



# THE STUDY OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF URBAN BELOW POVERTY LINE FAMILIES IN AURANGABAD CITY, MAHARASHTRA

A. S. Kharpude<sup>1</sup> and M.M.Gaikwad<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Student,

Department of Economics

Saraswati Bhuwan Arts and Commerce College, Aurangabad

Maharashtra State, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor and Head

Department of Economics

Saraswati Bhuwan Arts and Commerce College, Aurangabad

Maharashtra State, India

## ABSTRACT:

The study has confined only to the urban local body of Aurangabad city, Maharashtra, India. Aurangabad city is an important industrial center and historical tourism center in the state of Maharashtra. According to the census conducted in the year 2011, the total population of Aurangabad City is 1175116. According to survey of Municipal Corporation Aurangabad, the 32556 families are in below poverty line in the city. There are 115 wards in Aurangabad Municipal Corporation, out of which 25 wards were selected for study using random sampling method. The main objective of the study was to understand the livelihoods socioeconomic status of urban below poverty line families in Aurangabad city. Approach of the research related to review of available data, reports and survey of the city and initial consultation with the stakeholders. Data collection has conducted on different parameters followed by reconnaissance survey and field visits, with the help structured interview schedule. The socioeconomic status serves to understand the way of people survive and making a living in poor urban areas.

**KEYWORDS:** Below poverty line, socioeconomic status, education, occupation

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Socioeconomic is an important determinant of the livelihoods as it influence level of knowledge, skill and income conditions which mean their living.

The Aurangabad city is an important industrial center and historical tourism center in the state of Maharashtra. Aurangabad is considered to be a classic example of efforts of state government towards balanced industrialization of state. The city was a major silk and cotton textile production center. A fine blend of silk with locally grown cotton was developed as Himroo textile. Paithani silk saris are also made in Aurangabad. With the opening of the Hyderabad-Godavari Valley Railways in the year 1900 several ginning factories were started. After 1960, Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation (MIDC) began acquiring land and setting up industrial estates. The Maharashtra Center for Entrepreneurship Development's main office is in Aurangabad. Major industries in Aurangabad are manufacturing, biotechnology, pharmaceuticals and automobiles etc. According to the census conducted in the year 2011, the total population of Aurangabad City is 1175116. According to survey of Municipal Corporation Aurangabad, the 32556 families are in below poverty line in the city. Livelihood opportunities of urban below poverty line families in Aurangabad cities are limited because most of the members of such families are unskilled workers. Most of them are working poor, and form a major part of the informal sector of economy. The urban poor, residing in certain pockets of the city such as informal settlements and inner city areas, are particularly vulnerable and struggle to gain access to services and opportunities to improve their livelihoods.

There has been a lot of discussion of late in the country regarding the number of people living below the poverty line (BPL families). They vary from 42% and 26% in rural and urban India. They also differ based on the different committees that had been formed to look into the problem. There is a need to identify the actual beneficiaries who will be benefitted by the government programs/subsidies. One of the tools available to measure the problem is the identification of SES of the family by applying the SES scales.

There are many different scales to measure the SES of a family. B G Prasad classification proposed in the year 1961 is a scale based on per capita monthly income (modified in 1968 and 1970), and has been used extensively in India. In rural areas Pareek classification based on nine characteristics viz. caste, occupation, education, level of social participation of head of the family, landholding, housing, farm power, material possession and total members in the family is widely used. Modified Kuppuswamy scale is commonly used to measure the SES in the urban communities. The scale includes the education, occupation of head of the family and income per month from all sources. To get current income group, a conversion factor calculated based on current All India Consumer Price Index (AICPI) is applied. The Government of India in the National Family Health Survey (NFHS - II) had used the Standard of Living Index (SLI) scale which contains 11 items viz. house type, source of lighting, toilet facility, main fuel for cooking, source of drinking water, separate room for cooking, ownership of the house, ownership of agricultural land, ownership of irrigated land, ownership of livestock, ownership of durable goods for measuring the SES both urban and rural areas for the entire country. However each of these scales available for measurement have their own advantages and disadvantages. The question asked is which of these classifications best measures SES of the population.

Socioeconomic status is typically broken into three categories, highSES, middle SES and low SES to describe the three areas of family. Placing a family into one of these categories any or all of three variables like Income, Education and Occupation has assessed. The present study had explored the measuring SES of the below poverty family in Aurangabad city

## 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the present study, we were used Kuppuswamy's classification of socioeconomic status scale for measuring socioeconomic status of below poverty line families of Aurangabad city, Maharashtra, India with accordance to the outcomes of research data of education, income and occupation.

## 2.1 EDUCATION

An education is the main factor of plays role to earn higher income. Better educate people have greater probability of being employed, are economically more productive and therefore earn higher income. Education stimulates economic growth and development of poor families. Education has been considered primary weapon against poverty. Education plays major role in skill sets for acquiring jobs as well as specific qualities that stratify people with higher SES from lower SES.

**Table No.1: Educational Qualification of Head of BPL Family**

Standard Score	Education	Frequency	Percent
1	Illiterate	55	13.75
2	Primary School	150	37.5
3	Middle School	78	19.5
4	Higher School	48	12
5	Intermediate	40	10
6	Graduate	17	4.25
7	Post Graduate	12	3
	<b>Total</b>	400	100

The above table clarify designated the education of the head of the BPL family by rating on seven point scale with a standard score ranging from 1 to 7. It was found that, 3 % of the more educated respondents had professional qualifications with post graduate, 4.25% were graduate, 10% were intermediate, 12 % were higher school, 19.5% were middle school and 37.5 % had completed primary school education. The 13.75 % head of the BPL families were illiterate.

## 2.2 OCCUPATION

Occupation of the head of the BPL family is the major factor for measurement of socioeconomically status. Occupation status reflects the educational attainment to obtain the work and income levels that vary with different works and within ranks of occupations additionally, it shows achievement in skills required for the jobs. Occupational status measures social position by describing job characteristics, decision making ability and control.

**Table 2 : Occupation of the head of BPL family**

Standard Score	Occupation	Frequency	Percent
1	Unemployed	21	5.25
2	Multi- type Labourer	109	27.25
	Private Chowkidar	27	6.75
3	Grocer	59	14.75
	Meat Butchery	18	4.5
	Tailor	04	1.0
	Rickshaw puller or Driver	29	7.25
	Car driver	10	2.5
	Vehicle workshop worker	25	6.25
4	Blacksmith	15	3.75
	Carpenter	08	2.0
5	Retailor Agent	24	6.0
	Shop Keeper	22	5.5
6	Private School Teacher	12	3.0
	Total	400	100

Based on the fact and figures of the Table No. 2 , occupations of the head of BPL families were rating on six point scale with scores ranging from 1 to 6. It was observed that, 5.25 % respondents were unemployed and 34 % respondents were unskilled workers with 27.25 % of multi- type labourers and 6.25 % of private Chowkidar. The 36.25 % were semi-skilled workers with 14.75 % of grocers, 4.5 % of meat butchery, 1 % of tailors, 7.25 % of rickshaw puller or driver, 2.5 % of car drivers and 6.25 % of vehicle workshop workers. 5.75 % of skilled workers were observed with 3.75 % of blacksmith and 2.0 % of carpenter. It was observed that 3.0 % were semiprofessional with private school teacher, while 6.0% of retailor agents and 5.5 % of shop keeper.

### 3. INCOME

Income is a commonly used to measure of socioeconomic status because it is relatively easy to figure for most individuals. Income can be looked at in two terms, absolute and relative. Absolute income increases, so the consumption also increases but not at the same rate. Relative income related to persons or family savings and consumption based on the family income in relation to others. The main factors of income refers to wages, salaries, profits, rents and flow of earnings received.

**Table 3: Monthly Income of Family**

Standard Score	Monthly Income ( In Rupees)	Frequency	Percentage
2	1600-2000	48	12
	2001-2400	113	28.25
3	2401-2800	155	38.75
	2801-3200	84	21
	Total	100	100

The above tables shows the monthly income of below poverty line families. The standard score were rated on a three point scale with scoring from 2 to 3. The standard score of 1 is missing because the monthly income of the families took for the study is above rupees 1600/-, based on the Kuppusswamy socioeconomic scale of monthly income, SES score of 1 for family income is below than rupees 876/-.

It was found that about 12 % of families were having monthly income of between 1600- 2000/-, while 28.25 % between 2001- 2400/-, another 38.75 % between 2401-2800/- and 21 % between 2801- 3200/-.

The total socioeconomic scores of BPL families with respect to education, occupation and income is given in Table 4.

**Table 4: Total Socioeconomic Scores**

SES Score	Frequency	Percent
4	22	5.5
5	34	8.5
6	96	24
7	90	22.5
8	55	13.75
9	37	9.25
10	26	6.5
11	28	7
12	12	3

**Table 5: Total Socioeconomic Scores Graded**

SES Scores Graded	Frequency	percent
Lower	12	3
Upper Lower	147	36.75
Lower- Middle	55	13.75
Upper- Middle	186	46.5
Total	400	100

The above table shows that, 186 families belonged to upper middle socioeconomic status, 55 families belonged to lower middle socioeconomic status, while 147 families belonged to the upper lower socioeconomic status and only 12 families belonged to the lower socioeconomic status.

## CONCLUSION:

The measurement of socio-economic status and the classification of poverty are critical to understand the conditions in which people live, analyze factors determining this situation, design interventions and monitor and evaluate the effect of interventions aimed at improving living conditions or alleviating poverty. Three crucial aspects must be considered, availability of resources to meet needs as defined by a specified threshold, which may relate to income or consumption, inequality in distribution of an attribute in a population, and vulnerability or the risk of being or becoming poor in the future. The Aurangabad city is an important industrial center due to this industry required skilled workers. A successful strategy of poverty reduction must have at its core measures to promote rapid and sustained economic growth. The government should give skill based education to peoples who belong to BPL families. Due to skill based education such peoples will get jobs in industry. The government should give finance to person from BPL families for starting his small business.

**REFERENCES**

1. Agarwal OP, Bhasin SK, Sharma AK, Chhabra P, Agarwal K, Rajoura OP. (2005) A new instrument (scale) for measuring the socioeconomic status of a family: Preliminary study. Indian J Community Med., 30, 111–114.
2. Tendulkar SD. (2009) New Delhi: Government of India; . Report of the expert group to review the methodology for estimation of poverty. Planning commission, 29.
3. Prasad BG. (1970) Changes proposed in social classification of Indian families. J Indian Med Assoc. 55, 98–99.
4. Pareekh U. Delhi: Mansayan; (1981). Manual of socio economic status (rural)
5. Gupta MC, Mahajan BK. (2005) Social environment. In: Gupta MC, editor. Text book of preventive and social medicine. 3rd ed. New Delhi: Jaypee Publications, 117.
6. New Delhi: Government of India (2006). Household – population and housing characteristics. In: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. NFHS – II; pp. 21–51.
7. Patel AB, Atul S, Prabhu, Michael J, Dibley, Kulkarni LR. (2007) A tool for rapid socioeconomic assessment. Indian Pediatr. 74, 349–52.
8. B. Kupuuswamy's Socioeconomic status scale- A revision. (2003) Indian journal of pediatrics, Volume 70(3), 273-274.
9. City development plan of Aurangabad, (2016)
10. Statistical abstract (2012), Arth and Sankhikya Sanchanalaya, Maharashtra state.
11. Tiwari S.C., Kumar A., (2012) Updation of the scale to measure socioeconomic status in urban and rural communities in India, Indian J Med Res., 135(3), 432-434.

