

Chapter – I

Introduction

- 1.1 Socio-Economic Status and Human Capabilities**
- 1.2 Bodo People in Assam and in Chirang district**
- 1.3 Literacy Trend Among the Tribes of Assam**
- 1.4 Statement of the Problem**

- 1.5 Objectives of the Study**
- 1.6 Hypothesis**
- 1.7 Profiles of the Study Area**
- 1.8 Need of the Study**
- 1.9 Organisation of the Study**

Chapter-I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Socio-economic Status and Human Capabilities

The term “socio-economic status” has been defined in heterogeneous ways. It has no generally accepted single definition. Usually, socio-economic status refers to a person's social and economic position, relative to others, based on income, education and occupation. In the social aspect, it refers to the hierarchical social position or standing of the people in a society. In the economic aspect, socio-economic status includes resources such as income, occupation and wealth (Manjunatha & Gangadhar, 2018). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) defines socio-economic status as “relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage in terms of people’s access to material and social resources, and their ability to participate in society” (ABS, 2008, pp-5). A socio-economic status reflects one’s access to collectively desired resources like material goods, money, power, friendship networks, healthcare, leisure time, or educational opportunities (Oakes & Rossi, 2003). The socio-economic status of an individual or a family is the position related to prevailing standards of cultural possessions, effective income, material possessions and participation in the group activities of the community (Chapin, 1928).

In India, occupational based classification of British Registrar General may be considered as socio-economic status studies before 1960. The heads of households were classified into five social classes based on non-manual and manual classification of occupations. Social classes were non-manually professional, managerial and technical and manually skilled and unskilled (Srivatava et al., 2016). Later on, in 1961, Prasad’s classification of Indian families was based on per-capita monthly income and it was modified in 1968 and 1970 which has been extensively used. Kuppuswami's socio-economic scale introduced in 1981 is widely used to measure the socio-economic status of an individual in an urban community based on three variables namely education,

occupation and income. In the rural areas, socio-economic status is determined by Pareekh's nine socio-economic characteristics namely caste, occupation of the family head, education of family head, level of social participation of family head, landholding, housing, farm power, material possessions and type of family (Masthi and Kulkarni, 2013). The area-based and community-based socio-economic status were calculated as Socio-Economic Index considering their socio-economic influencing factors related to social factors, demographic factors and economic factors (Maity, Haobijam and Sen, 2014).

Whatever be the definition of socio-economic status, it reflects a separate identity and position of any community. It also influences the community's accessibility, affordability, acceptability and actual utilization of available facilities (Aggrawal et al 2005). The socio-economic conditions of a community reflect its material standard of diet, clothing, housing, household facilities, working environment, location of the dwelling place, education, occupation and other facilities that are available in the society. More specifically, income, occupation, literacy, health and the other facilities of living conditions directly reflect the socio-economic status of the people. An individual is said to be deprived if he/she has lacked these facilities. Similarly, a community is said to be relatively disadvantaged if these facilities are limited compared to that of other communities (Townsend, 1979).

The economic, social, cultural, political and all other aspects of development are incorporated with human capabilities. The capability approach introduced by Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen in his academic works of the 1980s is a normative attempt to study the socio-economic status of the people in term of wellbeing of the people. The capability approach provides a framework for assessing the social wellbeing of an individual within the capability functioning space. The human capabilities (Sen, 1985) indicate the all achievable ways that an individual can lead in his life. In other words, capabilities are the individual's abilities to do and be in his life. Every state of being and doing is called functioning (Sen, 1985). The key idea of the capability approach lies in the expansion of capabilities of an individual promoting more freedom from

deprivation of various socio-economic and demographic challenges so that an individual can select the kinds of life he enjoys and has reason to value. The expansion of capabilities is accessible through different alternative social arrangements of valuable activities and various dimensions of achievement or functioning. In the context of socio-economic status, the capability approach considers health capability, knowledge capability and living condition capability as basic capabilities for a developing or underdeveloped community (Sen, 1992). The functionings are the available facilities being and doing by the people of a community. Being well-nourished, being literate, being housed, and so on- an individual does better in socio-economic activities.

The “Human Development Index” (HDI) prepared by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1990) put into practice some of Sen’s ideas together with the research experience of the previous decades. The HDIs propose a comprehensive multidimensional approach to development – the human development paradigm – that has a sound theoretical reference of the capability approach and includes better composite indices of development and poverty. Since 1990, HDIs have been calculated yearly by the UNDP to assess the relative positions of the countries in terms of three dimensions of development: longevity, knowledge and standard of living. Since then various research activities are done by researchers to construct HDI for various grounds like community basis, regional basis, district basis, state basis and so on.

The term deprivation stands for the condition of a system or a community or a region which is lacking the necessities of a society or community. Analogically, socio-economic deprivation can be described as the lack of social and economic benefits which are considered to be necessities of a society or community or in a broader sense of a region. The regions with high demand and low supply of basic requirements often exhibit poor social and economic status compared to the other adjacent regions which mark the former as a socio-economically deprived region (Pampalon, 2000).

The fulfilment of the necessities is the primary requirement for the development of any region. But, it is difficult to measure the development of any

community or regional system only in terms of availability of food, shelter and warmth. The fundamental factors have to be more specific and quantified to assess achievement in human development. Therefore, a set of quantitative indicators that collectively represent the factors of development need to be identified to measure the overall development of any region. Human Development Index (HDI) is considered worldwide as a basic yardstick for the measurement of socio-economic development, whose fulfilment satisfies the reaching of "A composite index measuring average achievements in three basic dimensions of human development- a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living" (Human Development Reports, 2003, pp-353). The performances of HDI indicators also reflect the quality of life of people of any particular region. For example, it can be stated that low per-capita income (economic indicator) leads to poor quality of housing, high illiteracy rate (knowledge indicator) leads to less awareness, less number of doctors and beds in hospitals (health indicator) leads to a poor health condition, etc (Sarkar, Banerji and Sen, 2014). On the other hand, performances in the HDI indicators reflect inversely (higher the HDI value lower will be the deprivation) the state of deprivation and on a larger scale the pattern of deprivation for the whole region.

One of the attempts of this study is to investigate the socio-economic conditions of the Bodo people in the Chirang district. In this regard, Socio-economic Index (SEI) is estimated for Bodo households considering socio-economic variables. Similarly, the village wise socio-economic index is estimated by averaging the household socio-economic indices to compare socio-economic conditions of Bodo people among the villages.

The second attempt is to study the socio-economic conditions of Bodo people in human development perspectives. Human Development Index (HDI) is considered worldwide as a measure of socio-economic development in three basic dimensions of human development- a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living. The Human Development index is estimated for Bodo villages in Chirang district. It helps us not only to know their achievement in

human development but also to compare with that of other communities in the district.

Another attempt of this study is to study the socio-economic deprivation of the Bodo people in the study area. Socio-economic deprivation refers to the lack of material benefits considered to be necessities in society. Socio-economic deprivation is nothing but capability deprivation. Capability deprivations are seen as shortages of socio-economic amenities at the individual or household or society level. Socio-economic amenities may be classified as educational level, health and household assets within the framework of the capability approach. A Household fails to accommodate or avail basic amenities (assets) with a minimum level of a standard may be called the family members are deprived of a minimum standard of life. Poverty is a measure of capability deprivation. Poverty, in general, involves a situation where the standard of living in terms of income and consumption falls below a minimum acceptable level of nutrition and other necessities of everyday life. The main causes of poverty are unemployment, low income, and lack of access to socio-economic amenities such as basic education, health care, transportation, water etc (Ugoani, 2016). Therefore, deprivation or poverty is multidimensional instead of uni-dimensional (not just depends on income). Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is the measure of poverty or multiple deprivations which was introduced by Alkire and Foster in 2010. The multidimensional poverty index is estimated to know the socio-economic deprivation of Bodo people in the study area.

1.2 Bodo People in Assam and Chirang District

The status of the Bodo tribe in Assam has been changing in many aspects since their long past. The Bodo in Assam is one of the largest ethnic groups of the state belongs to Indo-Mongoloid ethnic group of the Tibeto-Burman language family (Sen, 1999). Bodos in Assam are referred to as *Kachari* by Rev. Endle who published the first ethnographic account of Bodo in 1911. Edward Tuite Dalton wrote on the *Meches* in 1872 where he agreed that Mech and Kachari are at least of common origin and they are the same people. Francis Buchanan observed in

1806 that *Mech* is a tribe of Kamrup and they differ very little from those of the *Kachari*. John F. Gruning stated in 1911 that “the Meches are of Mongolian origin and are believed to be the Western Branch of the Kachari or Bodo tribe.” Bodos are known as *Meches* in North Bengal and the eastern part of Nepal. Hodgson (1828) and Grierson (1903) used the term *Kachari* and *Bodo* interchangeably to refer to this linguistic group of Assam. Similarly, Bodos are known by different names in different places of India. In Assam, Bodos are known as Dimasa in North-Cachar hills, Bodo, or some times Boro-kachari in the Brahmaputra valley of Assam. They are known as Kok-Borok in Tripura. According to “History of Assam” written by Sir E. A. Gait in 1903, Bodos are found as different communities like Kachari, Mech, Garo, Dimasa, Tippera, Lalung (Tiwa), Rabha, Sonowal and Chutia communities.

The majority of Bodo people in Assam live in rural areas and depend on agriculture and allied activities. They are considered as “first settler over the entire Brahmaputra Valley” (Chatterji, 1951) of North-East India. The Bodo has its language, culture and land. They had their king in the long past but today they don't have even kingship. Even Bodo people have poor human capabilities i.e. their ability to live to old age, engage in economic transactions, or participate in political activities, etc are very limited (Basumatary, 2010).

According to the Census 2011, the Bodo people in Assam was 13,61,735 which was 4.37 percent of the total state population of 3,11,69,272. The growth rate of the Bodo population in Assam was 14.96 percent during the period 1991 to 2011 (Table 1.1). The tribal population in Assam was 38,84,371 which was 12.46 percent of the total population in 2011. The Bodo is the largest plain tribal community in Assam. Among all tribes, Bodos are 35.06 percent followed by Mishing/Miri (17.52 percent), Karbi (11.08 percent), Rabha (7.63 percent), Sonowal Kachari (6.52 percent), Lalung/Tiwa (4.70 percent), Dimasa (3.16 percent), Deori (1.13 percent) and other tribes comprise 13.2 percent in 2011.

Table 1.1 Scheduled Tribe (ST) Populations and Percentage to Total ST Population in Assam in 1991, 2001 & 2011.

Scheduled Tribes	1991	2001	2011	Growth rate in 2011 over 1991(in %)
Bodo (Boro-kachari)	11,84,569 (41.12)	13,52,771 (40.09)	13,61,735 (35.06)	14.96
Mising (Miri)	3,81,562 (13.27)	5,87,310 (17.80)	6,80,424 (17.52)	78.33
Karbi	3,55,032 (12.35)	3,53,513 (10.70)	4,30,452 (11.08)	21.24
Rabha	1,35,905 (4.73)	2,77,517 (8.40)	2,96,189 (7.63)	117.94
Sonowal Kachari	1,14,779 (3.99)	2,35,881 (7.10)	2,53,344 (6.52)	120.72
Lalung (Tiwa)	1,12,424 (3.91)	1,70,622 (5.20)	200915 (4.70)	62.48
Dimasa	84,654 (2.95)	1,10,976 (3.40)	1,22,663 (3.16)	44.9
Deori	32,633 (1.14)	41,161 (1.20)	43,750 (1.13)	34.07
Others	4,72,863 (16.45)	1,78,819 (5.3)	5,13,151 (13.2)	8.52
Total ST Population	28,74,421	33,08,570	38,84,371	35.14
Population of Assam	2,24,14,322	2,66,55,528	3,11,69,272	39.06
Share of ST Population to State Population	12.82	12.41	12.46	-----

Source: Census of India, 1991, 2001 & 2011.

According to Table1.2, in Chirang district, the share of the scheduled tribe population is 37.06 percent (178688) of the district population (482162). The Bodo population in Chirang district is 167888 and it is 34.82 percent of the total population of the district. Bodos are 93.96 percent of all scheduled tribal population in Chirang district.

Moreover, as stated above, more or less all the scheduled tribe population in Chirang district are Bodo people. Cent percent population from the same community within a particular phenomenon may be considered as homogenous from the point of beneficiary level and administrative level; which may reduce to some extent the problems of heterogeneity in statistical inference.

Table 1.2 Showing distributions of Scheduled Tribe and Bodo Population in the Districts of BTAD of Assam, Census 2011

Name of the Districts	Total Population	Scheduled Tribe Population		Bodo (Boro-kachari) Population		
		Total	Percent age of Total Popula tion	Total (percentage of the Bodo population of BTAD)	Percentage of District Population	Percentage of District ST Population
Baksa	950075	3,31,007	34.84	2,88,397 (32.05)	30.36	87.13
Chirang	482162	1,78,688	37.06	1,67,888 (18.66)	34.82	93.96
Kokrajhar	887142	2,78,665	31.41	2,25,041 (25.01)	25.37	80.76
Udalguri	831668	2,67,372	32.15	2,18,581 (24.29)	26.28	81.75
BTAD	3151047	10,55,732	33.5	8,99,907	28.56	85.24
Assam	3,11,69,272	38,84,371	12.46	13,61,735	4.37	35.06

Source: Census of India, 2011.

N.B.: BTAD= Bodoland Territorial Area Districts.

Table 1.3 Showing Distributions of the Bodo Population as the Rural-Urban Population in the BTAD Districts of Assam, Census 2011

District	Total			Rural			Urban		
	Total	Male	Female	Total (%)	Male	Female	Total (%)	Male	Female
Baksa	2,88,397	1,44,086	1,44,311	2,87,308 (99.62%)	1,43,553	1,43,755	1,089 (0.38%)	533	556
Chirang	1,67,888	84,007	83,881	1,65,760 (98.73%)	82,969	82,791	2,128 (1.27%)	1,038	1,090
Kokrajhar	2,25,041	1,12,701	1,12,340	2,14,866 (95.48%)	1,07,730	1,07,136	10,175 (4.52%)	4,971	5,204
Udalguri	2,18,581	1,09,328	1,09,253	2,15,227 (98.47%)	1,07,688	1,07,539	3,354 (1.53%)	1,640	1,714
BTAD	8,99,907	4,50,122	4,49,785	8,83,161 (98.14%)	4,41,940	4,41,221	16,746 (1.86%)	8,182	8,564

Source: Census, 2011 ("PCA CDB-1821-F-Census.xlsx" sheet (downloaded on 3/06/2020 from http://censusindia.gov.in/pca/cdb_pca_census/Houselisting-housing-Assam.html))

It observed in Table 1.3 that 98.14 percent of Bodo people were living in rural area as per Census 2011. Approximately all the Bodo people of Baksa district (99.62%) were living in rural area followed by Chirang district (98.73%), Udalguri district (98.47%) and Kokrajhar district (95.48%). Therefore, the urbanisation for Bodo people in all the districts of BTAD was too limited. Since very few percentage of Bodo people (1.86%) were living in urban area of BTAD, they were not sufficiently benefitted from the urban facilities for living.

1.3 Literacy Trend among the Tribes of Assam

The literacy trends of Bodos and other tribes of Assam are presented in Table 1.4. The literacy rates of Bodos were 41.15 percent in 1991, 51.48 percent in 2001 and 70.6 percent in 2011, whereas the literacy rates for Assam were 53.78 percent in 1991, 62.52 percent in 2001 and 72.19 percent in 2011. It is observed that the performance of Bodos in literacy is lower than the other tribes like Sonowal Kachari, Deori and Rabha. The total literacy rate, as well as male-female literacy rates of Sonowal Kacharies, is always the highest among all other tribes of Assam since 1991 (Table 1.4). The variation in the literacy rates among the tribes may be due to the existence of regional disparities in education in Assam.

Table 1.4 Literacy Trends Among Scheduled Tribes in Assam (in %)

Tribe	1991			2001			2011		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Bodo	41.15	49.77	32.53	51.48	59.8	43.00	70.6	77.9	63.2
Miri	38.72	48.46	28.98	49.12	58.4	39.43	69.3	77.4	60.9
Karbi	40.35	50.73	33.17	51.25	51.2	34.31	67.9	75.2	60.5
Rabha	44.98	55.95	32.01	56.37	64.3	48.20	75.1	81.5	68.7
Sonowal Kachari	56.11	62.60	50.62	70.52	76.2	64.66	85.4	90.4	80.5
Lalung	41.49	50.33	32.65	51.53	59.7	43.17	73.3	80.1	66.6
Dimasa	47.04	59.41	36.76	49.14	57.2	40.58	70.1	76.8	63.3
Deori	52.88	61.68	44.04	65.46	72.7	58.03	83.3	89.3	77.3
Others	49.47	53.43	45.51	50.54	58.2	42.20	70.6	76.5	64.7
State	53.78	61.24	46.32	62.52	72.3	52.40	72.1	77.8	66.27

Source: 1. Census of India 1991, 2001 & 2011

2. Ministry of Tribal Affairs India, Statistical Profiles of Scheduled Tribe in India 2013.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

Indigenous tribes have been contributing culture, heritage and linguistic diversity to the nations. Their traditional knowledge and strong connection with land and nature have been evolving the prospects of economic development. “Despite these achievements, indigenous people have to confront and overcome histories of discriminations, loss and dispossession.” (OECD, 2019 pp.4). They are living in economically backward region.

In Assam, the Bodo is the largest ethnic tribe. According to Census 2011, Bodos are 4.37% of the state population but they are 35.06% of all tribal population of Assam. At present, the majority of Bodo people are living in the east-west long strips under the foothills of Himalaya located northern part of the state Assam where Bodoland Territorial Area Districts (BTAD) was created in 2003 consisting of four districts namely-Kokrajhar, Chirang, Baksa and Udalguri. Now, BTAD is known as Bodoland Territorial Region (BTR). In Chirang district, Bodos are the highest as the percentages of district population (34.82%) as well as the district ST population (93.96%) among all BTAD districts (Census 2011).

Geographically, Chirang district is located in a backward region. Its north side is completely bounded by the Indo-Bhutan boarder. Three main rivers of lower Assam Champamati, Aie and Manas flow through this district and joined Brahmaputra river. The road communication is very poor. In this district, 92.67 percent people are living in the rural area. The rural areas of the Chirang district cover 99.37 percent geographical area of the district (Total area = 1923 sq km, Rural area = 1910.94 sq km and Urban area = 12.06 sq km.) (Table 1.3). Moreover, 98.73% of Bodo people live in rural area in Chirang district (Census, 2011).

Among the four districts of BTAD, Chirang district has the lowest percentage of households accessing electricity (72.0%), safe drinking water (70.8%) and sanitary facility (32.6%) (NFHS-4, 2015-16). This district is highly affected by the crime because the crime rate per-lakh population is 209.27 which is the highest among BTAD districts (SHB Govt. of Assam, 2019).

According to Census 2011, Chirang district has the lowest literacy rate (63.55%), but it has the highest Lower Primary schools per-lakh population (174) as well as the highest transition rate (87%) from lower primary to upper primary level among all districts of BTAD. Moreover, the school dropped out ratio is recorded in Chirang district as 17.2 percent in lower primary level and 7.5 percent in upper primary level and those are the lowest among the BTAD districts. The Chirang district has the lowest literacy rate though it has the highest number of lower primary school per-lakh population. It means that some sections of the population are out of schooling in Chirang district.

This sort of information indicates that most of the Bodo people in Chirang district were living in rural areas with limited infrastructures; those may be called as back-pushing forces behind this study. This is the first study in the study area which considers three attempts at a time namely studies on socio-economic status, human development and deprivation of Bodo people in Chirang district.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The socio-economic conditions are the basic ingredients of human development. The analysis of socio-economic conditions from the human development perspective is the general attempt of this study. In particular, it is an attempt to study the socio-economic conditions of the Bodo community in Chirang district. Further, this study is also an attempt to study the socio-economic deprivation of the Bodo people in the study area. More specifically, three objectives are taken for this study and they are,

- (i) To calculate the Socio-Economic Index (SEI) of the Bodo households in Chirang District.
- (ii) To measure the Human Development Index (HDI) of Bodo people of the study area.
- (iii) To estimate the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) to study the capability deprivation of Bodo people in the study area.

1.6 Hypothesis

In association with the objectives, the following two hypotheses are tested to carry out this research work.

- (i) The socio-economic conditions of the Bodo community in Chirang district, BTAD Assam are poor.
- (ii) Human Development Index for Bodos is poor in Chirang district.

1.7 Profiles of the Study Area

Chirang is one of the four districts of the state of Assam created under the Bodoland Territorial Council (BTC) which is a territorial privilege established according to the Memorandum of Settlement of February 10, 2003. The area under BTC jurisdiction is called the Bodoland Territorial Area District (BTAD). The district of Chirang has been carved out from Bongaigaon, Kokrajhar and Barpeta districts in 2004 vide notification No.GAG(B)137/2002/Pt/117 dated 30.10.2003. This district covers 1923 sq Km. having a total population of 482162 (Male-244860 & Female-237302), the density of population is 251 per sq Km. and the sex ratio is 969 females per 1000 male (Census, 2011).

For administrative purposes, the entire Chirang district is divided into two subdivisions Bijni and Kajalgaon. The subdivisions are further divided into 6 Revenue Circles namely Kokrajhar (Part), Bengtal, Sidli (Part), Bongaigaon (Part), Bijni (Part) and Barnagar (Part). This district has 508 villages. Revenue circles wise Kokrajhar (Part) has 13 villages, Bengtal has 87 villages, Sidli (Part) has 135 villages, Bongaigaon (Part) has 6 villages, Bijni (Part) has 259 villages and Barnagar (Part) has 8 villages. There are 501 inhabited villages and 7 uninhabited villages. The Chirang district has 5 Community Development Blocks (CD-Block) namely Gobardhana, Chakchaka, Manikpur, Sidli-Chirang and Borobazar which comprises 501 inhabited villages, 2 statutory towns, Basugaon (TC) and Bijni (TC) and one census town Chatiborgaon (CT). The distribution of habited villages through CD-Blocks is stated in Table-1.5.

Table 1.5 Scheduled Tribe Households and Population in Chirang District (Block/Town wise), Census 2011

Name of CD-Block/ Town	No. of Inhabited Villages/ Ward	Households		Population	
		Total	ST (in %)	Total	ST (in %)
Gobardhana	2	492	488 (99.18)	2191	2173 (99.18)
Chakchaka	6	1482	373 (25.19)	7309	1817 (24.86)
Manikpur	49	14236	1548 (10.87)	69158	7470 (10.80)
Sidli-Chirang	233	42044	20060 (47.71)	208743	98547 (47.21)
Borobazar	211	31569	13478 (42.69)	159424	66416 (41.17)
Basugaon TC	4	3039	174 (10.83)	13849	709 (5.12)
Chatiborgaon CT	1	1607	21 (1.31)	8231	109 (1.32)
Bijni TC	4	2926	360 (12.30)	13257	1447 (10.91)
Chirang District	Villages=501 Ward=9	97395	36502 (37.48)	482162	178688 (37.06%)

Source: Census, 2011.

NB.: TC = Town Committee and CT = Census Town

According to Table 1.5, the highest number of inhabited villages are in Sidli-Chirang block (233) followed by the Borobazar block (211). After the creation of Chirang districts, some parts of Manikpur, Chakchaka and Gobardhana blocks become parts of these districts, while, the major portion of these blocks belong to neighbouring districts either Bongaigaon or Barpeta or Baksa districts. As a result, they have fewer villages. The Manikpur block has 49 villages, Chakchaka block has 6 villages and Gobardhana block has only 2 villages. Gobardhana has the lowest number of villages among the CD-Blocks in Chirang district. Being the largest CD-Block, Sidli-Chirang has 42044 households with a population of 208743 and the percentage of the scheduled tribe population is 47.21 percent. The second largest CD-Block is Borobazar which has 31569 households with a size of population 159424. The scheduled tribe population is 41.17 percent of the total population of the Borobazar block. People of the

Gobardhana part are all scheduled tribe people and it is 99.18 percent of the population of this block.

Map 1 Chirang District, Assam (India)



Source: www.mapsofindia.com

Though Basugaon, Bijni and Chatiborgaon are under their town committees, they are not fully urban rather they are semi-urban areas. Both Basugaon and Bijni have 4 Wards in each with 3039 and 2926 households respectively. There are 360 (12.30 percent) ST households in Bijni and 174 (10.83 percent) ST households in Basugaon. The Chatiborgaon has only one ward with 1607 households and the number of ST households is 21. The ST population is 10.91 percent, 5.12 percent and 1.32 percent of the total population of the towns Bijni, Basugaon and Chatiborgaon respectively. Urban ST population is only 1.27 percent (2265) of the total ST population (178688) in Chirang district. Therefore, urbanization for the ST population in this district is very limited.

The source of income is one of the important socio-economic factors of households. In the Chirang district, the major portion of households depends on the income source of manual casual labour (42.55 percent) followed by cultivation (34.38 percent) and other sources (15.86 percent). The sources of income of 42.55 percent of rural households are their manual casual labour which is approximately equivalent to the BTAD average of 42.33 percent and the state average of 42.58 percent. About 34.38 percent of households of Chirang district are dependent on cultivation which is lower than the BTAD average of 34.79 percent but higher than the state average of 29.18 percent (Table 1.6).

Table 1.6 Percentages of Households with Sources of Income in Revenue Circles of Chirang District (in %), Census, 2011

Revenue Circles	Cultivation	Manual Casual Labour	Part-time or Full-Time Domestic Service	Foraging Rag Picking	Non-agricultural Own Account Enterprise	Begging /Charity/ Alms collection	Others
Barnagar Part	47.98	42.81	0.71	0.00	0.91	0.00	7.59
Bengtal	51.51	22.59	3.19	0.12	0.10	1.77	20.61
Bijni Part	29.07	46.26	7.15	0.19	1.55	0.52	15.27
Bongaigaon Part	13.33	31.23	2.50	0.00	1.13	0.06	51.75
Kokrajhar Part	24.91	48.48	0.88	0.00	0.06	0.18	25.50
Sidli Part	37.42	43.61	3.08	0.34	1.47	0.63	13.45
Chirang District	34.38	42.55	4.99	0.22	1.32	0.66	15.86
Assam	34.79	42.33	4.63	0.16	1.23	0.44	16.42
India	29.18	42.58	5.05	0.21	1.55	0.70	20.72

Source: Socio-Economic Caste Census, 2011

As the other source, 15.86 percent of households earn income either from services or business in this district which is lower than the BTAD average of 16.42 percent and state average of 20.72 percent (Table 1.6). Revenue circle wise, both Barnagar part and Bengtal are dependent mainly on cultivation. Both of them have 47.98 percent and 51.51 percent of households dependent on cultivation. The households of Bongaigaon part (51.75 percent) are mainly dependent either on

service or business. The households of the circles Kokrajhar part (48.48 percent), Bijni part (46.26) and Sidli part (43.61 percent) are majorly dependent on manual casual labour. The cultivation, as the main source of income, is found for 51.51 percent of households of Bengtal and 47.98 percent of households of Barnagar part.

Table 1.7 Households with Pucca House and Govt. Salaried Job in the Revenue Circles of Chirang District (in %), Census 2011

Revenue Circles	Households with Pucca House (in %)			Households with Govt. Salaried Job (in %)		
	ST	SC	Other Than ST/SC	ST	SC	Other than ST/SC
Barnagar Part	2.9	25	30.21	1.62	0.00	1.97
Bengtal	12.18	31.25	45.31	3.67	0.02	0.88
Bijni Part	13.46	19.5	24.86	3.93	0.41	2.51
Bongaigaon Part	62.7	5.19	45.5	13.58	0.31	4.32
Kokrajhar Part	43.27	8.02	6.14	1.41	0.41	5.51
Sidli Part	15.96	24.56	38.8	3.84	0.31	1.96
Chirang District	15.23	20.4	31.17	3.94	0.32	2.22
Assam	14.31	27.95	29.2	1.24	0.57	5.77
India	20.1	33.92	25.65	0.48	0.73	3.77

Source: Socio-Economic Caste Census, 2011

The socio-economic statuses of the rural households are also determined by pucca housing and Govt. salaried job of any one of the family members. According to Table 1.7, in the Chirang district, 15.23 percent of ST households, 20.4 percent of SC households and 31.17 percent of households other than ST/SC have pucca houses. Regarding pucca housing, ST households are lower compared to other households of other communities. However, about 3.94 percent of ST households have at least one or more family members with government salaried jobs which is better than SC households (0.32 percent) and other than ST/SC households (2.22 percent).

The revenue circle Bongaigaon Part of Chirang district has the highest pucca house (62.7 percent) and govt. salaried job (13.58 percent) in respect of ST households compared to households of other community of all other revenue

circles (Table 1.7). The ST households of Barnagar Part are the poorest because there are only 2.9 percent pucca houses for ST households.

1.8 Need of the Study

The socio-economic studies for any community are very much essential for identifying its actual socio-economic position among all other communities. Measures of socio-economic status help us to track the relative position of people at an individual level or household level or area level or community basis. A community based socio-economic study is one kind of performance reporting or assessment of achievement of area-specific and community-specific developmental policies adopted by the concerned government. Moreover, the human capabilities of an economy govern people's freedom of choice. The effectiveness of people's participation in the development process is determined by the freedom of choice or the capabilities people value. As per global consensus, the enhancement of human capabilities is only the solution to the various economic, social and political problems of a region. Various studies, as discussed above, about the performance of human capabilities have been addressed various economic, social and political problems at the national and international level. On the other hand, capability failure or human deprivation reflects the causes of the poor socio-economic status of the people of a community. It is necessary to measure human deprivation to highlight the nature of the socio-economic conditions of the Bodo community in Chirang district. It is also necessary for adopting appropriate policy measures for the removal of their various socio-economic challenges. The present study is an attempt in this direction. Here lies the need for the study on this particular topic.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This study has been organized into eight chapters and they are,

Chapter-I Introduction

Chapter-II Review of Literature

Chapter-III Methodology and Data Collection

Chapter-IV District Wise Variation in the Socio-Economic Status and Human Development in Assam

Chapter-V Socio-Economic Status of Bodo Households in Chirang District

Chapter-VI Human Development of Bodos in Chirang District of Assam

Chapter-VII Capability Deprivation of the Bodo Households in Chirang District

Chapter-VIII Summary of the Findings, Conclusion and Recommendation
