Chapter III

Sources of Income of Landless BPL Families

3.1 Introduction

One of the objectives of this research work is to find out all sources of income of landless BPL families in Khatav taluka. With this efforts, we essentially feel to conceptualise certain terms designing by its working definitions, based on the theoretical literature and experiences disclosed in the field survey. Such concepts are frequently used in this chapter.

The reviews of the outstanding efforts undertaken by wellknown institutions in determining the composition of sources of income in rural area were examined.

By adding up our own observations in the study area, an attempt had been made to identify and accounts for the sources of income of the selected sample landless BPL families in Khatav taluka. The sources of income (SOI) with which our sample households were familiar, were taken up for analysing them in terms of population size and social categories criterion.

The data pertaining to the annual income was compiled and classified for three consecutive years beginning form 2004-05. The compiled data was then analysed by applying certain determined statistical techniques for arriving at the results.

3.2 Concept and Definitions of Income.

The need to define certain terms was realised and thought essential for understanding and acknowledging the scope of present research work. While doing so review of some historical work vis-à-vis the observations in the field were considered. Let us define these terms.

Income

An attempt has been made in chapter I to conceptualise certain terms of income explored by some scholars in their theoretical as well as applied studies in economics. In pursuance to this, the working definitions of income was confined to the field work.

The term income is a sum of total earnings of all family members obtained out of either mental and physical labour during the budget year including transfer of payments received from non-government organizations ( NGO’s ) and from any other Govt. agencies in cash or
kind. While measuring the total income of a family, cash receipts as well as an imputed value of payments received in kind such as food items, products, milk, clothes or in any other were considered.

**Family or Households**

The term family and household connotes different meanings. (NSSO, 1999-2000). Here both terms are used as synonymous. A group of persons normally living together and taking food from a common kitchen constitutes a family or household. The word normally is considered vitally. Though temporary visitors are excluded from the term family, temporary stay of sure visitors is considered while confirming term family. A son or daughter or any other individual, due to various reasons, if staying away, but engaged partly or fully in the earning activities, are also considered in defining the term family. Living together and sharing food from common kitchen has been considered more important, rather than drawing the boundaries of family or household in either or other wise. In short the male and female individuals residing together with close relatives constitute the term family.

**Sources of Income**

Sources of income means the ways by which the family member earns and receives the income, as well as commands over the sources of income. It means the sources of income includes both the earned and unearned income. The unearned income constitutes transfer payment received in cash or kind from the close relatives, not residing in family or from the NGO’s, and the government agencies. In all 11 types of the sources of income, of the sample household were considered as the total earnings of the families.

**Sector and Areas**

The term ‘sector’ and ‘area’ have been frequently used in the present research work. The word ‘sector’ was used for showing the segments and nature of the economy like primary, secondary and tertiary sector and also unorganized sector.

The term ‘area’ was used with specific meaning. It was used to show rural-urban demarcation. It was particularly used regarding the landless BPL families for whether such families had their residence in the villages or towns. More specifically, the families selected for study purpose were belonged to the rural area.
3.3 Macro-level Attempts in Estimation of Sources of Income In India.

The poverty is closely associated with sources and level of income to which BPL families had approbation and capacity of commanding over them. Hence, the experts tried to identify and determine the sources of income of urban and rural BPL families in India. Considering the scope of the study, an attempt has been made to account for the sources of income exhibited in some eminent studies and in periodical surveys conducted by the well known institutions. The National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO ), National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER ), and Economic and Political Weekly Research Foundation (EPWRF ) are some of the major institutions who have tried to measure the sources of income of rural and urban households by periodical surveys. The aim of such survey was to measure and estimate the income level of households in general and income level of household belonging to urban and rural households in particular by using an appropriate accounting methodology.

NSSO Methodology

The National Sample Survey Organization ( NSSO ), the reorganised body of Central Statistical Organization ( CSO ) in it’s quinquennial survey of household consumer expenditure and employment-unemployment has been collecting information on sources of income of rural and urban households throughout the country. The NSSO, in it’s 55th Round Report No. 463 and 61st Round Report No. 508 ( 2004-05 ) has measured and analysed the sources of income of rural as well as urban households. The NSSO had categorised the sources of income in 9 categories. Some of the sources of income mentioned by the NSSO were reflected in the sample households . The sources of income estimated / measured by NSSO has been presented below.

- Cultivation.
- Fishing and other agricultural enterprises.
- Wages / salaried employment.
- Non-agricultural enterprises.
- Pension.
- Remittances
- Interest and dividend.
- Rent.
- Other sources.

The observations made by NSSO in identifying the sources of income for urban and rural households was of macro level, but based on
micro-level surveys. The present study is also a micro-level survey of landless BPL families in rural areas.

**NCAER Methodology**

The National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) has conducted the surveys aiming at estimating the household income, savings and consumption pattern in rural and urban parts of the country. One of the nationwide field survey was undertaken by the NCAER in 1996 covering the data for 1994-1995. It was vital study of the Micro Impacts of Macro-Economic Adjustment Policies (MIMAP). The survey was basically designed to obtain income distribution for different occupational groups of households in the country. It was aimed at finding out the impact of economic reforms on income distribution. While covering a sample of around 5000 households selected from rural and urban areas in the country, NCAER had gathered huge data on the sources of income of such households (B.Pradhan et al 2003)

The various sources of income of the households were categorised as under.

- Self-employment in farming.
- Self-employment in non-farming.
- Salary
- Agricultural wages
- Non-agricultural wages
- Others

The income from farming activities was classified as self-employment in farming and self-employment in non-farming activities. The farm income includes the income from cultivation, plantations and other allied agricultural activities such as orchards, sericulture, forestry, bee-keeping, fishery, piggery, poultry and livestock. Non-farm activities were composed of business/trade, blacksmithy, goldsmithy, weaving and other professions such as medical and legal.

Salary income was composed of the basic pay plus allowances, bonus, commissions other receipts and employer’s contribution to the providend fund.

Income from wages earned by the members of household was classified as agricultural wages and non-agricultural wages which includes both cash receipts as well as the imputed value of the payment in kind.

The other sources of income like house property current transfers were put under ‘others’ category.

A comparative study of measurement of sources of income both by NSSO and NCAER reveals the fact that, NCAER had attempted to cover more sources of income, that exists in the rural area.
The sources of income disclosed by NSSO and NCAER were broadly a macro-level efforts. In actual practice it was observed that the sources of income of BPL families in general and landless BPL families in least developed rural area in particular had a negligency towards the sources of income imputed / measured by NSO and NCAER. Certain other sources of income, which were considered as small and petty by the NSSO and NCAER have a high significance in adding to the size of total annual gross income of the landless BPL families in least developed rural areas.

3.4 Measurement of Sources of Income of Landless BPL Families

Considering the efforts made by the NSSO and NCAER in measuring the varieties of sources of income for urban and rural households, an attempt has been made to find out and measure the sources of income of landless BPL households in Khatav taluka, through field work observations and collection of the information through questionnaire. The sources of income of landless BPL families were petty and small which were least weighted or excluded at the macro-level studies conducted by the NSSO and NCAER. In all 10 items of the sources of income were identified. The working definitions of the sources of income were confined. They are explained below:-

Agricultural wage

Agricultural wages was one of the major sources of income of landless BPL families in Khatav taluka. Such wages earned by the members of family either in cash or kind were taken together as agricultural wage income of the landless BPL families. The imputed value of the payments were accounted at the current prices.

Wages from construction activities

Construction activities include construction of new buildings, construction and repairs of roads repairs of old houses, drainage and other maintenance of the construction sector. Number of construction activities are increasing in rural areas. The wages earned from such activities was the income of landless BPL families. Some members of the sample landless BPL families were engaged in construction activities. The NCAER in it’s survey had included such activities as non-agricultural wages.
**Earnings by enterprising activities**

The NSSO had identified non-agricultural enterprises as one of the sources of income. The earnings by such enterprising activities covers shopping activities of fruits and vegetables, non-vegetable items, cold drinks and rural craftsmanship etc. Purchase and sale of iron scrap, plastic waste was carried out by some family members. The income from such sources was considered as earnings by way of enterprising the economic activities. Some enterprising activities were seasonal. Earning from such activities was higher than the agricultural wages.

**Employment in trading sector**

Working with the trading enterprises is one of the economic activity which provides an employment and also self-employment opportunities to BPL families. The male and female work force was engaged in this activity. It is a kind of menial work engaged in cloth shops, hardware material shopping centre commodity shops etc. servicing to such trading activities is one of the pretty job of the landless BPL household in rural area.

**Dairy business**

Now a days rearing of milch animals for dairy business has opened up a new opportunity for regular earnings of the rural households. The term dairy business was used with broader meaning. It covers the milking and non-milking activities. The milking activities includes production and marketing of milk to dairy centres, while non-milking dairy activities includes trading of milk and milk products along with trading of the dairy cattles. Since the installation of the dairy co cooperatives in rural area the growth of dairy business has made the poor creditworthy and productive. Some sample landless BPL households were very much interested in performing such activities. The rewards and returns out of this activity is larger than the farm activities in drought regions.

**Sheep and goat rearing**

Sheep and goat rearing is one of the favourite activities of poor people. Sheep and goat were having potential opportunities in nearby rural area. It is a source of income in rural households and had found increasingly attracting towards this enterprises for earning purpose. The sample households were engaged both in small and large scale sheep and goat rearing activity.
Domestic poultry farming

In good old days poultry was considered as inferior and neglected gainful activity. Of late domestic poultry farming is one of the gainful employment and earning activity with sufficient value additions to rural households. It was found that the income earned through it was round about equal to an amount required for purchasing the sweets and green in the weekly local markets, domestic poultry farming was one of the best source of income of the landless BPL households in rural area.

Transfer payments

The transfer payments was also one of significant source of income. The term ‘transfer payments’ was used synonymous to transfer income. The term ‘remittances’ used by the NCAER connotes the same meaning. Here it was used to indicate unearned income in the form of money or kind received by sample households from government agencies and relatives. The income received as supportless pension scheme, subsidy for house construction, scholarship to students by government and aid by relatives were included in transfer payment activities. Especially, the students belonging to socially backward households receive scholarships awarded to them by Government. It was considered as source of income to such families.

Aid from NGO

The Non-Government Organisations ( NGO’s ) established in rural areas were involved in performing certain socio-economic services leading towards providing some services and facilities in terms of money or kind to the sample households. It was considered as source of income to such families. The aid in terms of educational facilities to the sample households were considered as aid from NGO’s and also as a source of income to such households.

Windfall income

The windfall income was identified as one source of income to the landless BPL families. This source of income was not accounted by NSSO and NCAER in their well-recognised survey reports. The income earned by members of the family by performing certain speculative activities had been considered as windfall income. It also includes the income received in terms of money or in kind from the political parties and candidates during the election sessions. Though occasionally in nature, periodically some elections are normally held. The bribe in money or in kind had been termed as a source of income to them. Some family
members were very much found of *matakas* and lotteries. Any earning out of it was termed as windfall income.

**Other sources of income**

The other sources of income includes all other sources of income not included in the sources of income. It includes interest, dividends, pensions (*B. Pradhan et al. 2003*). Interest received by the households on their savings in the banks and Post Offices was no doubt negligible but was held adding up to their corresponding increase in saving.

3.5 **Analysis of Sources of Income.**

The analytical study of sources of income of sample families was undertaken to highlight certain important issues pertaining to it.

On the one hand it explicites the nature and magnitude of command over sources of income by sample units. Secondly, it helps in understanding the approbation trend towards those sources of income.

It also reveals the standard of living of households. Taking in to consideration the same fact, conceptual definitions of each types of sources of income (*SOI*) to which landless BPL families were found mostly familiar were designed. Afterwards an attempt had been made to focus on, identifying and measuring the SOI and finding out the approbating trend towards those SOI in Khatav taluka. In all 10 items of sources of income were found familiar and hence included in the questionnaire for accounting purpose. Then the original statistical data was gathered by field survey of the sample households for three consecutive years beginning from 2004–05. The data was processed by using certain statistical tools of analysis.

3.6 **Data Tabulation and Analysis**

The statistical data pertaining to each types of SOI for the period of three consecutive years i.e. form 2004–05 to 2006–07, obtained in original form was aggregated to tri-annual averages. The percentage share of each source of income was also estimated. The tri-annual average income size and average command over all sources of income and the trend values of sources of income were calculated. This helped in understanding and illustrating the comparative importance of each sources of income and nature of command over it, and also approbation / preferential trend towards the SOI of landless BPL families in least developed rural area.

Taking in to consideration the main objective of this chapter, the processed data pertaining to sources of income of landless BPL families
had been presented in the consecutive text so as to arrive at the analytical results. Table No 3.1 explains the nature of tri-annual averages of sources of income and it’s percentage share in total income by social category.

### Table No. 3.1

**Tri-annual Average and Percentage Share of Sources of Income By Social Categories.**

(Per households/In Rs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Category</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>SEEA</th>
<th>ETA</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>GSR</th>
<th>DPF</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>ANGO</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>Tri annual Average Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.C</td>
<td>5490.06</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>4958.6</td>
<td>3533.66</td>
<td>2020.33</td>
<td>788.66</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>387.33</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>364.33</td>
<td>20769.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26.43)</td>
<td>(14.54)</td>
<td>(23.87)</td>
<td>(17.1)</td>
<td>(9.72)</td>
<td>(3.79)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C</td>
<td>5802.5</td>
<td>3390.66</td>
<td>5493.66</td>
<td>788.66</td>
<td>3163.66</td>
<td>788.66</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>654.33</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>401.00</td>
<td>20265.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.63)</td>
<td>(16.73)</td>
<td>(15.61)</td>
<td>(3.89)</td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(1.97)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T. + V.J.N.T.</td>
<td>5066</td>
<td>1817.33</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>2952</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>788.66</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>981.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221.66</td>
<td>21822.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25.40)</td>
<td>(9.11)</td>
<td>(14.80)</td>
<td>(2.88)</td>
<td>(8.86)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(5.06)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B.C</td>
<td>4393</td>
<td>3642</td>
<td>5631.66</td>
<td>4030.4</td>
<td>2008.33</td>
<td>778.66</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>981.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221.66</td>
<td>21822.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.12)</td>
<td>(16.68)</td>
<td>(15.61)</td>
<td>(3.89)</td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(1.97)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By all categories</td>
<td>5187.89</td>
<td>2967.49</td>
<td>5620.98</td>
<td>3419.93</td>
<td>1348.08</td>
<td>969.24</td>
<td>66.46</td>
<td>758.49</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>324.08</td>
<td>20698.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25.18)</td>
<td>(14.40)</td>
<td>(27.28)</td>
<td>(6.54)</td>
<td>(4.70)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(3.68)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

1) Figures in bracket indicate tri-annual percentage share of each source of income to tri-annual average incomes.
2) Tri-annual for the years 2004 – 07
3) Short forms of sources of income.

- **AW** = Agricultural wages.
- **C** = Wages in construction.
- **SEEA** = Self employment enterprising activities
- **ETA** = Trading activities / sector
- **DB** = Dairy business.
- **GSN** = Goat and sheep rearing
- **DPF** = Domestic poultry farming
- **TI** = Transfer income.
- **ANGO** = Aid from non-government organisations.
- **WI** = Windfall income
- **OC** = Open caste social category.
- **SC** = Scheduled caste category.
- **S.T.+V.J.N.T.** = Scheduled Tribes + VJNT category
- **OBC** = Other Backward Caste category

To Focus on the total annual income size of sample households by social category / groups, the original income data for three consecutive year ( 2004–05 to 2006–07 ) was processed to arrive at tri annual average...
income level of landless BPL households in Khatav taluka. It revealed that tri-annual average income level for all the social categories/groups was Rs. 20698.82 for three consecutive years i.e. from 2004-05 to 2006-07. The social category/group wise tri-annual average income explicit that it was highest (Rs 21822.64) in Other Backward Caste (OBC) and lowest (Rs. 19937.68) in Scheduled Tribes and V.J.N.T. (ST + VJNT) groups. The sample households from open category (OC) had more (Plus) tri-annual average income by Rs. 70.88 than the tri-annual average income level of all the sample households from all social categories. The sample households from Scheduled Caste (SC) had less (minus) tri-annual average income by Rs. 433.53, than the tri-annual average income level of all the sample households from all social categories.

The source wise tri-annual average income to all social categories revealed to, their major income source was the income from self employed enterprising activities (SEEA). In triannual total income size, income earned from self employment activities had 27.28 per cent share for all social categories, which was highest as compared to all other sources of income. But the percentage share of tri-annual average income earned from SEEA in tri-annual average income by each social category was found varying. The analytical study belonging to it reveals that the ST including VJNT social category had highest share (32.09 per cent), while open group had the lowest share (23.87 per cent), followed by the OBC (27.28 per cent) and SC (27.10 per cent) social categories.

As for all social categories, second largest source of income was agricultural wages. The tri-annual average share of income from agricultural wages (AW) in triannual income to all social groups was 25.18 per cent. It was highest (28.63 per cent) for sample households from SC category and lowest (20.12 per cent) for OBC category. The average of tri-annual average income from AW for open, ST and VJNT groups was 25.91 per cent.

The third largest source of income in the size was employment in trading activities. Some male and female family members were engaged in marketing their labour as servants in various types of privately run trading activities. It includes marketing of consumer commodities, hardware, fertilizers, clothes, garments and hospitals. The tri-annual average share of income earned by trading activities (TA) was 16.60 per cent. It was highest (18.46 per cent) for OBC and lowest (14.80 per cent) for ST including VJNT social category. The open and SC social categories shared 17.1 per cent and 15.61 per cent respectively.

The fourth ranked source of income was earnings from construction activities. The tri-annual average share of this income was 14.40 per cent. It was highest by 16.73 per cent to SC category and
lowest by 9.11 per cent to ST and VJNT social category. For OBC, it remained at 16.68 per cent and for open category it was 14.91 per cent.

The other sources of income were contributing to their total annual income in a varying size. The income sources from dairy business, goat and sheep rearing and transfer income were active in supporting to the total income. The income earnings from dairy business had performed active role in adding to the income of open and OBC social categories, which was very less to SC, ST and VJNT social categories.

The income earned from goat and sheep rearing by ST and VJNT was 8.86 per cent for all sample households from all social categories.

The sample households from all the social categories were found least involved in domestic poultry farming. The share of income earned from that source by all categories had just 0.41 per cent in their tri annual total income.

But the transfer income as a source of income had played substantially positive role. Especially the ST, VJNT and OBC households had 5.06 per cent and 4.49 per cent share of income respectively, it was higher in SC (3.22 per cent) and open (1.86 per cent) categories.

The tri annual average income level and it’s percentage share of income by each source of income in the social categories was found varying. It further brought to the notice that the landless BPL households from all social categories had a more share of income from self-employed enterprising activities than income from agricultural wages. More than 58 per cent of share to total income for all households was generated by with the C + SEEA + TA sources of income. This share of income was more than two fold higher than the income earned out of agricultural wages. The least developed rural economy, where the agricultural sector is recognised as dominant in generating income and employment was not sufficiently supporting to the poor BPL families. The shift from agricultural labour wages to self employed enterprising trading and construction activities was usefull. In fact there is a changing nature of earning sources found in least developed rural agricultural dominant economy.

The aid in the form of money and kind from non-government organizations (NGOs) and windfall income to sample households from all social categories had pity and small share in their total annual income. The wind fall income as a source of income to those family was mainly out of the payments received in the form of cash and kind by sample households in various elections. Now a days all the political parties and their candidates are actively involved in bagging the votes of hard-core poor by offering them pribe in various forms. The landless BPL households in least developed rural area had forced to accept it in cash or
kind. The periodical elections at various stages had opened opportunity to poor families to earn some income

3.7 Nature of Command Over Sources of Income

All the available sources of income and nature of command over them with approbating trend towards those sources of income was recognised by the field survey data. In all 11 sources of income, were identified. Due to a very negligible size and even complexities in calculating savings as one of the source of income was very small, hence it can not be considered as a main source of income. Only 10 sources of income were focused. In table no 3.2 those issues has shown.

Table No 3.2
Command over Total Sources of Income by Social Category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Category</th>
<th>Tri annual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.C</td>
<td>3.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T. + V.J.N.T</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.B.C</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By all categories</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:- 1 . Overlapping responses permitted

The study brings out a very interesting observations. The tri annual average command over sources of income to all social categories revealed that sample households had been commanding average 3.81 total sources of income. It means whatever the total income size was attributed by sample households, was shaped by merely less than half sources of income, which were in existence around them.

The social category wise command over the sources of income disclosed in study exhibits that, sample households from SC social category had highest command over to total ten sources of income, while sample households from OBC social category had lowest command over to ten sources of income. The sample households from Open and ST including VJNT social categories had 3.9 and 3.7 items of average command over to sources of income respectively.

It leads towards formulating some arguments. In first instance, in spite of lowest number of sources of income were being entertained by sample households from OBC social group, they had highest level of tri annual average income, and inspite of comparatively larger number of sources of income were being commanded sample households from SC social group, they were placed at third position pertaining to tri annual
average income of in four social categories. It leads towards framing an argument that just number of sources of income commanded by landless BPL households in rural area does not substantially influence on their income size as such.

Secondly, general command over sources of income by all social categories depicts the fact that dairy business, domestic poultry farming and goat and sheep rearing were marginally contributing in total income size of households. Being a local landless BPL households in rural area, such households can exploit those sources at maximum possible limits. It signifies the reforms in designing of policy measures aimed at eradication of poverty of such hard core poors in rural area.

The source wise income size pertaining to some sources of income reveals that the study, focuses on a contributory importance of such sources in total income to certain households. The members of sample households engaged in self employment enterprising activities and in construction activities were earning substantially larger income comparing to other sources of income belonging to them.

Change in Total Annual Income by Social Categories.
For exhibiting the nature of change in size of income from each and also total sources of income earned by sample households, obtained data pertaining to it was processed by applying method of measuring the trend. After processing original gathered data pertaining to total income size for three consecutive years, beginning from 2004 – 05, it’s trend values were found by using formula as Trend Value = a + b (x). The Table No 3.3 focuses on trend values of changes in annual income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Category</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>976613.3</td>
<td>1038573</td>
<td>1100533</td>
<td>1162493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>954976.7</td>
<td>1013267</td>
<td>1071557</td>
<td>1129847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.+VJNT</td>
<td>1015198</td>
<td>997068.3</td>
<td>978938.3</td>
<td>960808.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>1045726</td>
<td>1091158</td>
<td>1136591</td>
<td>1182023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By all categories</td>
<td>998128.5</td>
<td>1035016.57</td>
<td>1071904.82</td>
<td>1108792.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table No. 3.3 it was revealed that, total income size by all social category had increasing trend. It was Rs. 998128.5 in 2004 – 05, which has raised to Rs. 1071904.82 in 2006 – 07. It would rise to Rs. 1108792.75 for the year 2007 – 08.

The category wise trend values of total income size revealed that sample households from OBC social group had substantially higher rising trend. The lowest rising trend values of total income size recorded were belonged to ST,VJNT social category. It was found that sample households from ST including VJNT social category had shown declining trend in total income size from 2004 – 05 to 2006 – 07 and onward. It indicates that high illiteracy along with frequent migrative nature in those families had made them weak in capturing sustainable and higher remunerative sources of income. Sample households from OBC social group were found involved in capturing the sources of income such as trading and self-employment enterprising activities than the sample households from open category. Hence the OBC social category had been strengthening their income size strongly compared to open and also rest of the social categories.

3.8 Conclusions

The landless BPL families in least developed rural areas are hard-core poor society in rural areas. The annual income size of such families is mostly lower than the families belongs to general poverty phenomena. In spite of high illiteracy, unskilled labour and inadequate health services, they struggles for searching the earning activities, and tries to command over maximum sources of income. Still the policy measures aimed at raising their income level can only change their fortune.