



Socio-Economic Profile of the Sample Households/ Respondents of JFM

- An empirical analysis

¹Dr.Jogi Madhusudan ²Dr.P.Vijayakumar

¹UGC – Dr.Sarvepally Radhaakrishnan Post Doctorial fellow, Department of Rural Development & Social work at S.K.University, Anantapur, A.P. 515003.

²Research Associate in Poverty learning foundation, Hyderabad.

Abstract: In this paper, an attempt is made to present the profile of selected respondents for the study with reference to their social and economic characteristics. There are 880 sample respondents spread over four districts. Analysis has been carried-out district-wise in order to examine the similarities and dissimilarities.

The socio-economic characteristics of the sample households are analyzed here in terms of the caste composition, household size, work participation rates, ownership of land, housing status including amenities available, possession of assets including gold and silver, earnings from different sources, indebtedness, and savings, which may determine their extent of participation in the implementation of JFM programme. Further, the personal characteristics of the sample respondents such as the education status, marital status and primary occupation pursued are analyzed here, as these would have a bearing on their levels of participation in VSS activities.

Out of the total of 240 sample households, a vast majority (88.3%) had nuclear family system, while the rest had the system of joint family (10%) or extended family (1.7%). The sample respondents comprised mostly men; out of 240 sample respondents, 227 were males (94.6%) and only 13 females (5.4%). Most of the sample respondents (97.1%) were married. Only 1.3 per cent of the sample respondents were unmarried, while the widowed constituted 1.7 per cent.

Caste Composition

In Indian society caste is an important social parameter which decides the position of an individual in the society. The political and economic empowerment of people largely depends on their caste. The caste wise particulars of sample respondents are given in table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of the Sample Households by Caste Category

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents				
		SC	ST	BC	OC	Total
1	Ananthapuramu	69 (31.36)	43 (19.55)	93 (42.27)	15 (6.82)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	67 (30.45)	39 (17.73)	94 (42.73)	20 (9.09)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	82 (37.27)	41 (18.64)	85 (38.64)	12 (5.45)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	76 (34.55)	44 (20.00)	86 (39.09)	14 (6.36)	220 (100.00)

	294 (33.41)	167 (18.98)	358 (40.68)	61 (6.93)	880 (100.00)
Total					

Source: Field Data

Table 1 shows that the Backward Classes (BCs) accounted for 40.68 per cent of the sample households, followed by Scheduled Castes (SCs) 33.41 per cent, Scheduled Tribes (STs) 18.98 per cent and Other Castes (OCs) 6.93 per cent. It could be noted that the BCs constituted the majority of the sample households in sample forest ranges of four districts. In all more than 90 per cent of the sample households belonged to the weaker sections of the society, with the SC and ST categories accounting for about half of them.

Sex Composition and Household Size

The distribution of members in the sample households is shown in table 2.

Table 2
Composition of the Sample Households

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents			Sex Ratio
		Male	Female	Total	
1	Ananthapuramu	398 (51.76)	371 (39.80)	769 (100.00)	932
2	Chittoor	409 (52.30)	373 (40.90)	782 (100.00)	912
3	Kurnool	387 (51.67)	362 (38.70)	749 (100.00)	935
4	Kadapa	401 (51.61)	376 (40.10)	777 (100.00)	938
Total		1595 (51.84)	1482 (48.16)	3077 (100.00)	929

Source: Field Data

It may be noted from table 2 that out of 3077 members in the sample households, there were 1595 males (51.84%) and 1482 females (48.16%). The sex ratio worked out to 929 females per 1000 males, which is far below the state average. The sex ratio was found to be highest in Kadapa district (938 females per 1000 males) and lowest in Chittoor district (912 females per 1000 males). The average household size worked out to 3.50 in the case of the sample households.

Number of Workers and Work Participation Rates

The distribution of workers in the sample households and the work participation rates are shown in table

3

Table 3
Work Participation Rates in the Sample Households

S. No.	District	No. of Workers			Work participation Rate		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	Ananthapuramu	296	257	553	74.4	69.3	71.9
2	Chittoor	341	286	627	83.4	76.7	80.2
3	Kurnool	301	287	588	77.8	79.3	78.5
4	Kadapa	314	297	611	78.3	79.0	78.6
Total		1252	1127	2379	78.5	76.0	77.3

Source: Field Data

It may be seen from table 3 that there were 2379 workers in the sample households comprising 1152 males (52.63%) and 1127 females (47.37%). However, the work participation rate for all members in the sample households worked out to 77.3, being higher among the males (78.5) when compared to females (76.0). The higher work participation rates among the males could be due to inclusion of both the main and the marginal

workers. The work participation rates were found to be highest in Chittoor district and lowest in Ananthapuramu district among both males and females in case of the sample households.

Housing Status

Most of the sample households were residing in their own houses. However, there were variations with regard to the type of house in which the sample households resided. Table 4.4 presents the distribution of sample households by type of house.

Table 4
Distribution of the Sample Households by Type of House

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents			
		Pucca	Huts	Thatched	Total
1	Ananthapuramu	208 (94.55)	5 (2.27)	7 (3.18)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	201 (91.36)	9 (4.09)	10 (4.55)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	204 (92.73)	3 (1.36)	13 (5.91)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	202 (91.82)	6 (2.73)	12 (5.45)	220 (100.00)
Total		815 (92.61)	23 (2.61)	42 (4.77)	880 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

Table 4 makes it clear that about 92.61 per cent of the sample respondents were residing in pucca houses (made of brick walls, RCC/ stone roof and concrete flooring covered by mosaic or slabs). In all four districts more than 90 per cent of sample respondents were residing in pucca houses. The respondents living in thatched constitute 4.77 per cent of total sample. Around 2.61 per cent are living in huts.

Number of living Rooms

The number of rooms possessing by a household largely reflects its socio-economic status in the village/locality. The distribution of sample households by the number of living rooms in their houses is shown in table 5.

Table 5
Distribution of the Sample Households by No. of Living Rooms

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents					Total
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five and Above	
1	Ananthapuramu	11 (5.00)	123 (55.91)	79 (35.91)	5 (2.27)	2 (0.91)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	14 (6.36)	127 (57.73)	70 (31.82)	8 (3.64)	1 (0.45)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	21 (9.55)	132 (60.00)	55 (25.00)	11 (5.00)	1 (0.45)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	15 (6.82)	121 (55.00)	68 (30.91)	13 (5.91)	3 (1.36)	220 (100.00)
Total		61 (6.93)	503 (57.16)	272 (30.91)	37 (4.20)	7 (0.80)	880 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

As per table 5 a preponderant majority i.e.57.16 per cent of the sample households were residing in houses with two living rooms, such a percentage varying from 55 per cent in Kadapa district to 60 per cent in Kurnool district. In 30.91 per cent of households the number of living rooms is three. The living rooms in 4.20 per cent of households were four. Only 6.93 per cent of the sample households resided in houses with one living room. Only 7 out of 880 households have five and above living rooms.

Electricity Connection

The electric connection to a household is a primary need for the family. The number of sample households electrified is shown in table 6.

Table 6
Distribution of the Sample Households by Electricity Connection

S. No	Name of the District	Opinion	Total
		Yes	
1	Ananthapuramu	220 (100.0)	220 (100.0)
2	Chittoor	220 (100.0)	220 (100.0)
3	Kurnool	220 (100.0)	220 (100.0)
4	Kadapa	220 (100.0)	220 (100.0)
Total		880 (100.0)	880 (100.0)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

It is crystal clear from table 6 that all sample households in the study area were electrified. It can be attributed for the policy of the state government to supply electricity to the households which uses one electric lamp.

Source of Drinking Water

The percentage of the respondent households in terms of the source of drinking water is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Distribution of the Sample Households by Drinking Water Source

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents			
		PWS	Bore well	Others	Total
1	Ananthapuramu	181 (82.27)	33 (15.00)	6 (2.73)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	177 (80.45)	31 (14.09)	12 (5.45)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	174 (79.09)	38 (17.27)	5 (2.27)	217 (98.64)
4	Kadapa	178 (80.91)	40 (18.18)	2 (0.91)	220 (100.00)
Total		710 (80.96)	142 (16.19)	25 (2.85)	877 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

Table 7 indicates that nearly 80.96 per cent of the sample households were dependent on protected water supply (PWS) for drinking water, such a percentage being lowest at 79.09 per cent in Kurnool district and 82.27

per cent in Ananthapuramu district. About 16.19 per cent of the sample households fetching drinking water from bore wells. There are small variations with regard to fetching drinking water from bore wells. In Chittoor district 14.09 per cent of the respondent families were dependent on bore wells and in Kadapa district 18.18 per cent the respondent families were depending on bore wells for drinking water. The proportion of households depending on open wells and other sources for drinking water was, however, negligible.

Land Holding Size

The economic status of a family depends on the land possessed by particular family. It is truer in case of rural areas. As such during field survey the details of landholdings of sample respondents were collected and presented in table 8.

Table 8
Distribution of the Sample Households by Landholding Size Group

S. No.	District	Number of Households by Landholding Size Group					
		Land less	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Big Farmers	Total
1	Ananthapuramu	32 (14.55)	77 (35.00)	73 (33.18)	28 (12.73)	10 (4.55)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	27 (12.27)	81 (36.82)	76 (34.55)	31 (14.09)	5 (2.27)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	30 (13.64)	75 (34.09)	71 (32.27)	36 (16.36)	8 (3.64)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	29 (13.18)	83 (37.73)	64 (29.09)	38 (17.27)	6 (2.73)	220 (100.00)
Total		118 (13.41)	316 (35.91)	284 (32.27)	133 (15.11)	29 (3.30)	880 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

* Marginal Farmers (up to 2.5 acres); Small Farmers (2.5 to 5 acres);
Medium Farmers (5.0 to 10 acres); Big Farmers (Above 10 acres).

The data in table 8 shows that the landless accounted for 13.41 per cent, such a percentage varying from 12.27 per cent in Chittoor district to 14.55 per cent in Ananthapuramu district. Nearly 35.91 per cent of sample respondent families were possessing 2.5 acres of land, which are termed as marginal holdings. About 32.27 per cent of the sample households belonged to the category of small farmers and one-third marginal farmers. Around 15.11 per cent of the respondent families belonged to the medium and 3.30 per cent belong to the big farmers' category. Thus, nearly 81.59 per cent of the sample households belonged to the economically weaker sections of the society namely the landless, and marginal and small farmers; there was no much variation in the corresponding figure across the four districts.

Land Particulars

The land particulars of the sample households are presented in table 9. The total land possessed by 762 sample households stood at 4816 acres comprising 3715.95 acres of dry land (77.16) and 1100.25 acres of irrigated land (22.84). The average land owned per household worked out to 6.32 acres in the case of the land owning sample households.

Table 9
Land Particulars of the Sample Households

(acres)

S. No	Name of the District	Dry Land Owned	Dry Land Cultivated	Irrigated land Owned	Irrigated land cultivated
1	Ananthapuramu	901.5	887.5	269	267.85
2	Chittoor	898.25	766	282.5	278.35
3	Kurnool	1014.85	989	331.5	329.5
4	Kadapa	901.35	878	217.25	215.5
Total		3715.95	3520.5	1100.25	1091.2

Source: Field Data

The total land cultivated by the sample households stood at 4611.7 acres consisting of 3520.5 acres of dry land (76.34) and 1091.2 acres of irrigated land (23.66). The average land cultivated land per household worked out to 6.05 acres in the case of the sample households.

Cropping Pattern

The cropping followed by the sample households is shown in table 10. It may be seen from table 10 that groundnut was the single most important crop grown by the sample households, accounting for 25.1 per cent of the gross cropped area. The other important crops include paddy (15.2), jowar (15.2) and horticultural crops (17.4). Besides, the sample households grew mulberry, sunflower, sugarcane and a few other crops. There was no much variation with regard to the cropping pattern across the different districts.

Table - 10
Cropping pattern of the Sample Household during 2013-14

Name of the District	Area under each crop (acres)								Total
	Paddy	Sugar	Ground nut	Mulberry	Sun flower	Jowar	Horti-culture	Others	
Ananthapuramu	112	29	335	184	45	220	201	29	1155
Chittoor	98	32	290	178	39	185	182	41	1045
Kurnool	349	44	173	218	101	112	229	92	1318
Kadapa	142	21	361	101	38	183	190	58	1094
Total	701	126	1159	681	223	700	802	220	4612
	15.2	2.7	25.1	14.8	4.8	15.2	17.4	4.8	100.0

Source: Field Data

Note: The total area under all crops does not tally with the total land cultivated due to rounding off errors

Possession of Assets

The possession of assets by the sample households is presented in table 11. It may be noted from table 11 that 471 out of 880 sample households (53.52) possessed one bullock cart each. The average value of bullock cart worked out to Rs.25, 716. In addition, 312 households (35.45) possessed electric motors, with the average value per household being Rs.21, 013. 569 households constituting 64.66 per cent possessed other agricultural implements worth about Rs.38, 120 per household. Besides, 848 households (96.36) possessed different types of durable household goods such as television, fridge, fan, gas stove, furniture, etc., the average value of such goods being Rs.35, 963 per household. Thus, the possession of assets could be noticed only in the case of slightly over three-fourth of the sample households.

Table 11
Possession of Assets by the sample Households

S. No	Name of the District	No. of HH Possessing Bullock Carts	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)	No. of HH Possessing agriculture Implements	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)	No. of HH Possessing Electric Motors	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)	No. of HH Possessing Durable Household Goods	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)
1	Ananthapuramu	109 (49.55)	23587	148 (67.27)	39780	66 (30.00)	21500	214 (97.27)	35900
2	Chittoor	121 (55.00)	28950	164 (74.55)	41500	105 (47.73)	22100	215 (97.73)	34650
3	Kurnool	113 (51.36)	25450	125 (56.82)	35000	75 (34.09)	19800	211 (95.91)	37800
4	Kadapa	128 (58.18)	24879	132 (60.00)	36200	66 (30.00)	20650	208 (94.55)	35500
Total		471	102866	569	152480	312	84050	848	143850
Mean value		(53.52)	25716.5	(64.66)	38120	(35.45)	21013	(96.36)	35963

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total.

Possession of Gold and Silver

Table 12 shows the number of sample households possessing ornaments made of gold or silver.

Table -12

Possession of Gold and Silver by the sample households

S. No	Name of the District	No. of HH Possessing Gold	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)	No. of HH Possessing Silver	Mean Value Per Household (Rs.)
1	Ananthapuramu	165 (75.00)	59900	208 (94.55)	15650
2	Chittoor	181 (82.27)	172500	214 (97.27)	18000
3	Kurnool	162 (73.64)	48750	211 (95.91)	21800
4	Kadapa	154 (70.00)	52625	209 (95.00)	18750
Total		662	333775	842	74200
Mean value		(75.23)	83444	(95.68)	18550

Source: Field Data

Note Figures in the parentheses indicate the number of households possessing gold/silver.

It could be seen from table 12 that 662 households (75.23 per cent) possessed gold ornaments with an average value of gold being Rs.83, 444per household. In addition, 842 households (95.68 per cent) possessed silver ornaments with the average value of silver being Rs.18, 550 per household.

Earnings from different Sources

The earnings of the sample households from different sources are shown in table 13.

Table -13
Source-wise Earnings of the sample Households

S. No	Name of the District	Earning of the sample households from different sources during 2014-15						Total (Rs.)
		Agriculture (Rs.)	Agricultural labour (Rs.)	Animal Husbandry (Rs.)	Artisan (Rs.)	Forest based activity(Rs.)	Others (Rs.)	
1	Ananthapuramu	9840000 (209)	1381000 (218)	580000 (43)	290250 (32)	392000 (114)	785000 (9)	18068250 (625)
2	Chittoor	6533000 (214)	1557000 (213)	431000 (52)	287550 (28)	658000 (109)	76000 (13)	13742550 (629)
3	Kurnool	9905000 (211)	2158000 (204)	390000 (49)	175980 (18)	328500 (125)	81000 (11)	16638480 (618)
4	Kadapa	3252500 (215)	2038000 (212)	334000 (41)	158000 (15)	320000 (118)	85000 (14)	9087500 (615)
Total		29530500 (849)	7134000 (847)	1735000 (185)	1735000 (185)	1698500 (466)	1027000 (47)	57536780 (840)
Average per households		34782.69	8422.67	9378.38	9378.38	3644.85	21851.06	50043.79

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in the parentheses indicate the number of households deriving earnings from a particular source.

It may be noted from table 13 that the sample households had multiple sources of income. Out of 880 sample households, 849 households (96.48) were dependent on agriculture. The dependence on agricultural labour could be noticed in the case of 847 households (96.25 per cent). The dependence on forest based activities was noticed in respect of 466 households (52.95 per cent). Besides, 185 households (21.02 per cent) were deriving some income from animal husbandry and 93 households (10.57 per cent) from artisan activities.

Borrowings from different sources

The borrowings of the sample households from different sources are presented in table 14.

Table - 14
Source-wise borrowings of the Sample Households

S. No	Name of the District	Amount Borrowed from different sources (Rs.)					Total (Rs.)
		SHGs (Rs.)	Cooperative banks (Rs.)	CBs/RRB (Rs.)	Landlords/ Money lenders (Rs.)	Traders / Commission agents (Rs.)	
1	Anantha-puramu	1915000 (201)	1030000 (39)	4469000 (28)	560000 (147)	425780 (69)	8399780
2	Chittoor	1899000 (208)	5275000 (28)	5135000 (89)	99000 (108)	520000 (71)	12928000
3	Kurnool	2150000 (199)	1110000 (31)	3820000 (47)	900000 (122)	718952 (44)	8698952
4	Kadapa	1791000 (214)	859000 (18)	1950000 (87)	86000 (101)	850000 (88)	5536000
Total		7755000 (822)	8274000 (116)	15374000 (251)	1645000 (478)	2514732 (272)	35562732
Borrowings Households as of total Households		93.41	13.18	28.52	54.32	30.91	
Average per households (Rs.)		9434.31	71327.59	61251.00	3441.42	9245.34	18340.76
Total Borrowings		21.8	23.3	43.2	4.6	7.1	100.0

Source: Field Data

Note: (1) Figures in the Parentheses indicate the number of households borrowing from a particular source.

(2) Some households have borrowed from multiple sources

It may be noted from table 14 that about 93.41 per cent of the sample households borrowed from SHGs, 4.6 per cent borrowed from Landlords/ Money lenders and 7.1 per cent borrowed from traders. Regarding the access to institutional credit, about 28.51 per cent households borrowed from Commercial Banks/and Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) and 13.8 per cent of the sample households had access to cooperatives. The total borrowings of the sample households stood at Rs.3.55 crores, the average per household being Rs.40, 412.

With regard to the share of different agencies in the borrowings of the sample households, it could be noted from table 14 that Commercial Banks/and Regional Rural Banks were the single most important source accounting for 43.2 per cent of the total borrowings. The borrowings from the cooperatives accounted for 23.3 per cent. Besides, the sample households also borrowed from the SHGs which accounted for about 21.8 per cent of their total borrowings. The share of Landlords/Money lenders in the total borrowings is 4.6 per cent. The borrowings from the traders constituted only 7.1 per cent of the total.

Savings in different Agencies

The savings of the sample households in different agencies are shown in table 15.

Table -15

Source-wise savings of the sample households

S. No	Name of the District	Amount saved by source (Rs.)				Total
		SHG	Post office	Banks	Land lords	
1	Ananthapuramu	944900 (228)	268000 (14)	3147000 (21)	2970000 (5)	7329900
2	Chittoor	838500 (198)	313000 (19)	150000 (18)	325000 (1)	1626500
3	Kurnool	938000 (211)	132050 (13)	115000 (23)	290300 (0)	1475350
4	Kadapa	721500 (221)	125900 (12)	217000 (20)	290000 (1)	1354400
Total		3442900 (858)	838950 (58)	3629000 (82)	3875300 (7)	11786150
Households with Saving as total Households		97.5	6.6	9.3	0.8	
Average savings per household (Rs.)		3912. 386364	953.35	4123. 863636	4403.75	13393. 352
Percentage of total savings		29.2	7.1	30.8	32.9	100.0

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in the parentheses indicate the number of households saving in SHG/Post- Office/Bank.

It may be seen from table 15 that only about two-thirds of the sample households had some savings. The SHGs appear to be the single most important agency available to the sample households for saving money, which accounted for 97.5 per cent of their total savings. While only 6.6 per cent of the sample households could save in post office, the correspondent figure pertaining to banks was 9.3 per cent. The total savings of the sample households stood at Rs.1.17 crores, the average per household being Rs.13, 393. Out of the savings amount, 29.2 per cent was put in the SHGs, while post office and banks accounted for 7.1 per cent 30.8 per cent respectively.

Education Status of the Sample Respondents

The distribution of the sample respondents by their education status is presented in table 16.

Table -16

Distribution of the sample respondents by Education status

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents							Total
		Illiterate	Just literate	Primary	Secondary	High school	Inter-mediate	Graduate	
1	Ananthapuramu	131 (59.55)	23 (10.45)	13 (5.91)	15 (6.82)	19 (8.64)	10 (4.55)	9 (4.09)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	152 (69.09)	13 (5.91)	8 (3.64)	22 (10.00)	14 (6.36)	6 (2.73)	5 (2.27)	220 (100.00)

3	Kurnool	139 (63.18)	16 (7.27)	13 (5.91)	23 (10.45)	5 (2.27)	13 (5.91)	11 (5.00)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	153 (69.55)	7 (3.18)	17 (7.73)	14 (6.36)	10 (4.55)	8 (3.64)	11 (5.00)	220 (100.00)
Total		575 (65.34)	59 (6.70)	51 (5.80)	74 (8.41)	48 (5.45)	37 (4.20)	36 (4.09)	880 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

It may be noted from table 16 that 65.34 per cent of the sample respondents were illiterate, varying from 59.55 per cent in Ananthapuramu district to 69.55 per cent in Kadapa district. The just literates (without any formal schooling) constituted 6.70 per cent of the sample respondents. The sample respondents with some formal education accounted for 27.95 per cent of the total – about 5.80 per cent had studied only up to primary school level, 8.41 per cent up to secondary school level and 5.45 per cent up to high school level. The respondents completed Intermediate constitutes 4.20 per cent and 4.09 per cent completed graduation.

Primary Occupation of the Sample Respondents

Table 17 presents the distribution of sample respondents by primary occupation. It could be seen from table 17 that a majority of the sample respondents (74.77) pursued agriculture as their primary occupation, followed by agricultural labour (18.18).

Table - 17
Distribution of the Sample Respondents by Primary Occupation

S. No.	District	District Wise Coverage of Respondents					Total
		Agriculture	Wage Labour	Non-Agriculture	sheep rearing	Household Activities	
1	Ananthapuramu	179 (81.36)	27 (12.27)	11 (5.00)	2 (0.91)	1 (0.45)	220 (100.00)
2	Chittoor	192 (87.27)	18 (8.18)	9 (4.09)	1 (0.45)	0 (0.00)	220 (100.00)
3	Kurnool	166 (75.45)	31 (14.09)	12 (5.45)	6 (2.73)	5 (2.27)	220 (100.00)
4	Kadapa	121 (55.00)	84 (38.18)	9 (4.09)	4 (1.82)	2 (0.91)	220 (100.00)
Total		658 (74.77)	160 (18.18)	41 (4.66)	13 (1.48)	8 (0.91)	880 (100.00)

Source: Field Data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis is percentage to Total

The percentage of respondents pursuing agriculture as their primary occupation varied from 55 per cent in Kadapa district to 87.27 per cent in Chittoor district. Only 1.48 per cent was pursuing sheep rearing as their

primary occupation and 4.66 per cent were non-agriculture labour. Household activities are the primary occupation for only 0.91 per cent of respondents. There were not many variations in the percentage of respondents depending on agricultural labour as their primary occupation across the different sample districts.

Overview

To sum up, it may be said that over four-fifths of the sample households belonged to socially and economically backward sections. Even though the sample households had higher number of males among the workers, the work participation rates were higher for females when compared to males. Over four-fifths of the sample households were primarily dependent upon agriculture and agricultural labour for their livelihood. In addition, the forest based activities occupied an important place in their livelihoods, accounting for about one-eighth share in the total earnings. Only about one-fourth of the sample households reported the possession of some household articles. They were dependent on both institutional and non-institutional sources of credit, but had very limited access to institutional agencies like banks and post offices for savings. Over two-thirds of the sample respondents were illiterate. Even the literacy levels were also low in the case of the sample respondents, with only a few having education up to 10th class or above.

