Economic Performance of Scheduled Caste: An analysis from Socio-Economic Caste Census of India

Dr. Enayat Bano¹, Dr. Pasarul Islam²

^{1,2} Researh Scholar, Department of Geography, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India.

Abstract: This paper attempted to examine the economic status of Scheduled Castes and Other Castes and to compare the economic performance between SCs and Other groups based on the Socio-Economic Caste Census of India (2011). The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) method of data standardization has been used, while ONE WAY ANOVA, Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation and Coefficient of Variation statistical techniques have been applied in this work. The outcomes of the study reflect that the overall economic conditions of SCs are made satisfactory progress due to various governmental policies and measures in India.

Keywords: Scheduled Castes, Other Caste groups, Economic Performance, Policies

Introduction

Economic inequality refers to the uneven distribution of income, wealth and opportunities between different groups in society and it has been a major concern in almost all the countries of the world. India is a caste based society that is based on hierarchy and graded inequality (Borooah, 2005). The caste in Indian society is still the most important factor in determining the social, political and economic status of a person. In India, Hindu society is classified into four major castes on the basis of occupation i.e. Brahman, Khastriya, Vaishyas and Shudras. Shudras or dalits are placed at a much lower level in terms of both social and economic status as compared to the higher castes (Raju, 1992). Scheduled Castes, being the bottom rung of the social ladder, are denied several occupations which are relatively cleaner or well paid. Hence they are compelled to engage in menial jobs which yield low income. The Scheduled Castes in villages are among the very bottom elements of Indian society in both status and economic terms (Mendelsohn & Vicziany, 1998). They are associated with a variety of specialized traditional occupations such as scavenging, cobbling, disposal of carcasses, rickshaw pulling, pig-rearing, basketry etc. The National Family Health Survey 2015-2016(NFHS, 2015) reveals that 26.6 per cent of the SCs populations are under the lowest wealth bracket compared to 9.7 per cent of other castes. The per capita consumption expenditure declines as we move from Higher Castes to OBC and SCs, indicating the persistence of graded inequality in income. The graded inequality in consumption expenditure is also reflected in poverty. About 22 per cent of the total people of India lie below the poverty line while it is only 9 per cent among higher castes. Thus poverty increases as we go down in caste hierarchy to lower middle castes with OBC at 20 per cent and 30 per cent among SC located at the bottom of caste gradation (NSSO, 2012). They are regarded as economically poor and socially oppressed and hence cannot avail freely of the benefits of constitutional provisions made for them due to their economic dependence on Non-Scheduled Castes (Gupta, 1991). Restriction on the mobility of labour also leads to unemployment among the SCs. By not permitting readjustment of employment, caste becomes a direct cause much of involuntary unemployment among the low castes (Akerlof, 1980; Ambedkar, 1987).

The deprivation of the scheduled castes in respect of ownership of land had been most severe and even now they have only a small percentage of the agricultural land (Ahmad & Bano, 2018). Land ownership has been in the past and still continues to be the most important determinant of social status and economic security in the predominantly agricultural economy of rural India (Mohanty, 2001). The main objective of this paper is to analyze the economic performance of SCs and other groups. **Objectives of the Study**

The following objectives have been taken into consideration for the study:

- 1. To examine the economic status of Scheduled Castes and Other Castes in the study area.
- 2. To compare the economic performance between Scheduled Castes and Other Castes in the region.

Study Area

The present study has been carried out in Kaimur district of Bihar, which is located between $24^{\circ}0'13"$ N to $25^{\circ}0'24"$ N latitude and $83^{\circ}0'19'E$ to $83^{\circ}0'51'E$ longitude. As per Census of India (2011), Kaimur district ranks 32^{nd} in terms of population (1,626,384) and 6th in terms of area (3,362 Sq.Km) in the state of Bihar. The district has only 4.03 per cent urban population as compared to the state average 11.29 per cent. Agriculture has the largest share of employment in the region i.e. 52.55 per cent. There are 23 sub- castes of scheduled caste in Bihar, among them chamar constitutes more than two-third of the total SC population. The literacy rate of the district is 69.34 per cent, of which 79.37 per cent are males and 58.40 per cent are females. While the literacy rate of scheduled caste population in the study area is only 46.92 per cent with 56.64 per cent males and 37.92 per cent females. The work participation rate of SCs is 34.18 per cent whereas 31.43 percent among Non-Scheduled Castes. Most of the scheduled castes is 46 per cent.

Database methodology

The present study is based on secondary sources of data, collected from the Socio-economic Caste census, Census of India, and District Statistical Handbook (2011). Block has been taken as a unit of study. In order to highlight the economic status of SCs and Others, four indicators have been selected in the present study which include house types, ownership of land, sources of income as well as levels of income. The variables which are considered in house types are kutcha, pucca, and semi-pucca houses; land

holdeprars and landless population; cultivators, manual casual labour's and other workers for sources of incomes, and finally incomes that has been divided into three categories viz. below five thousand, five to ten thousand and more than ten thousand rupees (table 5).

The method invented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for the standardization of data of Human Development Index (HDI) is adopted in the study (Bano, 2020).

Actual Value – Minimum Value Data Standardisation = $\frac{Metaal + Meta}{Maximum Value - Minimum Value}$

If the data is in percentage form, then the minimum value should be Zero (0) and the maximum should be Hundred (100). In the data are in absolute number, for that minimum and maximum value would be from the table value. The value of index ranges from zero (0) to one (1). Here, 'zero' indicates the lowest and 'one' denotes the highest value of the individual parameter.

The technique of analysis of variance i.e. ONE WAY ANOVA has been used to measures the economic inequality between SCs and Others. To know the degree of contribution of various factors in economic inequality Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation method is adopted which is calculated with the following formula;

$$r = \frac{\sum XY - (\sum X) \cdot (\sum Y)/N}{\sqrt{\left[\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2/N\right] \left[\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2/N\right]}}$$

Where, r = Coefficient of Correlation

X, Y = the two given variables

N = Number of Observations

The Coefficient of Variation (CV) method is applied to find out the levels of economic inequality between SCs and Others using the following formula;

$$CV = \frac{S.D}{Mean} X \ 100$$

Where, CV= Coefficient of Variation

S.D. = Standard Deviation of ith variable in j block

And finally the Composite Standardized Score (CSS) is calculated using the formula of;

$$CSS = \frac{IIJ}{N}$$

Where, Iij denotes standardized score of all variables i in block j

N refers to the total number of variables

Selection of Indicators

Housing Types

Housing is one of the basic necessities of human beings which reflect the social and economic condition of a particular household. Although the government has taken various initiatives to provide shelter to houseless population specially SCs but failed to achieve the targets. Households who have no shelter forced to sleep under the open sky. Census identifies three basic types of houses i.e. kutcha, pucca and semi-pucca or kutcha. Thus housing conditions are the important determinant of economic development (Sinha, 2014).

Ownership of Land

Land being the most crucial asset in rural India, its absence with other deprivations means a household has no asset and is that much more vulnerable. It has an uncertain source of income, without skills and also no asset to fall back upon (Shah et al., 2007). According to census of India (2011) more than half of the scheduled castes households in the country are landless whereas, only one third of the families having land in the study area.

Sources and levels of Income

The SCs are economically most backward section of our society. The income level of SCs is very low because of lack of own earning assets (land), secure employment and education. The ownership of the country's total wealth is mainly concentrated in the hand of non-scheduled castes. Praxis Annual Report (2009) stated that almost of all the SCs are doing work as safaikarmachari and around 82.54 per cent of the total sanitation workers hail from Dom, Mehtar and Bhangi communities of scheduled castes.

Result and Discussion

Economic Performance of Scheduled Castes

It can be seen from table 5 that 62.75 per cent SCs have been living in kutcha houses as compared to 37.41 per cent of other castes. The pathetic condition of poor housing among SCs may be attributed to their poverty and non access of government housing schemes (Sundaram & Tendulkar, 2003). Ownership of land is not only an asset but also a determinant of degree of financial security, social status, power or even the identity. The study reveals that only one-third of SCs population in the district having own land which is lower than other castes who account for remaining two-third. The scenario of occupation is even worse as it indicates that 87.09 per cent SCs are entirely dependent on causal manual work for their livelihood by earning less than five thousand rupees per month. Therefore, needless to say that there is a huge inequality in terms of economic status between SCs and other castes in the district.

Indicators		Variables										
mulcators		Economic Condition		Economic inequality								
House Types	X1	Percentage of households having kutcha houses to total household	Y1	Percentage of households Pucca Household to total household								

	X2	Percentage of households having semi-pucca houses to total household						
	X3	Percentage of Pucca Household to total household						
Land Ownership	X4	Percentage of having Own land to total household	va	Percentage of households having own land to				
	X5	Percentage of Landless households to total household	12	total household				
	X6	Percentage of Cultivators to total workers						
Sources of Income	X7	Percentage of Manual casual labour to total workers	Y3	Percentage of Cultivators to total workers				
	X8	Percentage of Others to total workers	Y4	Percentage of Others to total workers				
	X9	Percentage of household having income Rs. 5000 per month	V5	Percentage of household having income Rs.				
Level of Income	X10	Percentage of household having income Rs. 5000 to 10000 per month	15	5000 to 10000 per month				
	X11	Percentage of household having income Rs. Above 10000 per month	Y6	Percentage of household having income Rs. Above 10000 per month				

Source: Socio-Economic and Caste Census, 2011

It has been assumed that there is a significant economic inequality between SCs and other castes. The variables taken into consideration to measures economic inequality are, percentage of pucca household to total household, percentage of households having own land to total household, percentage of cultivators to total workers, percentage of others to total workers, percentage of household having income between five to ten thousand per month, percentage of households having income ten thousand per month. The researchers while selecting variables have given preferences to those variables which are found to be most relevant for economic development as well as showing the dominance of other castes people. The result of analysis of variance (table 2) indicates that the F-value is greater than the F-critical value meaning thereby, that there is a significant inequality in terms of economic conditions where SCs are far behind than of others castes. Therefore, the hypothesis seems to be accepted at 99 per cent level of significance. Variable wise analysis shows that a highest inequality has been recorded in cultivation sectors where around 67 per cent SCs are landless as compared to 33 per cent of other castes followed by land ownership, income between five to ten thousand rupees, income more than ten thousand rupees and pucca houses. But the lowest inequality is found in others working sectors. The reason for such is due to the high participation of SCs in menial works, daily wage activities while other castes people engaged either in government sectors or private jobs (L C Jain, 1981).

	Variables	ON	E WAY AN	Contribution to			
		F- value	F- crit.	P- value	Economic inequality		
Y1	Pucca houses	22.552		0.000	0.973**		
Y2	Land ownership	48.063		0.000	0.951**		
Y3	Cultivation	84.127		0.000	0.889**		
Y4	Other workers	16.970		0.001	0.152		
Y5	Income between five to ten thousand rupees	33.831	4.385	0.000	0.946**		
Y6	Income more than ten thousand rupees	32.041		0.000	0.697*		
Ove	rall Economic Inequality	78.669		0.000			

Table 2: Economic inequality between SCs and Other Castes

*. Correlation is significant at 95 per cent. ** .Correlation is significant at 99 per cent.

Source: Calculated by Researcher

The result of Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation reveals that the variables which have relatively higher contribution in economic inequality between SCs and other castes are pucca houses (0.973**) followed by land ownership (0.951**), income between five to ten thousand rupees (0.946**) and cultivation (0.889**) at 99 per cent level of significance. The variable of income more than ten thousand rupees is associated with economic inequality at 95 per cent level of significance (table 2).

Levels of Economic Inequality

Amartya Sen stated that the relative advantages and disadvantages that people have; compared with each other can be judged in terms of many different variables, e.g. income, wealth, utilities, resources, quality of life and so on. The well accepted technique of Coefficient of Variation (CV) is adopted to measure the economic inequality between SCs and Other Castes in the present study. Higher the value of coefficient greater the extent of inequality and vice versa. In order to find out the spatial distribution of economic inequality between these communities, all the blocks of the district have been categories into three grade of high (more than 51.60 per cent), medium (35.63 to 51.60 per cent) and low (less than 35.63 per cent) inequality (figure 2). The study reveals that there are eight blocks namely Ramgarh, Kudra, Chand, Bhagwanpur, Chainpur, Nuaon, Durgawati, Mohania, which have recorded higher economic inequality because in these blocks SCs have relatively higher landlessness, poverty, illiteracy, discrimination and exploited by dominant castes, whereas two blocks namely Rampur and Bhabua come under the category of moderate inequality. Only one block i.e. Adhaura has recorded as low inequality because of comparatively low level of landlessness

83°15'0"E 83°30'0"E 83°45'0"E 84°0'0"E KAIMUR DISTRICT N..0.020.57 25°30'0"N Levels of Economic Inequality Between SCs and Other Castes (2011)12 KILOMETERS Ramgarh 25°15'0''N N...0.51.07 Durgawati Mohania Chan Kudra Bhabua N., 0.0.57 N...0.0.57 Chainpu Bhagwanpur Rampu 24°45'0"N 24°45'0"N Per cent Adhanra Above 51.60 High Medium 35.63 to 51.60 Low Below 35.63 24°30'0"N 24°30' 83°15'0"E 83°30'0"E 83°45'0"E 84°0'0"E Figure 2

among SCs. This block is affected by naxal activities resulted which has resulted in major share of lower caste people over common land properties as well as forest products which become the sources of earning and livelihood particularly the scheduled castes.

Conclusion

The above discussion highlights that the most backward community of Indian society, i.e., Scheduled Castes are made remarkable enhancements in their economic performance over the decade. But their economic conditions are comparatively lacking from upper caste groups in the study region. Most of the SCs are either landless or hold marginal and small size of land in rural areas which are major causes of their economic backwardness A large number of SCs people migrate to far-off places in search of employment during lean agricultural season (Barman, 2014; Mamgain, 2013). Those who work as agricultural labourer and do not get proper wage. It is unfortunate that despite such a large number of people engaged as agricultural labour, there is no satisfactory mechanism to protect their rights, ensure them payment of minimum wages and stop their exploitation. Such multidimensional discrimination and deprivation have resulted high rate of poverty among them (Thorat, 2005; Thorat & Sabharwal, 2011). The study also reveals that landlessness is a major factor for their low status because it plays a crucial role to enhance the income of rural population. Unemployment, poverty and low wages of the landless labourers force their children and women to work at even lower rates and in exploitative conditions. The government should take steps for training, skill progradation, co-operatisation and better organization of the traditional occupations of the SCs to provide them help in the form of access to raw materials, finance and marketing of the products.

D1 1	_	14		1 Leono														
Blocks	Pu	icca	ca Owned		Cult	ivato	oti	iers	Rs. :	5000-	R	s. >	Т	otal	Coefficient of			
			land		rs				10)00	10	000			Variation (CV)			
	SC	Oth	SC	Oth	SC	Oth	SC	Oth	SC	Oth	SC Oth		SC	Oth	S.	Me	Inequalit	
		ers		ers		ers		ers		ers		ers		ers	D	an	y (%)	
Ramga	0.3	0.73	0.3	0.71	0.0	0.38	0.0	0.09	0.1	0.30	0.0	0.18	0.1	0.40	0.1	0.2	55.08	
rh	99	6	58	0	78	1	57	5	22	1	43	2	76	1	59	88		
Nuaon	0.2	0.60	0.2	0.68	0.0	0.40	0.0	0.05	0.0	0.28	0.0	0.09	0.1	0.35	0.1	0.2	67.56	
	41	3	80	0	69	8	50	7	97	3	14	3	25	4	62	39		
Kudra	0.3	0.61	0.2	0.67	0.0	0.36	0.0	0.13	0.2	0.36	0.0	0.17	0.1	0.38	0.1	0.2	56.07	
	11	3	98	6	79	2	60	6	12	6	46	4	68	8	56	78		
Mohan	0.4	0.73	0.3	0.72	0.0	0.39	0.0	0.10	0.1	0.30	0.0	0.11	0.1	0.39	0.1	0.2	53.17	
ia	35	5	43	8	99	2	43	5	22	0	36	7	80	6	53	88		
Durga	0.3	0.71	0.3	0.79	0.0	0.41	0.0	0.07	0.1	0.34	0.0	0.13	0.1	0.41	0.1	0.2	55.28	
wati	90	1	76	1	68	4	48	7	67	4	35	9	81	3	64	97		
Chand	0.2	0.50	0.3	0.74	0.0	0.40	0.0	0.02	0.0	0.22	0.0	0.08	0.1	0.33	0.1	0.2	57.73	
	70	7	83	3	64	7	23	8	87	6	11	4	40	2	36	36		
Chainp	0.2	0.42	0.2	0.51	0.0	0.20	0.0	0.06	0.0	0.20	0.0	0.05	0.1	0.24	0.0	0.1	54.00	
ur	43	9	41	1	49	8	32	9	78	4	18	8	10	7	96	78		
Bhabua	0.2	0.52	0.3	0.62	0.0	0.33	0.0	0.07	0.1	0.28	0.0	0.14	0.1	0.33	0.1	0.2	47.48	
	92	4	39	0	71	6	52	4	83	8	50	0	64	0	17	47		
Rampu	0.2	0.45	0.4	0.70	0.1	0.44	0.0	0.08	0.1	0.32	0.0	0.13	0.1	0.35	0.1	0.2	47.05	
r	37	9	12	7	47	0	46	7	80	1	53	2	79	8	26	68		
Bhagw	0.2	0.45	0.2	0.56	0.0	0.34	0.0	0.07	0.0	0.18	0.0	0.05	0.1	0.28	0.1	0.1	58.81	
anpur	37	1	20	2	90	4	48	9	83	9	15	5	16	0	16	98		
Adhaur	0.1	0.22	0.6	0.80	0.3	0.45	0.0	0.08	0.2	0.22	0.0	0.07	0.2	0.31	0.0	0.2	19.67	
а	47	8	96	8	10	3	30	8	10	3	25	5	36	3	53	74		

Table 4: Economic Inequality between SCs and Others Castes in Kaimur district

Source: Calculated by Researcher based on Table 5

 Table 5: Percentage distribution of various indicators of economic development in Kaimur district

		He	ousin	g Typ	es		Land Ownership				Sources of Income						Level of Income (in rupees)												
BLO	Kutcha		Pu	Pucca		Pucca		Pucca		Pucca		Semi- Pucca		Own land		Landle ss		Cultiva tors		Manual casual labor		Others		Below 5000		5000- 1000		Above 10000	
CK5	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	SC	Oth ers	S C	Ot he rs	S C	ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs	S C	Ot he rs							
Ramg arh	52 .7 6	21 .5	39 .9 1	73 .5 6	7. 3 3	4. 02	35 .8 4	71 .0 4	64 .1 6	28 .9 6	7. 76	38 .0 8	86. 57	52.3 8	5. 6 7	9. 53	83 .5 4	51 .7 7	12 .2	30 .0 6	4. 2 5	18 .1 7							
Nuao n	66 .7 4	31 .2 6	24 .1	60 .3 4	9. 1 6	8	27 .9 6	67 .9 5	72 .0 4	32 .0 5	6. 86	40 .8 1	88. 15	53.5 1	4. 9 9	5. 68	88 .8 8	62 .4 8	9. 69	28 .2 5	1. 4 3	9. 27							
Kudr a	64 .2 1	32 .4 6	31 .0 8	61 .3 2	4. 7 1	5. 57	29 .8	67 .5 7	70 .2	32 .4 3	7. 9	36 .1 7	86. 15	50.2 7	5. 9 5	13 .5 5	74 .1 9	45 .9 8	21 .2 3	36 .6 5	4. 5 8	17 .3 8							
Moha nia	48 .9	20 .4 8	43 .5 3	73 .4 9	7. 5 7	5. 48	34 .3 4	72 .7 6	65 .6 6	27 .2 4	9. 85	39 .1 9	85. 83	50.2 9	4. 3 2	10 .5 2	84 .2 6	58 .2 8	12 .1 6	30 .0 3	3. 5 8	11 .6 9							
Durg awati	55 .9 3	23 .8 1	39	71 .0 8	5. 0 7	4. 45	37 .6 1	79 .0 6	62 .3 9	20 .9 4	6. 78	41 .4 1	88. 37	50.8 9	4. 8 5	7. 69	79 .8 4	51 .7 2	16 .6 8	34 .3 7	3. 4 9	13 .9 1							
Chan d	67 .9 5	43 .3	26 .9 9	50 .7 3	5. 0 6	5. 27	38 .2 8	74 .2 6	61 .7 2	25 .7 4	6. 45	40 .7	91. 3	56.5 3	2. 2 5	2. 78	90 .1 6	69 .0 2	8. 74	22 .6	1. 1	8. 37							
Chain pur	70 .1	52 .8 9	24 .3 2	42 .8 7	5. 5 9	4. 06	24 .0 6	51 .1 4	75 .9 4	48 .8 6	4. 93	20 .8 2	91. 82	72.3	3. 2 4	6. 88	90 .3 8	73 .7 7	7. 79	20 .4 4	1. 8 4	5. 79							
Bhab ua	65 .5 3	41 .8	29 .2	52 .4 4	5. 2 7	5. 08	33 .8 6	62	66 .1 4	38	7. 06	33 .6	87. 72	58.9 8	5. 2 2	7. 42	76 .7 4	57 .1 8	18 .3 1	28 .8	4. 9 5	14 .0 2							

Ramp	69 .5	46 .5	23 .6	45 .8	6. 7	4.	41 .2	70 .7	58 .7	29 .2	14 .7	44 .0	80.	47.2	4. 6	8.	76 .7	54 .7	17 .9	32 .1	5. 2	13 .1
ur	4	2	7	9	9	57	4	4	6	6	5	4	62	3	3	13	9	1	6	1	5	8
Bhag wanp ur	69 .2	46 .9 5	23 .6 6	45 .0 6	7. 1 4	6. 95	22 .0 4	56 .2 3	77 .9 6	43 .7 7	8. 97	34 .4 4	86. 2	57.6 2	4. 8 3	7. 94	90 .1 6	75 .6 1	8. 32	18 .9	1. 5 2	5. 49
Adha ura	82 .1 7	73 .3 5	14 .6 5	22 .8	3. 1 8	3. 17	69 .6 4	80 .8 5	30 .3 6	19 .1 5	30 .9 8	45 .2 9	66. 02	45.9 2	3	8. 79	76 .5 2	70 .1 9	21 .0 1	22 .3	2. 4 7	7. 5
Distri ct Total	62 .7 5	37 .4 1	31 .0 8	56 .7 2	6. 1 7	5. 13	33 .1 4	66 .5 2	66 .8 6	33 .4 8	8. 39	35 .7	87. 09	56.0 5	4. 5 3	8. 25	83 .0 5	60 .1 8	13 .6 4	28 .0 5	3. 3 1	11 .7 6

Source: Socio-Economic Caste Census, 2011

- References
 - Ahmad, S., & Bano, E. (2018). Deprivation in housing and basic amenities among scheduled castes in Kaimur District, 1. Bihar. *The Geographer*, 65(2), 20–26.
 - 2. Akerlof, G. (1980). A theory of social custom, of which unemployment may be one consequence. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 3, 1–94.
 - 3. Ambedkar, B. (1987). The Hindu social order-Its essential features. In B. Ambedkar (Ed.), Writings and Speeches (Vol. 3, pp. 96-115).
 - 4. Bano, E. (2020). Spatial dimensions of deprivation among scheduled castes population in Kaimur District [Aligarh Muslim University]. In University. https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in
 - 5. Barman, A. (2014). Socio-economic status of scheduled caste people in Kamrup district of Assam. Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies, 2(13), 1629–1640.
 - 6. Borooah, V. (2005). Caste, Inequality, and Poverty in India. Review of Development Economics, 9(3), 399-414. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9361.2005.00284.X
 - 7. Chandramouli, C., & General, R. (2011). Census of India. In censusindia.gov.in.
 - 8. District Census Handbook. (2011). Directorate of Census Operations Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.
 - Gupta, S. S. (1991). Varna Castes and Scheduled Castes. Concept Publishing Company. 9.
 - 10. L C Jain. (1981). Emancipation of Schedule Castes and Tribes: Some Suggestions. Economic and Political Weekly, 16(9), 325-332.
 - 11. Mamgain, R. P. (2013). Situating scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in the post-2015 development framework.
 - 12. Mendelsohn, O., & Vicziany, M. (1998). The untouchables: Subordination, poverty and the state in modern India.
 - 13. Mohanty, B. B. (2001). Land Distribution among Scheduled Castes and Tribes. Economic and Political Weekly, 36(40), 3857-3868. https://doi.org/10.2307/4411206
 - 14. NFHS. (2015). National Family Health Survey.
 - 15. NSSO. (2012). National Sample Survey (68th round): Employment and Unemployment.
 - 16. Praxis. (2009). Landlessness and Social Justice: An Assessment of Disparities in Land Distribution and Prospects of Land Reforms.
 - 17. Raju, V. (1992). An Inquiry into nature and extent of rehabilitation of the weaker sections in non-farm activity through IRDP - A Case Study in Srikakulam district, A.P. Journal of Rural Development, 2(6), 874.
 - 18. Shah, M., Rao, R., & Shankar, P. (2007). Rural Credit in 20th Century India: Overview of History and Perspectives . Economic and Political Weekly, 42(15), 14-20.
 - 19. Sinha, R. (2014). Institutional reform and public services: The case of Delhi. South Asia@LSE.
 - 20. Sundaram, K., & Tendulkar, S. D. (2003). articles Poverty Social among Groups in India and Economic in 1990s. Economic and Political Weekly, 38(50), 5263-5276. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4414401
 - 21. Thorat, S. (2005). Caste, Social Exclusion and Poverty Linkages Concept, Measurement and Empirical Evidence. Concept Paper for PACS, 1-28. https://doi.org/2005
 - 22. Thorat, S., & Sabharwal, N. (2011). Social exclusion and commons. Vocabulary of Commons, 359–385.