CHAPTER - 1

INTRODUCTION

India, since independence is committed to build a democratic polity and to initiate a process of relatively rapid socio-economic change with an objective of ensuring economic freedom and social justice. However, development of India depends upon the development of Indian villages, because India lives in her villages.¹

As a part of the socio-economic planning and development of Indian villages, Community Development Programme was launched in 1952 as a first measure in post-independent India and it became a continuing programme which needed active planning and provision of funds. But after a short-while, it was observed that Community Development Programme did not achieve full success due to lack of people's participation in rural areas. So as per the recommendation of the Mehta Committee², a three-tier system of local self-government administration or popularly known as Panchayati Raj was introduced in rural areas to act as a tool of evoking people's participation and to narrow down the gap between the people and the government.

1. In 1936, Gandhiji wrote in Harijan, "I have believed and repeated times without number that India is to be found not in its few cities but in its 7,00,000 villages. If the village perishes, India will perish too". See Gandhiji, Harijan, 4.4.1936.
After the introduction of Panchayati Raj in India, the 'Block' which emerged as the only administrative unit of Community Development Programme, has played the crucial role in converting the people's programme in Government's initiative to Government's Programme in the people's initiative. It is not only acting as a catalyst to expedite people's participation in the rural areas but has helped in evolving a unique relationship between the bureaucratic officials, elected representatives to the citizens, Panchayat Samiti and the beneficiaries.

Thus, being the lowest in the administrative structure, the Block is the epitome of the whole administrative system due to its direct relationship with the people and their representatives and the variety of activities it undertakes and thereby it becomes the only medium of rural transformation in India. As development, Block administration, and people's participation are dynamic concepts, the scholars have been interested in making their constant evaluation and their study has become important for students of public policy and administration. The problem of the present study is to find out the nature of block administration and the extent of community participation in Orissa. An attempt will be made to study the nexus of

3. To cite a few, L.H. Gary (ed.), *Community Development as a process* (Missouri University Press, 1970); S.K. Bhattacharya, *Power to the people* (Orient Longmans, New Delhi, 1969); N. Mukherjee, *Community Development in India* (Orient Longmans, Calcutta, 1961).
penetration-participation and the relationship between official machinery and the citizens in block administration.

Block: A Conceptual Analysis

Block is the lowest unit of administrative structure in the Indian administrative hierarchy. The concept of "development block" was revoked in the Community Development Programme of Government of India in 1952. Ensminger has visualised the 'development block' as following: "Four to five Mandi centres together with satellite villages should constitute what can be called a 'development block'. The headquarters of the 'development block' should be a rural-cum-urban township with an approximate population of 5,000 distributed in 1,000 families. The area of a 'development block' will approximate a thana or sub-tehsil in the existing framework of the State". 4

A Mandi unit, as has been defined by Ensinger is a 'growth Centre nucleus' linking the village with a common market and centre of other activities. It can be located as a nucleus of 15 to 25 villages depending on population. But the whole approach had to be given up due to financial and administrative constraints.

However, Balvantray Mehta Committee Report defines a Block as an area large enough for functions which the village Panchayats cannot perform and yet small enough to attract the interest and service of the residents. The same Committee also pointed out, "The intension, however, is to devolve power and responsibility on to a local body for the purpose of carrying out developmental activities in rural areas for which purpose the block has been, specially brought into being" and the block should as far as possible

5. The Mandi unit should include

i) A middle or secondary school
ii) A small dispensary connected with the primary health centre through mobile services, health unit and having a Lady Health Visitor, Midwives and Sanitary Inspector.
iii) An agricultural extension service sub headquarters.
iv) A post and telegraph office
v) A transport service centre.
vii) A Marketing Centre.
viii) An arts, crafts and cottage Industry Centre.
ix) A Marketing Centre and Storage Godown for agricultural produce.
x) A Shopping Centre.
xii) An open air dispensary for peripatetic Veterinary Services",

See Douglas Ensinger, Ibid.
"be treated as administrative unit of all development
departments so that there is one unified set up without
duplication or overlapping of jurisdiction or blurring
of responsibilities". Thus the Blocks have come to exist
by the State Governments as a unit for planning and
development in rural areas. It is the coordinating agency
for the various departments of the State Government that
contribute to the programmes. The C.D. programme now covers
the whole country. Its unit remains the block and its aim
is achieving rural development through people's participation
and initiative. The assistance from Government took the
shape of a budget grant for the block. Regarding the size
of the Block, it is pertinent to refer to the Report of
Purushottam Pai Committee that "the size of a block should,
therefore, be such as to ensure easy communication on the
one hand between extension officers and individual residents
of the block and on the other hand effective supervision over
them by block development Officer and a good standard of
essential house-keeping by the block development officer's
office". Hence blocks in India had emerged as the lowest
administrative units of governmental organisation on the
principles of devolution and decentralisation of power.
Block is the only nationally evolved territorial unit in
India, created taking into consideration the geographical
feature, area, density of population and levels of development.

It comes in between a village and a subdivision. A block would be a manageable unit for purpose of planning in a small way and implementing specific target-oriented schemes of local importance. Its main purpose is the development of rural areas coming under its jurisdiction. Thus the block emerged as a unit of the project area, the latter having a population of about 2,00,000 and the former about 65,000; even when under the NES dispensation, the block became the basic unit without a wider project area, the adhoc approach continued. On the recommendation of the Verrier Elwin Committee, special Multipurpose Tribal Blocks were opened in the Tribal Areas during the Third Plan Period. By the Fourth Plan all villages were covered by blocks. There are now some 5265 blocks including 489 tribal development blocks. Of these 999 were in State-I and 2585 in State-II. The rest had completed ten years and passed both the stages.

Community Participation : A Conceptual Analysis

Development, in its various dimensions determines the rate of dynamism of a State. A system's level of development should be seen in terms of its capacity to make decisions for its survival and growth and its ability to implement those decisions with effectiveness. In development administration, the role of the administrative system becomes crucial, for it is primarily the administrative system that determines the degree of penetration in a particular

7. Penetration here implies the capacity to get governmental decisions throughout the territory of a State.
political system. However, an effective system of penetration needs to be complemented by a considerable degree of people's participation. The penetration-participation nexus has been recognised as the most important factor for the achievement of socio-economic goals in the society. Participation implies 'sharing', 'involvement' and connotes a sense of 'belongingness'. People's participation promotes efficiency of the total process of development administration by making the public administrators responsive and adoptive to the new social demands. It not only helps in correcting the occasional injustices and bridge the gap between policy pronouncements, political promise and administrative performance but also mitigates discontent and opposition in respect to policies programmes or administrative action designed for public benefit. On the other hand, development process arouses people's consciousness and aspirations and thereby creates an environment for the people to participate in democratic process.

Community participation refers to the participation of those components of the community to whom particular developmental programmes are directed. In this sense, participation is not an end in itself; it is a means


to achieve certain desirable multifaceted goals; that is why its utility is seen more in the context of the outputs that it generates and the support that it lends to the enhancement of system effectiveness\(^{10}\).

Thus participation is regarded as a technique for setting goals, choosing priorities and deciding what resources to commit to goal attainment\(^{11}\).

A developmental programme becomes successful only when its fruits reach the people for whom the programme is directed. But people can gain the fruits of the programme only if they have a participatory role in the programme. Participation promotes efficiency, effectiveness and equity in the total process of development. People's participation is necessary particularly for those development programmes which require continuous public action, where technology required is locally accessible, where inputs are to be related to the needs of the people of the locality and outputs are to be distributed on the basis of equity and justice. Programme participation increases the credibility of government programmes, providing opportunities to the citizens to exert influence over the environment by reaching to the relevance of the services and products provided by the government. The community participation in such programmes not only increases the influence of the individual but also

---

10. Ibid. P.xviii.
helps to create "a type of balance among various interest groups". 12

For evoking community participation in development, certain factors are needed, namely, social values favouring participation, the level of achievement motivation in a society and community's receptivity to change which influences the phenomenon of people's participation in development. Thus, it is observed by Montgomery and Esman that environmental factors which could be considered favourable for participation include "an 'open' bureaucracy, existence of sympathetic interest groups, sympathy of the political leaders to programme objectives and to the client groups and a history of cooperative activity within the client group" 13.

Community participation may take the form of association, consultation, cooperation, physical action, monetary and material contribution etc. It may take place at the stages of decision, making, implementation, benefit as well as at the evaluation stage 14. But much of the efficiency of

12. Ref. S.C. Jain, Community Development and Panchayati Raj in India (Delhi, 1967).


14. Dimensions of participation in development are treated as three by a Conference held at M.I.T. in 1968. They are, (a) participation in decision - making (b) Participation in implementation and (c) Participation in benefits. To these, later, the Cornell University Rural Development Committee added a fourth dimension i.e. participation in evaluation. These four kinds of participation taken together constitute something of a cycle for rural development activity - decision-making, implementation, benefits and evaluation. The four kinds of participation are rather distinct from the one another in their respective activities and in their structure of participation. The kinds of participation
administrative machinery and success of the developmental programme depends upon the level, extent, and intensity of community participation as much as the participation depends upon the governmental machinery and level of development.

S.J. Eldersveld has given five theoretical propositions about involvement of citizens in the administration of development programmes. In these five propositions he spelled out the tasks of administration. The five propositions are as follows:

(1) If citizens are to be properly involved in the system and in the achievement of system goals, administrative contacts with the public, to be relevant, must be extensive, continuous and should penetrate to those sectors of the population which are most "traditional", which are most probably alienated, and are most vital for the success of developmental goals.

(2) If citizens are to be properly involved in the developing India today, these administrative contacts, if relevant, should lead to greater information and knowledge, instrumental and substantive, about governmental programmes, policies, plans and goals.

Contd...

(3) If citizens are to be properly involved, these administrative contacts, if relevant, should result in greater citizen belief in, and support of governmental actions and programmes. One should not expect, however, that there will be unanimous consensus over goals or means, but rather a consensus by the large majority that programmes exist which are worth-while and feasible.

(4) If citizens are to be properly involved, these administrative contacts, if relevant, should inspire confidence on the part of the public in the integrity, efficiency and "bureaucratic style" of officials, leading to a feeling that officials care about the citizens, treat them fairly, and thus demonstrate that the individual citizen counts in the system, and that his actions are considered meaningful for the system.

(5) If citizens are to be properly involved, these administrative contacts, if relevant, should tap the realistic aspirations of the common man, appeal to these aspirations, whether strictly utilitarian or idealistic, and motivate the individual to action and achievement, which is significant for the citizen as well as for the system. 15

Review of Literature

In post-independence India, a quite good number of studies have been made on block administration. The notable studies made after independence are B'ouglas Snsminger's *A Guide to Community Development* (1957), B. Mukherjee's *Community Development in India* (1961), S.K. Day's *Community...* 15

Development: A Bird's Eye View (1964) and Rajeshawar Dayal's Community Development Programme in India (1966) which have dealt with the problem of block administration along with the question of success and failure of Community Development Programme in India. However, these studies concern only a period of a decade of the launching of the Community Development Programme and it is too short a time for evaluation. Similar type of study on block administration in historical and institutional perspectives has also been made by S.C. Jain, Community Development and Panchayati Raj in India (1976) and V.T. Krishnamachari, Community Development in India (1988) and many others.

A number of studies have also been made on the nature and role of bureaucracy in general and in block administration in particular. Bureaucratic administration in independent India has been dealt with by Paul H. Appleby in his Report on Public Administration in India (1953), C.P. Bhambhri in Bureaucracy and Politics in India (1971) and Administrators in a Changing Society (1972), S.C. Dube in The Old Society and a New Nation (1973), Ramesh K. Arora (ed.) in Administrative Change in India (1978), A Avasthi and Ramesh K. Arora (eds.) in Bureaucracy and Development: Indian Perspective (1978), Mohit Bhattacharya in Bureaucracy and Development Administration (1979) and P. Arjun Rao in Dynamics Policy Development and Executive Administration (1984) and in many others. Ramesh K. Arora particularly points out that the process of development may create dilemmas such as,
individual versus community, homogeneity vs. plurality, 
production versus consumption and distribution, spontaneous 
evolution vs. planned change and preventive vs. remedial 
action.

In a survey of Block Development Officers in 
Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, Kuldip Mathur in Bureaucratic 
Response to Development (1972) found a clear linkage 
between administrative culture and social environment. In 
a similar study in Bureaucracy and Local Community: Dynamics 
of Rural Development (1977), H.R. Chaturvedi has examined 
the interaction between bureaucracy and the local community 
in the task of rural development within the framework of 
Panchayati Raj. A detailed study of block level administration 
has also been made by M. Shiviah et. al. (ed.) in Block-Level 
The authors of this book have studied the problem from four 
dimensions, namely 'culture of poverty', the structural and 
procedural aspects, the locational dimensions and managerial 
approach.

The relation between citizens and administration 
is dealt with Samuel Eldersveld, et. al. in Citizen and 
Administration in a Developing Democracy (1968). Here it has 
been pointed out that there is greater hostility and negativism 
of the middle and upper social strata towards the administrative 
system.

A 16-century comparative analysis of Asian 
experience by the Rural Development Committee at Cornell
University found national success measured in terms of both agricultural productivity and social welfare measures strongly correlated with effective system of participatory local organisations linking to rural communities to rational centres of decision-making and implementation. A study by Development Alternatives Inc of 36 rural development projects in "African and Latin American Countries showed a clear connection between project's success and small farmers involvement in decision-making and in resource commitment to the Project.


So far as block administration and community participation in Orissa are concerned very little study has been made. The book edited by Dr. H.K. Mahatab, *History of Freedom Movement in Orissa*, Volume IV (1957) is an informative work on freedom movement and 'Praja Andolan' in Orissa. Thus this book makes a study of people's participation in Orissa in the post independence period first of its kind. F.G. Bailey, *Caste and The Economic Frontier*, (1958) gives a good micro-level sociological enquiry which offers insight into the processes of socio-political transformations taking place in an Orissan village. But this book does not emphasize the participation of the rural people as a result of socio-political transformation. Prof. S.C. Dash, "Emergence of Modern Orissa" and K.V. Rao, "Pattern of Orissa Politics" in Iqbal Narain (ed.), *Seminar in State Politics* (1967) provide a historical analysis of the events leading to the creation of a state and the political changes thereafter.

However, with the introduction of Community Development Programme and Panchayati system in Orissa, no systematic and scientific study has been made on Community participation in block administration in a poor state of India like Orissa. So in this dissertation, an humble attempt is made to highlight this point in a particular block in Orissa.
Scope and Objectives:

Along with the rapid implementation of the Community Development Programme and the consequential changes in the organisational structure, the block study has been made more interesting and inquisitive. However, block studies have tended to be holistic and general. These studies have emphasised more on the organisation, structure and working of block administration on the one hand and development administration on the other. In this sense, blocks have been studied as a whole.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to relate block administration with community participation, because at present, block level administration is not separated from the Panchayati Raj bodies and the people. So this study is concerned primarily on the organisation and working of block level administration as well as the nature, extent, and intensity of participation of people directly as well as through Panchayati Raj bodies.

The objectives of the study can be stated through a paradigm given below:
This study is both explanatory and evaluative in nature. It deals with the attitudes, behaviour and opinion of the government officials concerned with block administration, elected representatives concerned with the Panchayati Raj bodies, and the common citizens, coming under block jurisdiction. The geographical scope of the study is limited as the 'explanatory' and 'evaluative' study needs an approach of micro-analysis. For this purpose, I have taken five panchayats coming under the Athgarh Block of Cuttack District of the State of Orissa. The units of study are the block administrative officials, the elected representatives represented in Panchayati Raj bodies and the rural individuals. The variables to be used may be stated as follows:

1) Administrative Structure in block administration of Athgarh.
2) Development Programmes
3) Participation of the rural people
4) Socio-economic Status of the sample respondents and
5) Bureaucratic official, elected representatives and citizen relationship.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are formulated to give us point of inquiry as well as specific directions in our study. These are some of the main hypotheses undertaken in order to be tested to make the analysis empirical.

1. Governmental machinery may likely be responsible to create awareness and interest among the rural people for community participation in government administration.

2. Community participation is likely to be effective because of introduction of Panchayati Raj system.

3. Planning may likely to encourage the community participation at block level.

4. The magnitude of community participation is likely to be high in block administration.

5. Political leaders may provide an effective link between government machinery and the people at Block level.

6. There may likely be much of political interference in block administration.

7. There may be adequate contact and communication between citizens, elected representatives and government officials in block administration.

8. The relation between government officials, elected representatives and rural citizens may be one of trust and confidence.

9. Citizens may remain aloof when there is too much of observance of government rules and procedures.

10. Bureaucratic officials may likely be non-committal and neutral in block administration.

11. Block level administration may likely fail to achieve its goal.
Method of Study

The method of study, used for the present dissertation is both institutional and empirical. We have made a study of official records, documents, available published and non-published literature including the governmental reports on block administration. Field studies have also been made through the use of survey method based on personal observation, interview and circulation of schedules. The survey was undertaken of the village respondents, bureaucratic official respondents and the elected representative respondents involved in block level administration. So three sets of separate schedules were prepared and served to the different categories of respondents. Most of the questions of the schedule were structured questions.

Sample Design and Coverage

The study is made of Athgarh Block in the district of Cuttack. Under the block, five Panchayats namely, Khuntuni, Jenapadadesh, Kandarpur, and Gobara are selected as sample. This sample selection is based on the consideration of the dominance of both general and Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe population. Attention in selecting Panchayats as sample was also given to the areas where the government programmes are already in implementation.

The survey has been undertaken by circulating three separate schedules to three categories of respondents. The bureaucratic official respondents are those from the top Secretariat level to the village level workers who are...
involved in block level administration in Athgarh block.
In choosing bureaucratic officials, we have not used the sample technique and we have tried to cover almost all officials of the said block and the District Rural Development Agency, Cuttack and some of the officials related to block administration of Cuttack Collectorate. However, we are able to collect 42 responses from the bureaucratic officials of the block, S.D.O. Office, DRDA, DAO, Collectorate and C.D. Department of Orissa Secretariat at Bhubaneswar.

So far as the elected representative respondents are concerned, we have tried to cover a number of Sarpanchs and Ward members of the sample Panchayats coming under the aforesaid block. Here also no sampling method is used but the elected representatives who became available were interviewed. Because of the small number of the elected representatives, we do not adopt any sample technique and we are able to collect responses from fifty respondents. As these elected representatives are mostly political partymen, some of them hesitate to respond to our questions and we are not able to make a universal study of them.

In choosing the people respondents for the study, we have to adopt sample technique. From each sample Panchayat, irrespective of population strength, we have taken 20 villagers as sample respondents. On the total we have taken 100 villagers of 5 village Panchayats as citizen respondents of the study. For choosing the sample respondents, random sampling method was adopted and the head member of the family was interviewed.
Precautions were taken not to interview two persons of one and the same family.

Respondent's Structure

So far as bureaucratic official respondents are concerned, we have not taken their socio-economic backgrounds. For, on the one hand, so far as official work is concerned, it is irrelevant and on the other, the official respondents feel embarrassed to answer the questions on socio-economic characteristics. So we have noted down only their official position.

But as awareness, motivation, attitude and reactions of the elected representatives and of the villagers are to be studied, it is necessary to take note of the socio-economic profile of these two categories of respondents. Social, cultural and economic factors have been widely recognised for playing a significant role in determining the way in which people behave and react, so we have taken sex, age, marital status, educational qualification, income, occupation etc. as variables of socio-economic profile of the respondents. The table No. 1:1 gives a picture of the socio-economic characteristics of the elected representative respondents and the table No. 1:2 gives a picture of the socio-economic profile of rural sample respondents of five panchayats under study.
Data Analysis

When the data were collected, an elaborate code book was prepared and the data were posted in the code sheet. Then the data were tabulated and analysed. Because of the heterogeneity of the answer pattern to open ended questions only those respondents whose answers could be coded in a particular category, were used as a base for computing percentages. We have not tested the findings with the test of statistical significance, nor we have found out correlation coefficient, but we only deduced the percentage distributions in interpreting the findings.

Table No. 1: 1

Shows the socio-economic profile of the elected representatives of Panchayati Raj Bodies of Athgarh Block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61 and above</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Caste</td>
<td>Schedule Caste</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule Tribe</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undermatriculate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculate</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. 1 (Contd..)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. Components</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Monthly</td>
<td>Income (in Rs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 600</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>601 - 1200</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1201 - 1800</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801 and above</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 1: 2

Shows the Socio-economic Profile of the rural citizens of Panchayats under Study

N = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. Components</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Period of</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residence</td>
<td>Months</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undermatriculate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Industry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Land Possession</td>
<td>Above 5 acres of non-irrigated land</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 2.5 acres of irrigated land</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5 acres of non-irrigated land</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 2.5 acres of irrigated land</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 2.5 acres of non-irrigated land</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below 1.5 acres of irrigated land</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No land at all</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td>601 - 1200</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in Rs.)</td>
<td>1201 - 1800</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1801 - 2400</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2401 and above</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>Less than 4</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 - and above</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61 and above</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>