

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF BHAIRABPUR VILLAGE IN MALDA DISTRICT, WEST BENGAL

MD ISMAIL\*

DR MD MUSTAQUIM\*\*

### **Abstract**

*Socio-economic characteristics and status are the foremost issues all over the world especially in developing countries in the world. The study of Socio-economic status, try to explain the actual situation of population in particular region but the study of Socio-economic status found very rare at micro level such as village and ward level. Economic growth and Socio-economic status are growing very rapidly with the help of various models given by planners. In spite of these, there are number of area, region, village etc. are having unbelievable socio-economic status and not avail minimum basic needs for their living. The study area of Bhairabpur village located nearly 85 km away from the district head office and 100 per cent population are living below standard conditions of living. Very surprising fact in this village is that there is no any government and private service holder. The paper try to find out the socio- economic profile, food security situation and possible measures to overcame the problem in the village. However at the same time there is a realization that certain parts of the rural area have been left behind in development and the authority is currently promoting rural area in order to sustain local economies and to enhance employment and growth.*

**Keywords:** Socioeconomic status, education, occupation, remote village

\* Research Scholar, Department of Geography, Aliah University, En-69, Salt Lake City, Kolkata, India

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, Aliah University, En-69, Salt Lake City, Kolkata, India

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate, India as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.

**International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences**

<http://www.ijmra.us>

**Introduction:**

Socio-economic status is evaluated as a combination of factors including income, level of education, income, size of landholding, pattern of food consumption, caloric intake per head, occupational structure, and other basic amenities and infrastructure facilities. It is a way of looking at how individuals or families fit into society using economic and social measures that have been shown to impact individuals' health and well being. Socio-economic status and health condition are closely related, and Socio-economic status can often have profound effects on a person's health due to differences in ability to access health care as well as dietary and other lifestyle choices that are associated with both finances and education. A country which is failed to develop the knowledge and skill of its people and to make their best use is likely to be lag behind. Socio-economic status can be developed in many ways, one of the development would be handicapped as long as village population remain less important, illiterate, powerless, and deprived the just and equitable status most important being education. Now days, literacy and education among rural population has come to mean a more efficient fulfillment of the changing role and status, better quality of life, freedom from ignorance, diseases, poverty, malnutrition etc. Lastly healthy and balanced growth of the nation depends on the proper socio-economic development of a nation. Development is a whole process; its ecological, cultural, social, economic, institutional and political dimensions must be understood and interrelated. A number of researches and planning have expressed that population should be integrated into ongoing socio-cultural process so as to improve the existing poor conditions of rural population. There is general consensus that income, education, and occupation together represent Socio-economic status better than any of these alone (White 1982), there is no consensus (a) how best to composite the set of indicators; (b) whether it works best to examine relations between Socio-economic status and child outcomes using a composite, a statistical procedure that includes each indicator, or each indicator singly; or (c) how best to measure each component (Krieger et al. 1997). Socio-economic status (SES) is one of the interests that may influence physical activities. Krieger, Williams, and Moss (1997) define socio-economic position as "an aggregate concept that includes both resource-based and prestige-based measures, as linked to both childhood and adult social class position" (p. 345). Although they suggest that the term Socio-economic status clouds the distinction between resource-based measures such as income and education, and prestige-based measures such as occupation (Krieger et al., 1997), Socio-economic status is an

appropriate term for the current thesis given the social class measures of interest are both resource-based and prestige-based measures. Socio-economic status is often considered a personal demographic variable; however, Socio-economic status can also reflect aspects of an individual's broader environment. As a result, it can be measured at the individual level or the area level (Lynch & Kaplan, 2000). Individual measures of Socio-economic status such as income, education, and occupation reflect the opportunities and resources people might have (Lynch & Kaplan), and are part of one's intrapersonal environment. For example, occupation might determine whether someone can afford the time and expense of participation in organized sports. Area level measures are either aggregated individual indicators or can be used to represent contextual effects of Socio-economic status (Lynch & Kaplan). For example, the average income of a neighbourhood might help to explain the resources that are available or not, to that specific community (Chen et al., 2002).

### Objective

- i. To find out the socio- economic profile of the village
- ii. To find out the food security situation
- iii. To find out possible measures to overcome the problem

### Location of Bhairabpur

Bhairabpur is located under Harishchandrapur-II Block. It is bounded by Hardamnagar in the North, Talbangrua in the west, Jagannathpur in the East and Talgachi and Malipakur in the South. Bhairabpur is the most backward village in the Malda district. Total areas of the village are 233.22 hectares and household is 432. According to 2001 census total population is 3672. It is located 75 km away from the district headquarter English bazaar. Communication of the village is very bad; there is no market in the village, only some small shops are present in the village. The economy of the village is predominately agriculture oriented. It is the Muslim populated village and 100 per cent of the villages' people are Badia community. They are other back ward caste (OBC).

### Data base and Methodology

The present study is based on primary data and secondary data. The Stratified Random sampling has been used for the study. Whole village are divided into equally four units and 22 households have been randomly taken from each unit of the village. Out of 432 household, 88 households have been considered for the study. The secondary data is used for the study of general profile of

the village and primary data is used for knowing unknown fact of the village. All the data were converted into relative number such as percentage; for observed the overall situation of the villages.

### **Socio-economic characteristics (Discussion)**

Educational status of the Bhairabpur is very meager, only 40.74 per cent are literate, among them 55.45 per cent are the male and 44.55 per cent are the female. The most of them are primary educated (44.54%), followed by middle (30%), 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> to (15.45%) only 9.09 per cent are graduate and remaining 0.92 per cent are other.

There is only one primary School, no post office, no portable drinking water, bus and railway station is located about 7 km away from the village and nearest town is Katihar from 50 km away from village. Electricity is available for agricultural purpose.

Agriculture is the backbone of the village, about 38.16 per cent of the people are directly engaged in the agriculture, 11.84 per cent of people are businessman, and 21.06 per cent the other worker and 7.89 per cent are the agricultural labourer. There is no any serviceman and 100 per cent are male workers.

Lifestyle of the village is very low. because they have not sufficient income, 63.64 per cent of the household belong to less than Rs 3000 income per month, followed by 22.73 per cent are the 3000-5000 income and only 13.63 per cent people are earn more than 5000 (Rs). More than 50 per cent of the households belong to below poverty line.

The field study in the village reveals that the size of operational holding for 31.85 per cent of the household is below the size 5 Bigha 38.46 per cent are total landless and remaining 29.54 per cent having more than 5 Biga land. A major section of them live in a poor condition and the land is not sufficient to maintain their family.

From the field survey it is observed that on an average per head per day caloric intake is 2005 of which 89.09 per cent is available from cereals mainly rice and wheat. Intake of milk and milk product is negligible, which flesh food is very common. They also eat pulses, fish, egg, meat and other. According to primary survey 45.46 per cent household are hungry (below 1800kcal per day/per head), followed by 27.27 per cent insecure (intake 1800-2399 kcal per day/per head), and 27.27 per cent are secure (2400 & above kcal per day/per head).

It is found that it affects 29.72 per cent male followed by 29.27 per cent female and 40.56 per cent are Child patients. Most of the households are going to private and government health centre, only 2.12 per cent of the households going to other place. The most dominant disease in the village is skin.

It is investigated that most of the people in the village suffer from nutritional diseases like anemia, night blind, beriberi pellagra, Rickets, respiratory and number of seasonal diseases like loose malison, fever, malaria, pneumonia and general weakness.

### Conclusion

The above analysis vividly indicates that the socio-economic well being of village is not satisfactory. It may be noted here that low economic level is the main cause of discontentment among the village resulting social tension and other problems.

### Suggestions

- To improve the educational status of the village people
- To introduce subsidies programmes for various activities, especially, agriculture, social services and credit.
- Primary health care facilities should be provide
- Credit guidelines, rural and community banking facilities should be provided.
- Fare prices food shop, road and rural infrastructure should be providing by the government.
- Employment sell should be established at Panchayat level
- Small and medium scale enterprise such as agro-based industries should be encouraged at village level.
- Provide better life for rural women and family planning programme.
- Income oriented programme generated at village level.
- Create awareness about Fisheries, animal husbandry, forestry, poultry farming among the villagers.
- Special programme for target group should introduce such as women, youth, beggars, children's, economically disadvantage family.
- Vocational training should be popularly launched.

### References

- Krieger, N., Williams, D. R., & Moss, N.E. (1997) Measuring social class in US public health research: Concepts, Methodologies, and Guidelines. Annual Review of Public Health 18, 341-378.
- Lynch, J., & Kaplan, G. (2000). Socio-economic position. In L. F. Berkman, & I. Kawachi (Eds.), Social epidemiology (pp. 13-35). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chen, E., Matthews, K. A., & Boyce, W. T. (2002). Socio-economic differences in children's health: How and why do these relationships change with age? Psychological Bulletin, 128, 295-329.
- White KR. 1982. The relation between socio-economic status and academic achievement. Psychol. Bull. 91:461-81.
- Krieger N, Williams DR, Moss HW. (1997). Measuring social class in US public health research: concepts, methodologies, and guidelines. Annu. Rev. Public Health 18:341-78

