.3)	24 (8.0)	8 (2.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Social relation with other castes reveals that majority 47.3 per cent of the respondents who said that caste-based discrimination by upper castes people has decreased followed by 21.3 per cent respondents who said that social discrimination by other castes has decreased. There are 8 per cent respondents replied that they are allowed to take water from hand pumps and community water tank while 2.7 per cent allowed to vote at voting centers. There are 7 per cent respondents who said that they eat food with upper castes peoples. Very few respondents 0.3 per cent replied that they can enter in temples of upper castes for worship.

Table 1.13 Impact on Social and Occupational Mobility After Allotment of Land

Sub-Castes	Social and Occupational Mobility						Total
	<i>Don't Know</i>	<i>Not Increase</i>	<i>Less Increase</i>	<i>Moderate Increase</i>	<i>Still Increasing</i>	<i>Good increase</i>	
Jatav	9 (5.6)	29 (18.0)	44 (27.3)	33 (20.5)	23 (14.3)	23 (14.3)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	3 (7.1)	10 (23.8)	13 (31.0)	6 (14.3)	3 (7.1)	7 (16.7)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	4 (6.2)	19 (29.2)	17 (26.2)	14 (21.5)	7 (10.8)	4 (6.2)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	2 (12.5)	1 (6.2)	4 (25.0)	2 (12.5)	3 (18.8)	4 (25.0)	16 (100.0)
Kori	0 (0.0)	7 (46.7)	2 (13.3)	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	18 (6.0)	67 (22.3)	80 (26.7)	58 (19.3)	36 (12.0)	41 (13.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Impact on social and occupational mobility after allotment of land highlights that facts that majority 26.7 per cent of the respondents replied that their social and occupational mobility has less enhanced followed by 19.3 per cent respondents who said that their social and occupational mobility has moderate enhanced. There are 13.7 per cent respondents who replied that their social and occupational mobility has increase good while 12 per cent respondents who said that their social and occupational mobility is being increasing after getting allotment of land. There are 22.3 per cent respondents reported that their social and occupational mobility has not enhanced yet, rest of the respondents 6 per cent did not know about their social mobility increment.

Table 1.14 Impact on Economic Condition

Sub-Castes	Economic Condition					Total
	<i>Economic condition improved</i>	<i>No Effect yet</i>	<i>Growth of Income</i>	<i>Development Growth</i>	<i>Become Loan Less</i>	
Jatav	43 (26.7)	44 (27.3)	28 (17.4)	25 (15.5)	21 (13.0)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	7 (16.7)	11 (26.2)	6 (14.3)	10 (23.8)	8 (19.0)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	17 (26.2)	15 (23.1)	9 (13.8)	6 (9.2)	18 (27.7)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	3 (18.8)	5 (31.2)	5 (31.2)	1 (6.2)	2 (12.5)	16 (100.0)
Kori	6 (40.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (20.0)	4 (26.7)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	76 (25.3)	77 (25.7)	48 (16.0)	45 (15.0)	54 (18.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in above table reflects the facts about impact on economic condition of the respondents after allotment of land of the study area. It is found that more than one fourth of respondents 25.3 per cent reported that their economic condition is improved after having a piece of land while 25.7 per cent found to have no impact yet. There are 18 per cent respondents who said that they had paid their income for loan which is taken from banks and cooperative societies. 16 per cent respondents accounted that their income has improved followed by 15 per cent respondents who said that their economic development has improved positively after allotment of land.

Table 1.15 Employment Generation of the Respondents

Sub-Castes	Employment Generation (<i>in days</i>)					Total
	<i><50</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>50-100</i>	<i>100-150</i>	<i>> 150</i>	
Jatav	49 (53.4)	54 (33.5)	10 (6.2)	8 (5.0)	3 (1.9)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	22 (52.3)	17 (40.5)	1 (2.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.8)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	39 (60.0)	23 (35.4)	2 (3.1)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	9 (56.2)	7 (43.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	16 (100.0)
Kori	12 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	169 (56.3)	101 (33.7)	15 (5.0)	10 (3.3)	5 (1.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Employment generation of the respondents after allotment of land shown in above table. Employment generation reveals that majority 56 per cent of the respondents who said that their employment enhanced less than 50 days followed by enhanced 50 days employment comprised 33.7 per cent. There are 5 per cent respondents reported that their employment has enhanced in a range of 50-100 days while only 3.7 respondents found to have 100-150 days employment after allotment of land. Very few respondents 1.7 per cent reported to have more than 150 days employment after allotment of land.

Table 1.16 Impact on Monthly Income

Sub-Castes	Income (₹)					Total
	<1000	1000-1500	1500-2000	2000-2500	>2500	
Jatav	101 (62.7)	23 (14.3)	22 (13.7)	11 (6.8)	4 (2.5)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	29 (96.1)	5 (11.9)	5 (11.9)	3 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	43 (66.2)	9 (13.8)	6 (9.2)	7 (10.8)	0 (0.0)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	8 (50.0)	1 (6.2)	6 (37.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (6.2)	16 (100.0)
Kori	13 (86.6)	1 (6.7)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	195 (65.0)	39 (13.0)	40 (13.3)	21 (7.0)	5 (1.7)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in above table reflects the facts about impact on monthly income after allotment of land of the study area. Majority 65 per cent of the respondents who replied that their income has enhanced less than ₹1000 followed by 13 per cent replied that their income has enhanced in a range of ₹1000-1500 after allotment of land. Income in a range of ₹1500-2000 has enhanced accounted for 13 per cent comprised followed by 7 per cent said that their income has enhanced in a range of ₹2000-2500 and very few respondents 1.7 per cent reported that their income has enhanced more than ₹2500.

Table 1.17 Sources for getting Loan

Sub-Castes	Sources							Total
	Land lord	Co-Operative Society	Rural Bank	Land. Bank	Above Three	No Need Loan	Relative	
Jatav	12 (7.5)	10 (6.2)	14 (8.7)	5 (3.1)	24 (14.9)	47 (29.2)	49 (30.4)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	3 (7.1)	5 (11.9)	5 (11.9)	4 (9.5)	3 (7.1)	10 (23.8)	12 (28.6)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	4 (6.2)	9 (13.8)	3 (4.6)	4 (6.2)	6 (9.2)	25 (38.5)	14 (21.5)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	0 (0.0)	2 (12.5)	1 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	5 (31.2)	7 (43.8)	1 (6.2)	16 (100.0)
Kori	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	5 (33.3)	4 (26.7)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	21 (7.0)	26 (8.7)	25 (8.3)	13 (4.3)	40 (13.4)	94 (31.3)	81 (27.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

The data shown in above table reflects facts about getting loan from different sources of the study area. The study reveals that majority 27 per cent of the respondents reported to get loan on interest from their relatives while 7 per cent got from land lords. The respondents who get loan from co-operative society accounted for 8.7 per cent followed by 8.3 per cent reported to get loan from Rural Bank and 4.3 per cent reported to get loan from land development bank while 13.4 per cent who said that they got loan from above three sources. Rest of the respondents 31.3 per cent did not have need to get loan for any purpose.

Table 1.18 Respondents Responses towards Crossing Poverty Line after Allotment of Land

Sub-Castes	Responses					Total
	<i>Success</i>	<i>Unsuccessful</i>	<i>Less Success</i>	<i>More Success</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>	
Jatav	9 (5.6)	48 (29.8)	65 (40.4)	6 (3.7)	33 (20.5)	161 (100.0)
Dhobi	4 (9.5)	11 (26.2)	16 (38.1)	1 (2.4)	10 (23.8)	42 (100.0)
Valmiki	4 (6.2)	26 (40.0)	19 (29.2)	3 (4.6)	13 (20.0)	65 (100.0)
Khatik	1 (6.2)	5 (31.2)	5 (31.2)	2 (12.5)	3 (18.8)	16 (100.0)
Kori	0 (0.0)	5 (33.3)	3 (20.0)	4 (26.7)	3 (20.0)	15 (100.0)
Nat	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Total	18 (6.0)	95 (31.7)	108 (36.0)	16 (5.3)	63 (21.0)	300 (100.0)

Primary Source- Field Survey of Study Area 2015, Note: The figure in bracket indicate percentage

Respondents responses towards crossing poverty line after allotment of land shown in above table. It is found that majority 36 per cent of the respondents who said that allotment of land is less success while 31.7 per cent respondents replied that allotment of land is unsuccessful towards crossing poverty line. The respondents who said that allotment of land successful accounted for 6 per cent followed by 5.3 per cent responded more successful to cross poverty line and 21 per cent did not know about any success.

Conclusion: - Generally, income is defined as money that is received in payment of the normal work of an individual. But here income is defining as money received in production of crops after having a piece of land. Respondents are asked to whether their monthly income has enhanced or is increasing. Scheduled Castes can extricate themselves from the cluster of poverty is by shifting from their traditional, ancestor and low paying occupation to those that are lucrative. In order to occupationally mobile, one needs to be mentally agile to various occupational information and must have excellent perception to process it. Social mobility is any transition of an individual from one social position to other. The dimension of social mobility are education, job, expenditure and social power. Participation in politics brings political status. Political participation is the extent of political awareness and participation in the political process of village, district, state and country level. Political participation increases social mobility of an individual and brings Scheduled Castes into contact with the wider world. Which gives them knowledge of and a desire for a better life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. Chaudhary, S. N. (2007)**, "Grazing Land to Dalits in Shehore: Case Study", (ed.) S.N. Chaudhary, 'Dalit Agenda and Grazing Land to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes', Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- 2. Joshi, Y. G. (2007)**, "Allotment of Grazing Land to Scheduled Cast and Scheduled Tribe Under Dalit Agenda in M.P.", (ed.) S. N. Chaudhary, 'Dalit Agenda and Grazing Land to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes', Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- 3. Kurikose, Francis and Deepa Kylasam Iyer (2011)**, "Land Use and Agrarian Relation: Issues and Prospects in the India Context" 'Kurukshetra' Vol. 59, No. 9, July 2011.

4. **Mander, Harsh (2013)**, “Reviving Land Reforms?”, Economic & Political Weekly, Vol XLVII No. 35, August 31, 2013.
5. **Mathur, B. L. (2002)**, “Economic Planning and Development: Theory and Practices”, Sublime Publications, Jaipur.
6. **Mohanti, B. B. (2001)**, “Land Distribution among Scheduled Castes and Tribes”, Economic and Political weekly, Vol. 36, No. 40, October 6, 2001.
7. **Moses, Bribdavan C. (2003)**, “Panchama Land in Tamil Nadu”, (ed.) M. Thangraj, ‘Land Reforms in India, Tamil Nadu: An Unfinished Task’, Vol. I, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
8. **Nancharaiah G. (1989)**, “Impact of Land Legislation on Land Distribution: A Case Study of an A. P. Village (ed.) I. Satya Sundarm, ‘Rural Poverty and Area Planning’, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi.
9. **Nancharaiah, G. (1988)**, “Land and Caste”, Himalaya Publication, New Delhi.
10. **Rao, V. M. (1992)**, “Land Reform Experiences: Perspective for Strategy and Programmes”, Economic Political Weekly, Vol. 27 No. 26, June 27, 1992.
11. **Sankaran, S. N. (1996)**, “Introduction”, (ed.) B. N. Yugandhar, ‘Land Reforms in India’, Vol. 3, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
12. **Sarkar, Bikram (1989)**, “Land Reforms in India”, Ashish Publishing House, New Delhi.
13. **Singh, A. K. (2005)**, “Poverty among Scheduled Castes: A study of Surplus Land Distribution in Uttar Pradesh”, (ed.) S. N. Chaudhary, ‘Human Rights and Poverty in India: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Evidences’, Vol. 2, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
14. **Thangraj. M. (2003)**, “Land Reform and Caste” (ed.) M. Thangraj Land Reforms in India, Tamil Nadu: An Unfinished Task, Vol.1, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
15. **Thimmaiah, G. (2001)**, “New Perspective of Land Reforms in India”, Journals of Social and Economic Development, Vol. III, No. 2, July-December 2001.
16. **Tim Hanstand, T. Haque, Robin Neilson (2008)**, “Improving Land Assess for India’s Rural Poor”, Economic Political Weekly, March 2008.