



Basic facilities and living conditions in rural households of Punjab

Jasdeep Singh Toor¹, Naresh Kumar^{2*}, Gian Singh³

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

² PhD Scholar, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

³ Former Professor, Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

Abstract

Inequalities can be both economic and social. Inequalities related to income, consumption expenditure, assets ownership, employment and wealth are referred as economic. Inequalities related to education, health, gender, unfairness in access to welfare services, racial discrimination, cultural and religious unfairness form the social inequalities. These can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, lead to social inequalities. The main objective of the study is to analyse the basic facilities and living conditions across the different categories of rural households in Punjab. The analysis is based upon the primary data, collected through a detailed schedule, of 591 sampled households involved from the 23 villages belonging to four situated in three different regions of the Punjab state. The analysis shows that a majority of the houses are semi-pucca houses. Kutcha houses belong to agricultural labour households, non-agricultural labour households and 'Other' households. Good condition houses mostly belong to farming community. Single room houses belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisan and 'Other' households. Majority of the houses have a separate kitchen. Out of the households, which do not have a separate kitchen, most of these belong to labour households. Most of the sampled households are connected through metalled road or bricked roads. More than four-fifth of the sampled households have pucca nali for their house's waste water drainage. In case of total sampled households, more than four-fifth of the households have the facility of toilets and slightly more than one-tenth of households do not have facility of toilets. Most of the dilapidated conditioned toilets are in houses owned by agricultural labour households, non-agricultural labour households, artisan households and 'Other' households. More than one-third from the total sampled households have bathroom of dilapidated condition. Most of the households' source of drinking water is public water works. Only one-sixteenth households have R.O. facility and the maximum numbers of households are from large farm households. Mostly, the sampled households use LPG, dung cakes and wood as fuel. Around four-fifth of total sampled households have gas connections and one-fifth of the households do not have gas connection in their houses.

Keywords: social, demographic, economic profile, rural households

Introduction

Inequality has emerged as an important issue in the debates related to the development process. The concept of Inequalities is multi-dimensional, multi-layered and cumulative. Inequalities can be of economic and social inequalities. Inequalities related to income, consumption expenditure, assets ownership, employment and wealth are referred as economic inequalities (Bardhan, 1974; Laxminarayan, 1979; Paul, 1989; Basole & Basu, 2015) ^[1, 7, 9, 2]. Inequalities related to education, health, gender, unfairness in access to welfare services, racial discrimination, cultural and religious unfairness from the social inequalities (Krishnamurty, 1988; Borooah, 2005) ^[5, 3]. These can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, leads to social inequalities. After independence, one of the main problems faced by Indian economy was increasing demand for food grains and less domestic production of the same. To overcome this problem and develop the agricultural sector, Indian Government adopted New Agricultural Technology. The lack of a steady agrarian system in India has made it hard for New Agricultural Technology to impact everybody

positively. The income inequalities widens among the different sections of farming population due to the new technologies (Chowdhary, 1970; Nandal, 1972) ^[4, 8]. This is because of a stiff social structure which makes it difficult for those without money to improve their social conditions. Use of modern equipment resulted in lesser demand for human labour in agriculture sector. Thus, there was an increase in the number of unemployed and poor sections of the state and most of them belonged to the rural areas. Unemployment further creates wage differentials. Education level and intensity of work were the main factors determining income of wage earners and also determined the level of inequality (Sarkar and Mehta, 2010) ^[10]. Variations across social groups in terms of certain important indicators like education, occupation and incomes are evident. Indeed, vulnerability conceptualised in terms of several socio-economic and demographic indicators exists among most of the social categories despite variations in the relative size of deprivation (Kumar *et al.* 2009) ^[6]. Although, much has been done to solve this problem, but inequality, whether it be economic or social, is still the main problem in the Indian rural areas. There is a need to look into

this problem with new time period and find out the changes and complications related to this problem.

Objective and Research Methodology

The main objective of the study is to analyse the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the sampled rural households across the different categories in Punjab. The analysis is based upon the primary data, collected through a detailed schedule, of 591 sampled households involved from the 23 villages belonging to four districts (Mansa, SAS Nagar Mohali, SBS Nagar Nawanshahr and Amritsar) situated in three different regions (Malwa, Doaba and Majha) of the

Punjab state. Standard statistical tools like mean values and proportions have been used while carrying out the tabular analysis.

Results and Discussion

Distribution of sampled households according to districts

The table 1 shows that out of 591 households, 74 are marginal farm households, 63 are small farm households, 47 are medium farm households, 17 are large farm households, 124 are agricultural labour households, 145 are non-agricultural labour households, 19 are artisan households and 102 are ‘Other’ households.

Table 1: Distribution of Sampled Households According to Districts

Category	Amritsar	Mansa	SAS Nagar (Mohali)	SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr)	Total
Marginal farm households	33 (14.67)	22 (15.49)	8 (7.69)	11 (9.17)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	21 (9.33)	31 (21.83)	4 (3.85)	7 (5.83)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	17 (7.56)	13 (9.15)	12 (11.54)	5 (4.17)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	10 (4.44)	6 (4.23)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.83)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	68 (30.22)	28 (19.72)	11 (10.58)	17 (14.17)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	44 (19.56)	18 (12.68)	29 (27.88)	54 (45.00)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	3 (1.33)	5 (3.52)	5 (4.81)	6 (5.00)	19 (3.21)
Other households	29 (12.89)	19 (13.38)	35 (33.65)	19 (15.83)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	225 (100)	142 (100)	104 (100)	120 (100)	591 (100)
Percentage	38.07	24.03	17.60	20.30	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Note: The figures shown in parentheses denote the percentages.

Out of 74 marginal farm households, 8 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 22 households from Mansa, 11 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 33 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 63 small farm households, 4 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 31 households from Mansa, 7 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 21 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 47 medium farm households, 17 households from Amritsar district, 12 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 13 households from Mansa and 5 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district have been selected. Out of 17 large farm households, 10 households from Amritsar district, 6 households from Mansa and 1 household from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district have been selected.

Out of 124 agricultural labour households, 11 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 28 households from Mansa, 17 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 68 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 145 non-agricultural labour households, 29 households

from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 18 households from Mansa, 54 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 44 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 19 artisan households, 5 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 5 households from Mansa, 6 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 3 households from Amritsar district have been selected. Out of 102 ‘Other’ households, 35 households from SAS Nagar (Mohali) district, 19 households from Mansa district, 19 households from SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) district and 29 households from Amritsar district have been selected for the purpose of the present study.

Distribution of Sampled Households as per House-structure

Table 2 shows category-wise household type, It includes the information regarding *katcha*, *pacca* and *semi-pacca* houses. The analysis shows that majority of the houses are *semi-pacca* i.e. 330 (55.84 per cent). Out of 591 sampled households, 16 (2.71) families lives in *Katcha* houses and

Table 2: Distribution of Sampled Households as per House-structure

Category	Katcha	Semi-pacca	Pacca	Total
Marginal farm households	0 (0.00)	36 (10.91)	38 (15.51)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	0 (0.00)	30 (9.09)	33 (13.47)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	0 (0.00)	7 (2.12)	40 (16.33)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (6.94)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	11 (68.75)	91 (27.58)	22 (8.98)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	4 (25.00)	98 (29.70)	43 (17.55)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	0 (0.00)	14 (4.24)	5 (2.04)	19 (3.21)
Other households	1 (6.25)	47 (19.18)	54 (16.36)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	16 (100)	245 (100)	330 (100)	591 (100)
Percentage	2.71	41.46	55.83	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

245 (41.46) own *pacca* houses. *Katcha* houses mainly belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour and ‘Other’ households. The field survey has revealed that infrastructure of the houses is also positively associated with the economic status in the rural areas of Punjab.

Number of Sampled Households on the basis of Housing Condition

After looking at the category-wise household type, it is important to observe their living conditions in which the housing condition is one of the most important indicators. Table 3 shows category-wise housing condition of sampled households. Only 94 (15.91 per cent) houses are in good condition. Good condition houses mostly belong to farming community.

Table 3: Number of Sampled Households on the basis of Housing Condition

Category	Good	Average	Dilapidated	Total
Marginal farm households	16 (17.02)	56 (13.90)	2 (2.13)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	20 (21.28)	40 (9.93)	3 (3.19)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	16 (17.02)	29 (7.20)	2 (2.13)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	12 (12.77)	5 (1.24)	0 (0.00)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	3 (3.19)	78 (19.35)	43 (45.74)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	8 (8.51)	106 (26.30)	31 (32.98)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	0 (0.00)	14 (3.47)	5 (5.32)	19 (3.21)
Other households	19 (20.21)	75 (18.61)	8 (8.51)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	94 (100)	403 (100)	94 (100)	591 (100)
Percentage	15.91	68.18	15.91	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

403 (68.19 per cent) and 94 (15.91 per cent) houses are in average and dilapidated condition. Out of 94 dilapidated houses, most of these belong to agricultural labour households (45.74 per cent), non- agricultural labour households (32.98 per cent), artisan households (5.32 per cent) and ‘Other’ households (8.51 per cent).

Distribution of Sampled Households as per Number of Rooms

Table 4 shows the information regarding category-wise number of rooms of households. Single room houses belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisan and ‘Other’ households. Percentage of single room houses out of total 591 sampled houses is 16.75. Out of

Table 4: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Number of Rooms

Category	One	Two	Three	Four	More than four	Total
Marginal farm households	0 (0.00)	25 (10.12)	27 (20.93)	15 (23.44)	7 (13.46)	74 (12.52)
Small farm households	2 (2.02)	9 (3.64)	32 (24.81)	10 (15.63)	10 (19.23)	63 (10.66)
Medium farm households	0 (0.00)	4 (1.62)	11 (8.53)	20 (31.25)	12 (23.08)	47 (7.95)
Large farm households	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.56)	16 (30.77)	17 (2.88)
Agricultural labour households	40 (40.40)	74 (29.96)	5 (3.88)	4 (6.25)	1 (1.92)	124 (20.98)
Non-agricultural labour households	36 (36.36)	81 (32.79)	21 (16.28)	6 (9.38)	1 (1.92)	145 (24.53)
Artisan households	6 (6.06)	9 (3.64)	2 (1.55)	2 (3.13)	0 (0.00)	19 (3.21)
Other households	15 (15.15)	45 (18.22)	31 (24.03)	6 (9.38)	5 (9.62)	102 (17.26)
Grand total	99 (100)	247 (100)	129 (100)	64 (100)	52 (100)	591 (100)
Percentage	16.75	41.79	21.83	10.83	8.80	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

the remaining 492 households, the maximum numbers of houses have two rooms i.e. 247 (41.79 per cent), followed by 129 (21.83 per cent) households having three rooms, 64 (10.83 per cent) households having four rooms and 52 (8.80 per cent) households having more than four rooms. Houses which have more than four rooms mostly belong to the farming community.

Distribution of Sampled Households according to Availability of Separate Kitchen

Distribution of the sampled households according to availability of separate kitchen has been shown in Table 5. Out of 591 sampled households of various categories, 493 (83.42 per cent) houses have a separate kitchen and 98 (16.58 per cent) houses do not have a separate kitchen.

Table 5: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Availability of Separate Kitchen

Category	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	71	14.40	3	3.06	74	12.52
Small farm households	61	12.37	2	2.04	63	10.66
Medium farm households	47	9.53	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	17	3.45	0	0.00	17	2.88

Agricultural labour households	75	15.21	49	50.00	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	114	23.12	31	31.63	145	24.53
Artisan households	15	3.04	4	4.08	19	3.21
Other households	93	18.86	9	9.18	102	17.26
Grand total	493	100	98	100	591	100
Percentage	83.42		16.58		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

In case of houses which have separate kitchen, the maximum number of households is from non-agricultural labour households i.e. 114 (23.12 per cent), followed by 93 (18.86 per cent) households from Other' households, 75 (15.21 per cent) households from agricultural labour households, 71 (14.40 per cent) households from marginal farm households, 61 (12.37 per cent) from small farm households, 47 (9.53 per cent) from medium farm households, 17 (3.45 per cent) from large farm households and 15 (3.04 per cent) from artisan

households. Out of 98 households, which do not have a separate kitchen, most of these belong to labour households.

Distribution on the basis of Passage Connecting Sampled Households

Table 6 shows distribution of households on the basis of passage connecting the sampled households. Most of the sampled households are connected through metalled road or bricked roads. Only 5.41 per cent of total 591 households are connected through *katcha* roads.

Table 6: Distribution on the basis of Passage Connecting Sampled Households

Category	Metalled Road		Bricked Road		Katcha Road		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	17	12.23	57	13.57	0	0.00	74	12.52
Small farm households	15	10.79	47	11.19	1	3.13	63	10.66
Medium farm households	27	19.42	16	3.81	4	12.50	47	7.95
Large farm households	4	2.88	12	2.86	1	3.13	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	17	12.23	94	22.38	13	40.63	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	35	25.18	101	24.05	9	28.13	145	24.53
Artisan households	8	5.76	11	2.62	0	0.00	19	3.21
Other households	16	11.51	82	19.52	4	12.50	102	17.26
Grand total	139	100	420	100	32	100	591	100
Percentage	23.52		71.07		5.41		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

A majority of the household premises i.e. 420 (71.07 per cent) houses are connected through bricked roads and 139 (23.52 per cent) are connected through metallic roads.

Distribution of Sampled Households as per waste water drainage system used

The information regarding waste water drainage is given in

Table 7. More than 85 per cent of the sampled households have *pacca nali* for their house's waste water drainage. Around 12 per cent i.e. 72 households have *katcha nali* for waste water drainage. Only one household, which is from 'Other' households, has *semi-pacca nali*. Among the remaining, 3 houses have open pit, these households are from non-agricultural labour households.

Table 7: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Waste Water Drainage System Used

Category	Pacca nali		Katcha nail		Semi-pacca nali		Open pit		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	66	12.82	8	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	74	12.52
Small farm households	55	10.68	8	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	63	10.66
Medium farm households	41	7.96	6	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	16	3.11	1	1.39	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	100	19.42	24	33.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	131	25.44	11	15.28	0	0.00	3	100	145	24.53
Artisan households	17	3.30	2	2.78	0	0.00	0	0.00	19	3.21
Other households	89	17.28	12	16.67	1	100	0	0.00	102	17.26
Grand total	515	100	72	100	1	100	3	100	591	100
Percentage	87.14		12.18		0.17		0.51		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Distribution of Sampled Households according Availability of Toilets

Distribution of the sampled households according to the availability of toilets is shown in Table 8. Out of the total 591

Sampled households, 514 (86.97 per cent) households have the facility of toilets and 77 (13.03 per cent) households do not have this facility. Out of these 77 households, which do not have toilet facility, 28(36.36 per cent) are from agricultural labour

Table 8: Distribution of Sampled Households according Availability of Toilets

Category	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	74	14.40	0	0.00	74	12.52
Small farm households	63	12.26	0	0.00	63	10.66
Medium farm households	47	9.14	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	17	3.31	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	96	18.68	28	36.36	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	105	20.43	40	51.95	145	24.53
Artisan households	15	2.92	4	5.19	19	3.21
Other households	97	18.87	5	6.49	102	17.26
Grand total	514	100	77	100	591	100
Percentage	86.97		13.03		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

households, 40 (51.95 per cent) from non-agricultural labourer households, 4 (5.19 per cent) from artisan households and 5(6.49 per cent) from ‘Other’ households. All 77 (13.03) households, which do not have any toilets, are from non-farming categories.

Distribution of Sampled Households as per Toilet Condition

Table 9 depicts the distribution of sampled households as per toilet condition, this table gives further information regarding the condition of toilets. Out of total 514 households, 42 (8.17

per cent), 338 (65.76 per cent) and 134 (26.07 per cent) households have good, average and dilapidated condition respectively of their toilets. Out of 42 households having good conditioned toilets, 5 (11.90 per cent) households are from marginal farm households, 7 (16.67 per cent) households from small farm households, 9 (1.43 per cent) households from medium farm households, 14 (33.33 per cent) households from large farm households, 1 (2.38 per cent) households from agricultural labour households and 9 (14.29 per cent) households from ‘Other’

Table 9: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Toilet Condition

Category	Good		Average		Dilapidated		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	5	11.90	64	18.93	5	3.73	74	14.40
Small farm households	7	16.67	51	15.09	5	3.73	63	12.26
Medium farm households	9	21.43	38	11.24	0	0.00	47	9.14
Large farm households	14	33.33	3	0.89	0	0.00	17	3.31
Agricultural labour households	1	2.38	30	8.88	65	48.51	96	18.68
Non-agricultural labour households	0	0	68	20.12	37	27.61	105	20.43
Artisan households	0	0	12	3.55	3	2.24	15	2.92
Other households	6	14.29	72	21.30	19	14.18	97	18.87
Grand total	42	100	338	100	134	100	514	100
Percentage	8.17		65.76		26.07		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

households. Mostly dilapidated conditioned toilets are in the houses owned by agricultural labour households, non-agricultural labour households, artisan households and ‘Other’ households.

Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Bathroom Condition

Every surveyed household has a bathroom, whether it be in a good, average or dilapidated condition. Table 10 gives

information regarding the condition of bathrooms of the sampled households. Only 6.26 per cent of total 591 sampled households have good condition bathrooms, most of those belong to the farming community. More than 35 per cent of total 591 households have bathrooms in dilapidated condition. Out of total 211 households, which have dilapidated condition bathrooms, 1.90 per cent are from marginal farm households, 2.37 per cent are from

Table 10: Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Bathroom Condition

Category	Good		Average		Dilapidated		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	5	13.51	65	18.95	4	1.90	74	12.52
Small farm households	5	13.51	53	15.45	5	2.37	63	10.66
Medium farm households	9	24.32	38	11.08	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	14	37.84	3	0.87	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labourhouseholds	0	0.00	32	9.33	92	43.60	124	20.98

Non-agricultural labour households	0	0.00	68	19.83	77	36.49	145	24.53
Artisan households	0	0.00	10	2.92	9	4.27	19	3.21
Other households	4	10.81	74	21.57	24	11.37	102	17.26
Grand total	37	100	343	100	211	100	591	100
Percentage	6.26		58.04		35.70		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

small farm households, 43.60 per cent are from agricultural labour households, 36.49 per cent are from non-agricultural labour households, 4.27 per cent are from artisan households and 11.37 per cent are from 'Other' households.

Distribution of Sampled Households as per Source of Drinking Water

Table 11 shows category-wise source of drinking water of households. Almost 95 per cent of total 591 household's source of drinking water is public water works. Only 8 (1.35 per cent) and 20 (3.38 per cent) households depend on hand pump and submersible pumps, respectively. Out of total 591 households, only 3 (0.51 per cent) households depend on other sources for drinking water.

Table 11: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Source of Drinking Water

Category	Hand pump		Submersible pump		Public water works		Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	1	12.50	5	25.00	68	12.14	0	0.00	74	12.52
Small farm households	2	25.00	0	0.00	61	10.89	0	0.00	63	10.66
Medium farm households	0	0.00	2	10.00	45	8.04	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	0	0.00	3	15.00	14	2.50	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	2	25.00	3	15.00	117	20.89	2	66.67	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	1	12.50	6	30.00	138	24.64	0	0.00	145	24.53
Artisan households	1	12.50	1	5.00	17	3.04	0	0.00	19	3.21
Other households	1	12.50		0.00	100	17.86	1	33.33	102	17.26
Grand total	8	100	20	100	560	100	3	100	591	100
Percentage	1.35		3.38		94.75		0.51		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Distribution of Sampled Households according to Availability of R.O.

Table 12 provides information regarding the availability of R.O. in the sampled households. Out of total 591 households, 36 (6.09 per cent) households have R.O. facility and 555 (93.91 per cent) households do not have this facility. Out of 36

households which have facility of R.O. system, the maximum number of households are from large farm households i.e. 11 (30.56 per cent), followed by 9 (25.00 per cent) from medium farm households, 7 (19.44 per cent) from 'Other' households, 6 (16.67 per cent) from marginal farm households and only 3 (8.33 per cent)

Table 12: Distribution of Sampled Households according to Availability of R.O.

Category	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	6	16.67	68	12.25	74	12.52
Small farm households	3	8.33	60	10.81	63	10.66
Medium farm households	9	25.00	38	6.85	47	7.95
Large farm households	11	30.56	6	1.08	17	2.88
Agricultural labour households	0	0.00	124	22.34	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	0	0.00	145	26.13	145	24.53
Artisan households	0	0.00	19	3.42	19	3.21
Other households	7	19.44	95	17.12	102	17.26
Grand total	36	100	555	100	591	100
Percentage	6.09		93.91		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

From small farm households. There is not even a single household from agricultural labour households, non-agricultural labour households and artisan households which has R.O. system.

Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Fuel Used

LPG, *gobbar* gas, kerosene, dung cakes and wood are used as fuel for cooking purposes in the sampled households. Table 13

provides information related to the category-wise fuel used for cooking in households. Mostly, the sampled households use LPG, dung cakes and wood as fuel. As many as 466, 414 and 466 households use LPG, dung cakes and wood as fuel, respectively. There are only 2 households which use kerosene and just 5 households which use *gobbar* gas as a fuel. Kerosene is used by non-agricultural labour households and *gobbar* gas is used by marginal farm, small farm and large farm households.

Table 13: Distribution of Sampled Households on the basis of Fuel Used

Category	LPG		Gobar gas		Kerosene		Dung Cake		Wood	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	72	15.45	3	60.00	0	0.00	59	14.25	64	13.73
Small farm households	62	13.30	1	20.00	0	0.00	55	13.29	52	11.16
Medium farm households	47	10.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	47	11.35	39	8.37
Large farm households	17	3.65	1	20.00	0	0.00	17	4.11	17	3.65
Agricultural labour households	69	14.81	0	0.00	0	0.00	91	21.98	110	23.61
Non-agricultural labour households	93	19.96	0	0.00	2	100	95	22.95	112	24.03
Artisan households	16	3.43	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	3.38	15	3.22
Other households	90	19.31	0	0.00	0	0.00	36	8.70	57	12.23
Grand total	466	100	5	100	2	100	414	100	466	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Distribution of Sampled Households as per Availability of Gas Connection

Category-wise availability gas connection is shown in Table 14. Around 79 per cent of total 591 households have gas connections and 21.15 per cent households do not have gas connection in their houses. In the case of households, which do not have gas connections, 2 (1.60 per cent) households are

from marginal farm households, 1 (0.80 per cent) is a small farm household, 55 (44.00 per cent) households are from agricultural labour households, 52 (41.60 per cent) households are from non-agricultural labour households, 3 (2.40 per cent) households are from artisan households and 12 (9.60 per cent) households are from 'Other' households.

Table 14: Distribution of Sampled Households as per Availability of Gas Connection

Category	Yes		No		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Marginal farm households	72	15.45	2	1.60	74	12.52
Small farm households	62	13.30	1	0.80	63	10.66
Medium farm households	47	10.09	0	0.00	47	7.95
Large farm households	17	3.65	0	0.00	17	2.88
Agricultural labour Households	69	14.81	55	44.00	124	20.98
Non-agricultural labour households	93	19.96	52	41.60	145	24.53
Artisan households	16	3.43	3	2.40	19	3.21
Other households	90	19.31	12	9.60	102	17.26
Grand total	466	100	125	100	591	100
Percentage	78.85		21.15		100	

Source: Field Survey, 2015-16

Summary and Conclusions

Inequalities can be of economic and social inequalities. Inequalities related to income, consumption expenditure, assets ownership, employment and wealth are referred as economic. Inequalities related to education, health, gender, unfairness in access to welfare services, racial discrimination, cultural and religious unfairness from the social inequalities. These can be co-related, as economic inequalities, most of the time, leads to social inequalities. The main objective of the study is to analyse the social, demographic and economic characteristics of the sampled households across the different categories. The analysis is based upon the primary data, collected through a detailed schedule, of 591 sampled households involved from the 23 villages belonging to four districts (Mansa, SAS Nagar Mohali, SBS Nagar Nawanshahr and Amritsar) situated in three different regions (Malwa, Doaba and Majha) of the Punjab state. The analysis shows that out of 591 households, 74 are marginal farm households, 63 are small farm households, 47 are medium farm households, 17 are large farm households, 124 are agricultural labour households, 145 are non-agricultural labour households, 19 are artisan households and 102 are 'Other' households. The analysis also shows that a majority of the houses are semi-

pucca houses. *Kutch* houses belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour and 'Other' household categories. The field survey has revealed that infrastructure of the houses is also positively associated with the economic status in the rural areas of Punjab. Out of total sampled households, slightly less than one-fifth of the houses belongs to farming community, shows a good condition houses. Out of one-sixth dilapidated houses mostly belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisans and 'Other' household categories.

Single room houses belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisans and 'Other' household categories. Houses, which have more than four rooms mostly belong to farming community. Out of total sampled households, four-fifth of houses have a separate kitchen are basically from and one-fifth of the houses have not separate kitchen. In case of houses which have separate kitchens, maximum numbers of households are from non-agricultural labour households. Households, which do not have any separate kitchen mostly belong to labour class.

Most of the sampled households are connected through metalled road or bricked roads. From the total, nearly one-fifth households of the households are connected through *katcha* roads. More than four-fifth of the sampled households have

pacca nali for their house's waste water. Just a half per cent houses have open pit, these households are from non-agricultural labour households. In case of total sampled households, more than four-fifth of households has the facility of toilets. Near about one-tenth of households do not have facility of toilets. Most of the dilapidated conditioned toilets are in houses owned by agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour, artisan and 'Other' household categories.

More than one-tenth of the total sampled households have good conditioned bathroom, which mostly belong to farming community. More than one-third of total sampled households have bathroom of dilapidated condition. Almost 95 per cent of total sampled household's source of drinking water is public water works. Almost four-fifth of the total sampled households has gas connections and one-fourth households do not have gas connection in their houses. Most of the sampled households use LPG, dung cakes and wood as fuel.

Based on the results of the present study, some of the policy implications have been presented for the betterment of the rural households. The findings of the present study clearly indicate that more than two-fifth of the rural population lives in *Katcha* houses or semi-*katcha* houses. These *Katcha* houses mainly belong to agricultural labour, non-agricultural labour and 'Other' households. Field survey has also shown that around one-sixth of the total households live in such houses, which are mostly in dilapidated conditions. To overcome this problem, the rural housing programmes chalked out by the government, should bring more and more needy and poor people, particularly rural labour households, in its ambit.

References

1. Bardhan PK. Inequality of farm incomes: A study of four districts. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 1974; 9(6-7-8):301-308.
2. Basole A, Basu D. Non-food expenditures and consumption inequality in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2015; 50(36):43-53.
3. Borooah KV. Caste, inequality and poverty in India. *Review of Development Economics*. 2005; 9(3):399-414.
4. Chowdhary BK. Disparity in income in the context of HYV. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 1970; 5(39):A90-A96.
5. Krishnamurthy S. Wage differentials in agriculture by caste, sex and operations. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 1988; 23(50):2651-2657.
6. Kumar R, Kumar S, Mitra A. Social and economic inequalities: Contemporary significance of caste in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2009; 44(50):55-63.
7. Laxminarayan H. Inter size group and inter-state variations in distribution of agricultural assets. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 1979; 14(26):A69-A74.
8. Nandal DS. Pattern of income, investment and saving of selected demonstration Farms in Haryana. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 1972; 27(4):11-19.
9. Paul S. Green revolution and income distribution among farm families in Haryana, 1969-70 to 1982-83. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 1989; 24(51-52):A154-A158.
10. Sarkar S, Mehta BS. Income inequality in India: Pre- and post-reform periods. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2010; 45(37):45-55.