

---

---

**SURVEY OF ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF  
UPPER CASTE POPULATION IN BIHAR**

---

---

**A Study Sponsored by  
State Commission for Upper Castes  
Government of Bihar**



**ASIAN DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

**PATNA OFFICE :** BSIDC COLONY, OFF BORING PATLIPUTRA ROAD, PATNA - 800 013  
**PHONE :** 2575649, 2578773, 2572745 **FAX :** 0612 - 2577102, **E-MAIL :** adri\_patna@hotmail.com

---

# SURVEY OF ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF UPPER CASTE POPULATION IN BIHAR

---

## Content

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1-9</b>
1.1	Identification of Backward Classes	1-3
1.2	Background of the Study	3-3
1.3	Methodology of the Study	4-7
1.4	Plan of the Report	7-7
<b>2.</b>	<b>Demographic Profile</b>	<b>10-23</b>
2.1	Size of Upper Caste Population	10-11
2.2	General Demographic Features	11-13
2.3	Activity and Employment Status	13-17
<b>3.</b>	<b>Educational and Health Status</b>	<b>24-44</b>
3.1	Literacy Rates and Levels of Education	24-26
3.2	Present Educational Practice	27-30
3.3	Present Health-Related Practices	30-32
<b>4.</b>	<b>Economic Status</b>	<b>45-87</b>
4.1	Occupational Pattern	45-47
4.2	Land and Related Endowments	47-51
4.3	Household Income Levels	51-54
4.4	Indebtedness	55-57
4.5	Migration Patterns	57-59
4.6	Standard of Living	59-61
<b>5.</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>88-92</b>
5.1	Status of Upper Caste Population	88-91
5.2	Recommendations	91-92

---

## LIST OF TABLES

### Chapter I : Introduction

- Table 1.1 : Sample Size by District, Religion and Caste (Rural and Urban)
- Table 1.2 : Percentage Distribution of Sample by Districts (Rural and Urban)
- Table 1.3 : Percentage Distribution of Sample by Religion and Caste Groups (Rural and Urban)

### Chapter II : Demographic Profile

- Table 2.1 : Average Household Size, Percentage Distribution by Age and Sex Ratio
- Table 2.2 : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Marital Status
- Table 2.3A : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Activity Status (Male)
- Table 2.3B : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Activity Status (Female)
- Table 2.4A : Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Employment Status (Male)
- Table 2.4B : Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Employment Status (Female)

### Chapter III : Educational and Health Status

- Table 3.1 : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level
- Table 3.2A : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level (Male)
- Table 3.2B : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level (Female)
- Table 3.3 : Percentage Distribution of Young Children (6-20 yrs) by Present Educational Practice

- Table 3.4A : Percentage Distribution of Children Not Going to School by Reasons for the Practice (Boys)
- Table 3.4B : Percentage Distribution of Children Not Going to School by Reasons for the Practice (Girls)
- Table 3.5 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Type of School/College
- Table 3.6 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Medium of Instruction
- Table 3.7 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Availability of Books and Extent of Private Tuition
- Table 3.8 : Percentage Distribution of Children(0-3 years) by Place of Birth
- Table 3.9 : Percentage Distribution of Children(0-3 years) by Practice of Vaccination
- Table 3.10 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Mode of Treatment of Illness

#### **Chapter IV : Economic Status**

- Table 4.1 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Their Main Occupation
- Table 4.2A : Percentage Distribution of Worker by Their Main Occupation (Male)
- Table 4.2B : Percentage Distribution of Worker by Their Main Occupation (Female)
- Table 4.3 : Percentage Distribution of Rural Households by Their Land Endowment (Total Land)
- Table 4.4 : Percentage Distribution of Rural Households by Their Land Endowment (Cultivated Land)
- Table 4.5 : Percentage Distribution of Net Cultivated Area of Rural Households by Cropping Pattern
- Table 4.6 : Information on Selling and Purchasing of Land by Rural Households

- Table 4.7 : Average Value of Agricultural Implements & Livestock for Rural Households
- Table 4.8 : Average Annual Income of Households From Different Sources
- Table 4.9 : Percentage Distribution By Annual Income of Households From Different Sources
- Table 4.10 : Percentage of BPL Households and Monthly Income Per Household
- Table 4.11 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Possession of Ration Card
- Table 4.12 : Percentage Distribution by Frequency of Lifting Ration
- Table 4.13 : Percentage of Households Indebted and Average Amount of Loan
- Table 4.14 : Percentage Distribution of Loan by Different Sources
- Table 4.15 : Percentage Distribution of Indebted Households by Reason for Loan
- Table 4.16 : Information on Migration of Household Members And Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Type of Migration
- Table 4.17 : Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Reasons For Outmigration
- Table 4.18 : Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Place of Migration
- Table 4.19 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Type of House
- Table 4.20 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Source of Drinking Water
- Table 4.21 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Toilet Facility
- Table 4.22 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Sources of Light
- Table 4.23 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Most Widely Used Fuel for Cooking
- Table 4.24 : Percentage of Households Possessing Different Household Durables
- Table 4.25 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Subscription of Daily Newspaper
- Table 4.26 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Financial Details

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Our constitution is a creation of the then prevailing national inspiration. A nation smirched by social heterogeneity and soaked in religious intolerance aggravated by the division on religious grounds cannot but have a constitution such as ours. Thus, Article 16 of the Constitution of India, in the first instance by its Clause (2), prohibits discrimination on the grounds, inter-alia, of religion, race, caste, place of birth, residence, but permits an exception to be made in the matter of reservation in favour of backward classes. The 'backward class' is not used here as synonymous with 'backward caste'. In its ordinary connotation, the expression 'class' means a homogenous section of people grouped together because of certain common traits and attributes. Article 16(4) confers a discretionary power on the state to make reservation in appointments in favour of those backward classes which, in its opinion, are not adequately represented in the services of the state. This discretionary power can obviously be used for other types of state interventions as well that free the backward classes from their social and economic disadvantages.

#### 1.1 Identification of Backward Classes

Under the Indian Constitution, Article 340 makes the provision for appointment of commissions to investigate the socio-economic conditions of backward classes. Adhering to this, there have been several attempts to identify these classes, either by the central or state government. Three of such Commissions are particularly important in terms of their reasoned efforts to locate some criteria that could help the government identify different backward classes in the overall population.

- (a) Kaka Kalelkar Commission (1953) : This Commission was set up by the central government in January, 1953, under the Chairmanship of Shree Kaka Kalelkar "to determine the criteria to be adopted in considering whether any section of the people in the territory of India, in addition to SC and ST, are socially and educationally backward classes ..." The Commission was also asked to investigate the conditions of all such socially and educationally backward classes and the difficulties they encounter in carrying out their economic activities. The Commission suggested the following criteria for determining backwardness — (i) low social position in the caste hierarchy; (ii) lack of educational progress; (iii) inadequate

representation in government services; and, (iv) inadequate representation in the field of trade, commerce and industry.

Although the Commission used caste as one of the criteria for determining backwardness, it observed : "If we eschew the principle of caste, it would be possible to help the extremely poor and deserving from all communities. Care, however, had to be taken to give preference to those who come from the traditionally neglected classes".

- (b) Mungerilal Commission (1977) : This Commission, under the Chairmanship of Shree Mungerilal, was set up by the Government of Bihar in 1971. The report was submitted in 1979. The Commission identified 128 backward communities in the state, hailing from Hindu, Muslim and Christian faith. These communities were declared as 'more backward' by taking into account their social status, educational backwardness, inadequacy of representation in government services, inadequacy of share in trade, commerce and industry etc. The Commission recommended 26 percent reservation in jobs and 24 percent in admissions in educational institutions for them.

Shree Karpoori Thakur, the then Chief Minister of Bihar, accepted the Mungerilal Commission Report and announced 8 percent reservation for OBCs, 12 percent for BCs, 14 percent for SCs, 10 percent for STs, 3 percent for women, and 3 percent for economically backward persons.

- (c) Mandal Commission (1980) : The second Backward Classes Commission by the central government was set up in 1979, with Shree B P Mandal as its Chairman. It submitted its report in 1980. The Commission identified a large number of criterion to determine the backwardness of a community, grouped under three heads — social (low caste status, dependence on manual labour for livelihood, low age at marriage, and high female participation in work), educational (non-enrolment of children in schools, high dropout rates, and low number of matriculates), and economic (low family assets, poor housing conditions, low availability of safe drinking water, and high incidence of consumption loan). Based on

these criteria, each caste was judged on a scale of 0-22, and those scoring 50 percent or below on the scale (11 or less) were listed as socially and educationally backward.

## **1.2 Background of the Study**

Because of historical reasons, people from lower or backward castes, Hindu or Muslim, have generally been investigated to know their social and educational disadvantages. But such disadvantages are not limited to backward castes alone. Both among the Hindus and Muslims, a considerable section of the upper caste population also suffers from these disadvantages. In this perspective, in January 2011, Shree Nitish Kumar, Chief Minister of Bihar, took a first of its kind initiative to conduct a survey to reach out to poor among the upper castes and decided to set up a Upper Caste Panel to study the condition of economically and educationally backward sections of upper castes. Accepting the recommendations of the Upper Caste Panel, the Upper Caste Commission was set up in February 2011 by the Government of Bihar, with Shree D.K. Trivedi, retired Judge of Hon'ble High Court, Allahabad, as its Chairman and four other members, representing Hindus and Muslims. The upper caste target group consisted of Brahmin, Bhumihar, Rajput and Kayasth (among the Hindus), and Sheikh, Syed and Pathan (among the Muslims).

Since the study was intended to provide the Upper Caste Commission sufficient inputs to make well-authenticated and appropriate recommendations, the following objectives were laid out for the study :

- (i) To identify the educationally and economically weaker sections among the upper castes.
- (ii) To make assessment of class differentiation among the upper castes in terms of control on resources and economy (including land etc.) and the diminishing importance of traditional occupations.
- (iii) To find out reasons for their backwardness and suggest measures for larger opportunities for their employment, including their share in state apparatus.



### **1.3 Methodology of the Study**

In view of the enormous sensitivity of the study, its mandated objectives, and the policy implications of its findings, its total sample size was planned to be 10,000 households. The sample size is much larger than that taken in any other socio-economic survey in Bihar, conducted either by any government agency or conducted by others in any primary survey. However, the allocation of the total sample of 10,000 households among the districts and between rural and urban areas, and then ensuring that the survey covers adequately the four upper castes (Brahmin, Bhumihar, Rajpur and Kayasth) among the Hindus and three upper castes (Sheikh, Syed and Pathan) among the Muslims was a challenging tasks, From the census data, one could obtain the distribution of Hindu and Muslim population among the districts, both in rural and urban areas, but there was no information about the distribution of upper caste population in districts. As such, the sampling framework had to be flexible, allowing for allocation of sample from different castes at the field level, to ensure that all the castes are adequately represented in the overall sample. The steps in the sampling procedure are detailed below :

- (a) Allocation of sample between religions: According to the 2011 census, Muslims constitute 16.5 percent of the total population. Assuming a similar ratio for the upper caste population, the allocation of sample for the Muslims would have been 1650 households. But, this would have meant a rather small sample at the district level, since it had to be distributed in as many as 20 districts. As such, it was decided to allocate a sample of 2500 households to the Muslims, with the remaining sample of 7500 households being allocated to the Hindus.
- (b) Allocation of sample between rural and urban areas : According to the 2011 census, the rate of urbanization in Bihar in only 11.5 percent. A proportional allocation would have resulted in a sample of only 1150 households in the urban areas, which again would have meant a rather small sample, once divided among the 5 chosen districts. As such, it was decided to allocate a sample of 1500 households for the urban component of the survey.
- (c) Sampling of districts and towns : To ensure substantial geographical coverage of the sample it was decided to conduct the survey in 20 out of 38 districts in Bihar. Apart from Patna, which was chosen purposively because of its strategic importance, the remaining 19 districts

were chosen, randomly. Of the chosen districts, 12 were in north Bihar where the concentration of Muslims is relatively more.

Although the rural survey were to be conducted in all the 20 sample districts, it was decided to restrict the urban survey to only 5, in view of the limited sample size of only 1500 households for the urban survey. All those 5 towns were chosen purposively — Patna for its strategic importance; Bhagalpur, Darbhanga and Gaya as the relatively larger urban centres, and Purnea for being located in the north-eastern region of the state, where the concentration of Muslims is relatively higher.

The above allocation pattern meant a sample of 425 rural households in each district, of which 315 were Hindu upper caste households and the remaining 110 households belonging to Muslim upper castes. For the urban survey, it meant a sample of 300 households in each of the 5 towns, 225 of them belonging to Hindu upper castes and the remaining 75 to Muslim upper castes.

- (d) Sampling of villages/wards : For sampling of villages for the rural survey, 2 blocks were chosen randomly from each district. In the next stage, 4 panchayats were chosen randomly from among those where there were at least 25 households belonging to either upper caste Hindus or upper caste Muslims. In the third stage, one village was chosen randomly. In case the chosen village did not provide the required number of sample households, a second village was chosen. In each sample village, a list was prepared of upper caste households, Hindu and Muslim, from which the required number of households was obtained randomly for the rural survey.

In urban areas, 10 percent of the wards were chosen randomly, subjected to the condition that each one of them had at least 100 upper caste households, either Hindu or Muslim. In the second stage, 2 particular streets/mohallas were chosen, each one having at least 25 upper caste households, belonging to either of the two religions. From the household list prepared for the chosen streets/mohallas, the required number of sample households was obtained randomly.

- (e) Allocation of sample among different castes : Broadly speaking, using the 1931 census data, the proportion of four upper castes in the total population of upper caste Hindus is as follows — Brahmin (35 percent), Bhumihar (20 percent), Rajput (35 percent) and Kayasth (10 percent). This implies that, in the rural component, the caste-wise allocation of total rural sample of 6300 Hindu upper caste households should have been — Brahmin (2200), Bhumihar (1250), Rajput (2200) and Kayasth (650). For the Muslim upper caste households, based on an earlier survey of the Muslim households, it was found that the broad proportions of three upper castes in the total upper caste Muslim households are — Sheikh (45 percent), Syed (20 percent) and Pathan (35 percent). This implies that, for the rural survey, the caste-wise allocation of total rural sample of 200 Muslim upper caste households should have been — Sheikh (1000), Syed (450) and Pathan (750). For the urban survey again (1175 Hindu upper caste households and 375 Muslim upper caste households), one could allocate the total sample in the desired ratios.

The choice of blocks, panchayats and villages for the rural survey and the choice of wards for the urban survey, as mentioned before, was done randomly. Since all the upper caste households, either Hindu or Muslim, were not present in all the villages/wards, a random selection process would not have included all the upper caste households in the desired proportion. Hence, the caste-wise allocation of sample in each district had to be done dynamically, keeping in mind the number of households of different castes that have already been interviewed in previously completed districts. Consequently, the caste-wise allocation of sample within each district varies considerably; however, the overall allocation pattern for the entire survey nearly corresponds to the demographic proportions. It should also be mentioned here that the field investigators were instructed to cover at least 10 percent more households than the planned sample size to take care of the rejection of those households that provided inconsistent replies to some of the listed questions. After such rejection exercise, the survey was able to use a sample of 10,099 households, distributed as follows — Rural Hindu (6402), Rural Muslim (2088), Urban Hindu (1068) and Urban Muslim (541).

The distribution of the total sample by districts, rural-urban areas, and castes (both Hindu and Muslim) is presented in **Table 1.1**. This is indeed a complex distribution. To help one to

understand the representativeness of the overall sample, **Table 1.2** presents the percentage share of all the districts in the total sample, separately for rural and urban components. Similarly, **Table 1.3** presents the percentage share of all the castes (Hindus and Muslims) in the total sample, again separately for rural and urban areas.

#### **1.4 Plan of the Report**

The present Report has 5 Chapters. This Introductory chapter presents, among others, the objectives and methodology of the primary survey. Chapter II is devoted to the Demographic Profile of the upper caste population in Bihar. Thanks to the availability of census data of 2011, the demographic characteristics are analysed here in a comparative framework, using similar information on the general population. Thereafter, Chapter III focuses on the Educational and Health Status of the upper caste population. The Economic Status of the upper caste population in Bihar is analysed in Chapter IV, using a number of indicators — Occupation, Land Endowment (in rural areas), Household Income, Indebtedness, Migration Pattern and Standard of living. Finally, Chapter V (Conclusion) collects the salient findings of the study, and then makes some recommendations to improve the substantial educational and economic disadvantages that part of the upper caste population in Bihar suffers from.

**Table 1.1 : Sample Size by District, Religion and Caste (Rural and Urban)**

Districts	Brahmin	Bhumihar	Rajput	Kayasth	ALL HUC	Sheikh	Syed	Pathan	ALL MUC	Total
<b>RURAL</b>										
Araria	179	56	12	52	299	0	0	45	45	344
Aurangabad	77	62	214	9	362	2	24	6	32	394
Bhagalpur	107	72	124	17	320	86	0	14	100	420
Begusarai	123	87	93	14	317	52	79	0	131	448
Buxar	171	108	27	23	329	2	27	13	42	371
Darbhanga	172	42	109	1	324	87	213	0	300	624
E.Champaran	84	95	105	35	319	61	51	0	112	431
Gaya	144	89	64	29	326	104	7	48	159	485
Gopalganj	83	8	228	32	351	10	23	23	56	407
Madhubani	122	73	88	15	298	95	0	21	116	414
Munger	83	76	156	44	359	50	4	54	108	467
Muzaffarpur	110	59	100	77	346	107	0	0	107	453
Nawada	112	125	28	17	282	60	22	28	110	392
Purnea	98	138	56	30	322	48	18	74	140	462
Patna	51	161	83	33	328	31	0	5	36	364
Rohtas	114	47	130	16	307	20	0	35	55	362
Saharsa	110	21	165	9	305	86	0	0	86	391
Supaul	178	48	76	12	314	42	6	57	105	419
Sitamarhi	113	62	100	30	305	34	0	78	112	417
Saran	66	0	172	51	289	26	12	98	136	425
Rural Total	2297	1429	2130	546	6402	1003	486	599	2088	8490
<b>URBAN</b>										
Bhagalpur	60	23	43	24	150	25	55	63	143	293
Darbhanga	116	2	5	40	163	66	11	54	131	294
Gaya	88	39	77	47	251	35	24	27	86	337
Purnea	86	32	110	43	271	80	14	11	105	376
Patna	47	33	69	84	233	23	10	43	76	309
Urban Total	397	129	304	238	1068	229	114	198	541	1609

**Table 1.2 : Percentage Distribution of Sample by Districts (Rural and Urban)**

District	Rural	Urban
Araria	344 (4.1)	-
Aurangabad	394 (4.6)	-
Bhagalpur	420 (4.9)	293 (18.2)
Begusarai	448 (5.3)	-
Buxar	371 (4.4)	-
Darbhanga	624 (7.3)	294 (18.3)
E. Champaran	431(5.1)	-
Gaya	485 (5.7)	337 (20.9)
Gopalganj	407 (4.8)	-
Madhubani	414 (4.9)	-
Munger	467 (5.5)	-
Muzaffarpur	453 (5.3)	-
Nawada	392 (4.6)	-
Purnea	462 (5.4)	376 (23.4)
Patna	364 (4.3)	309 (19.2)
Rohtas	362 (4.3)	-
Saharsa	391 (4.6)	-
Supaul	419 (4.9)	-
Sitamarhi	417 (4.9)	-
Saran	425 (5.0)	-
Total	8490 (100.0)	1609 (100.0)

**Table 1.3 : Percentage Distribution of Sample by Religion and Caste Groups (Rural and Urban)**

District	Rural	Urban
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>		
Brahmins	2297 (35.9)	397 (37.2)
Bhumihars	1429 (22.3)	129 (12.1)
Rajputs	2130 (33.3)	304 (28.5)
Kayasths	546 (8.5)	238 (22.3)
All HUC	6402 (100.0)	1068 (100.0)
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>		
Sheikhs	1003 (48.0)	229 (42.3)
Syeds	486 (23.3)	114 (21.1)
Pathans	599 (28.7)	198 (36.6)
All MUC	2088 (100.0)	541 (100.0)

## CHAPTER II

### DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The decennial census of India provides a fairly comprehensive demographic profile of its population, separately for different administrative units. This demographic information is also available separately for scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, the two social groups that are particularly disadvantaged for various historical reasons. But, the enormous social and economic heterogeneity across religions, castes and other social categories gets buried in the aggregated census data. As is well known, the disaggregated demographic data for different religions and caste groups were available up to 1931 census, whereafter it was discontinued ostensibly on the ground that such religion and caste-specific information causes social disharmony, highlighting, as it does, the social disparity among different religions and castes. But, unfortunately, the resulting information void has also left space for religion or caste stereotypes being used for many policy dialogues and even analyses of social dynamics in post-independence India. In this perspective, it is desirable that before this study delves on the economic and educational status of upper caste population in Bihar, their demographic profile is first presented along some important characteristics. It may also be mentioned here that the demographic information on a community, besides having obvious descriptive value, may also have analytical significance, explaining as they do the behavioural traits of the community or its social and economic status.

#### **2.1 Size of Upper Caste Population**

According to 2011 census, Bihar had a population of 104.1 million. In the absence of caste-specific data, we can only assume that the share of upper caste Hindu population (Brahmin, Bhumihar, Rajput and Kayasth) in Bihar is nearly the same as it was in undivided Bihar in 1931. Excluding the scheduled tribes, nearly the whole of whom now form part of Jharkhand's population, the share of upper caste Hindu population in Bihar was about 15 percent in 1931. Assuming the same share, the upper caste Hindu population in Bihar in 2011 is about 15.6 million. This broad estimate, however, ignores that the upper caste population might have grown at a slower rate, particularly in the recent decades, appreciating the advantage of smaller families. But the impact of this demographic change on the present population size is likely to be rather marginal.

As regards upper caste Muslims, one may first note that the share of all Muslims in the total population of Bihar is 16.9 percent, according to the 2011 census. This implies a population of about 17.6 million for all Muslims in Bihar. According to a survey on ‘Socio-economic and Educational Status of Muslims in Bihar’, conducted by the Asian Development Research Institute, Patna, the approximate share of upper caste Muslims in Bihar (Sheikh, Syed and Pathan) is 35 percent, which implies a population of about 6.2 million for the upper caste Muslims in Bihar. Together, the upper castes of Bihar, both Hindus and Muslims, have a population of 21.8 million in 2011. Thus, the share of upper caste Hindus in the total population of Bihar is about 15.0 percent, that of upper caste Muslims 6.0 percent, totalling to a share of 21.0 percent for upper castes (both Hindu and Muslim) in the total population of Bihar. It should also be noted here that this overall share of upper caste Hindu and Muslim population vary extensively not only across the districts, but between rural and urban areas as well.

## **2.2 General Demographic Features**

Within the general demographic features, the present survey has collected data on household size, sex ratio, age distribution of the population, and their marital status. The data on these features of the upper caste population are analysed below in a comparative framework, using the parallel data on total population in Bihar, as obtained from the 2011 census data.

The average household size for upper caste population in Bihar is found to be 6.4 persons in rural areas and 6.3 persons in urban areas (**Table 2.1**). This figure is substantially higher than the household size for the general population — 5.5 persons in rural areas and 5.7 in urban areas, as obtained from the 2011 census. This probably indicates that the practice of a joint or extended family is relatively wider among the upper caste households. It is also observed that the size of the upper caste Muslim households (6.7 persons) is a little higher than that for upper caste Hindu households (6.3 persons) in the rural areas; in the urban areas, the corresponding figures are 6.8 persons (Muslims) and 6.1 persons (Hindus).

Bihar is one of those states in India where the sex ratio (918 females per 1000 males) is lower than the national average (943 females per 1000 males), the latter itself being low, indicating gender bias against females in both Bihar and India. For the upper caste population in Bihar, the sex ratio



is only slightly better than the state average in the rural areas, where the sex ratio for upper castes stands at 935, compared to 895 for the entire population (**Table 2.1**); In the urban areas, however, the sex ratio for upper castes (898) is worse than that for the general population (921). It is, however, interesting to note that such gender bias against the females is relatively less among the upper caste Muslims.

From the percentage distribution of the population by age, one can approximate both fertility behaviour of the population through the share of children (0-6 years) in total population and, secondly, its health status through the share of old people (60+ years) in the same. From **Table 2.1**, one may notice that, on both these grounds, the upper caste population in Bihar enjoy an advantage. As regards the share of children in total population in rural areas, it is 11.7 and 17.8 percent for the upper caste Hindu and Muslim populations, respectively, compared to 18.8 for the general population. This indicates lowering of birth rates in recent years, particularly among the upper caste Hindus, which would gradually lead to the desired reduction in population growth rate. Similarly, in the urban areas again, the share of children in total population is 9.5 and 13.3 percent for the upper caste Hindu and Muslim population, respectively, compared to 14.9 percent for the general population. These figures also indicate that the above desirable demographic changes are more pronounced for the upper caste Hindus than for their Muslim counterparts; secondly, this desired change is also more visible in the urban areas. In case of relative health status of upper castes and general population, as indicated by the share of old people in total population, it is observed that the upper caste Hindu households probably enjoy a better health status than the general population, but this advantage is not available to upper caste Muslim population. In the rural areas, the share of aged persons (60+ years) is 9.6 percent for the upper caste Hindu population, compared to 8.6 percent for the general population, indicating a better health status for the former. But among the upper caste Muslim population, the corresponding share is lower at 5.9 percent, indicating their poorer health status. In the urban areas, one observes a similar pattern.

From the percentage distribution of the population in terms of marital status (**Table 2.2**), one observes two different patterns for the upper caste Hindus and Muslims. According to the 2011 census, the share of unmarried people in the general population in rural areas is 50.4 percent. For

the upper caste Hindus in rural areas, the survey indicates a lower share of 46.7 percent. This probably indicates a lower age at marriage for upper caste Hindus. In contrast, the share of unmarried people among the upper caste Muslims in rural areas is much higher at 59.1 percent, indicating a higher age at marriage for this section of the population. In the urban areas also, a similar contrast is observed between the upper caste Hindus and Muslims. From **Table 2.2**, it is also found that the phenomenon of divorce or separation is relatively less among the upper caste population, both Hindu and Muslim. In contrast to 2.0 percent divorcee/ separated persons among the general population in rural areas, as per the 2011 census, it is only 0.1 percent for both upper caste Hindus and Muslims. In the urban areas again one observes a similar contrast.

For all the demographic features that have been discussed above (household size, sex ratio, distribution by age, and distribution by marital status), no comparison was made among the four upper caste Hindus, or three upper caste Muslims, mainly because these characteristics were nearly the same across all the castes. Later, however, the report has drawn attention to the caste-wise differences, whenever they were significant.

### **2.3 Activity and Employment Status**

It is meaningful to judge the economic status of a population in terms of their levels of income or standard of living, which have been presented later in this report for the upper caste population of Bihar; but it is the activity status of the members of a population and the employment status of its working population that determines to a large extent its economic and social conditions. Ideally speaking, for a population to attain higher levels of income and living standards, all its younger members should be engaged in education and acquisition of skills, just as all its adult members should be gainfully employed in different occupations.

For a number of social reasons, these activity patterns are dissimilar for males and females, and they need to be analysed separately. From **Table 2.3A**, presenting the activity status of males, it is first observed that, in the rural areas, although attendance in school/college is a near universal practice for upper caste Hindu children, it is not so for the upper caste Muslim children. Among the Muslims, 3.3 percent of the children are still out of school/college, and this educational exclusion is even higher (4.2 percent) for the Pathans. Secondly, the size of the workforce (taking

both employed and unemployed) is 39.7 percent of the total population for the upper caste Hindus, and 38.9 percent for upper caste Muslims. This is substantially lower than 46.7 percent, the share of the workforce for the general population in rural areas, as reported by the 2011 census. It is also reported that nearly one-fourth of the workforce among the upper caste population, both for Hindus and Muslims, are unemployed. Surprisingly, this unemployment rate is the highest among the Bhumihars, a community which is most advantaged in terms of land endowments. It should, however, be mentioned here that the category of unemployed in the present survey includes a substantial number of highly under-employed workers. From these findings about the activity status of the upper caste males in rural Bihar, one can safely conclude that many of these households are economically stressed, in spite of their higher caste status.

In the urban areas, one observes an almost similar pattern. For one, the educational exclusion is quite noticeable for the young upper caste Muslims, unlike their Hindu counterparts. As regards the size of the working population (comprising both the employed and unemployed), it is higher in the urban areas for both the upper caste Hindus (46.6 percent) and upper caste Muslims (43.0 percent). Both these figures are quite close to the size of the working population for the general population (44.9 percent), as reported by the 2011 census. The extent of unemployment and underemployment is nearly the same in rural and urban areas, nearly one-fourth of the working population. As regards the castes, which are specially disadvantaged in terms of employment in urban areas, it is the Kayasths among the Hindus, 14.1 percent of whom are unemployed, and Syeds among the Muslims, 11.3 of whom are in the same category. As it would emerge in the next chapter, these two castes are indeed relatively more advantaged in terms of their educational status. This, in a sense, indicates high incidence of educated unemployment among the upper caste population in the urban areas, specially the Kayasths and Syeds.

For the female population, the pattern of activity status is substantially different, as mentioned before, particularly with respect to the size of the working population. As regards the activity status of young females (6-20 years) in rural areas, nearly all of them are going to school/college in case of upper caste Hindus; among the upper caste Muslims, however, one can observe some educational exclusion for young ones, as 4.4 percent of them are out of school/college. It should also be noted here that the extent of educational exclusion is higher among the females, for upper

caste population belonging to both the religions. The main difference between the two genders appear when one considers the size of the working population, barely 2.6 percent for the upper caste females, both for the Hindus and Muslims. This is primarily because of traditional social norms that discourages the participation of women from upper castes in economic activities. For the general population, the size of the working population for females is as high as 20.2 percent in rural areas, as per the 2011 census. The economic loss due to the non-participation of females in gainful activities is substantial for all upper castes, either Hindu or Muslim. One should, however, remember here that a majority of the adult females may not be a part of the workforce, but as housewives, they are undoubtedly engaged in gainful activities.

In the urban areas, although the exact figures for people under different activity categories are slightly different, the revealed pattern is nearly the same. For one, the phenomenon of educational exclusion is extremely limited among the upper caste Hindus, but for the upper caste Muslims, it is quite noticeable. Secondly, the size of the working female population is very small even in the urban areas — 7.6 percent for the upper caste female Hindus, and 7.4 percent for the upper caste female Muslims. Compared to this, the size of the working population among the females is noticeably higher at 10.4 percent for the general population, as per the 2011 census. One should, however, note here that the difference between the rural and urban female population in terms of the size of working population is substantial — 2.6 percent in rural areas, compared to 7.5 percent in the urban areas. Here again, two specific castes which record higher participation of women in economic work are Kayasths among the upper caste Hindus (12.2 percent) and Syeds among the upper caste Muslims (10.9 percent).

Just as the size of the working population, whether small or large, contributes to the economic status of the overall population, so does the employment status of their workers — whether self-employed, or unpaid family worker, or salary/wage earner (with regular income) or salary/wage earner (with irregular income). Here again, one observes considerable difference between the male and female workers and they need to be analysed separately.

**Table 2.4A** presents the percentage distribution of male workers in different employment status categories. A higher number of workers under the self-employment category for a particular

caste/religion would imply the ownership of substantial productive assets by the group. However, this is not the case for the upper caste population in rural Bihar, where only 24.7 percent of the upper caste Hindus and even lower 15.7 percent of the upper caste Muslims are self-employed, generally in agriculture, thanks to their land assets. The majority of the workers in rural areas (66.3 percent of the upper caste Hindu workers and even higher 82.2 percent of the upper caste Muslim workers) are only salary/wage earners, with or without a regular income. Obviously, those workers whose salary/wage earnings are irregular form a distinct disadvantaged category. Among the upper caste Hindus in rural areas, 32.3 percent are wage/salary earners with a regular income, while 34.0 percent of salary/wage earners have only irregular income. For the upper caste Muslim workers, the situation is far worse, only 23.9 percent of whom are salary/wage earners with regular income and a staggering 58.3 percent earn their living through irregular salary/wage earnings. Admittedly, such disadvantaged position in the labour market is a common phenomenon for the general population, but what needs to be noted here is that, even for the so-called privileged castes, the disadvantage is very substantial. It is this disadvantage in the labour market that ultimately causes economic hardship for many upper caste households, particularly those who are Muslims.

In the urban areas, an opportunity for self-employment is available to 23.3 percent of the upper caste Hindu workers, nearly the same as in rural areas (24.7 percent). For the upper caste Muslims, a similar opportunity is available to 19.3 percent of the worker, slightly higher than those in rural areas (15.7 percent). However, in any case, this leaves a large number of urban workers in the category of salary/wage earners. When one compares the distribution of salary/wage earners between those enjoying regular and irregular incomes, some major differences are observed, both between rural and urban areas and then between upper caste Hindus and Muslims. As regards rural-urban differences, it is seen that the proportion of regular salary/wage earners is substantially higher in urban areas, thanks to its diversified economy with relatively high productivity sectors. While in the rural areas, the share of regular salary/wage earners is only 30.1 percent, it increases to 54.2 percent in the urban areas. Even more significantly, while this increase is substantial for upper caste Hindu male workers (from 32.3 in rural areas to 60.7 percent in urban areas), the corresponding increase is rather modest for upper caste Muslim male workers (from 23.9 percent in rural areas to 41.4 percent in urban areas). It is this phenomenon of wider disadvantage in

labour market for upper caste Muslim male workers that leads to wider Hindu-Muslim economic disparity in urban areas, compared to the same in the rural areas.

Since the participation of upper caste females, be they Hindu and Muslims, in gainful employment is very limited, **Table 2.4B** indeed refers to only a small number of workers. As such, functioning of the women labour market contributes only marginally to the overall economic status of the population. But it is interesting to note from the table that, even among the upper caste females, being employed as an irregular salary/wage earner, is not a rare phenomenon. Among the upper caste Hindus, these irregular salary/wage earners constitute 11.8 percent of the total number of female workers in rural areas, and 8.8 percent in the urban areas. Among the upper caste Muslims, these shares are much higher — 35.7 percent in rural areas and 24.0 percent in urban areas.

Taking into account the overall findings above, it appears that much of the economic disadvantages that some sections of the upper caste population in Bihar suffer from can be easily traced to their traditional activity patterns and disadvantaged employment status.

**Table 2.1 : Average Household Size, Percentage Distribution by Age and Sex Ratio**

Religion / Caste	Average Household Size	Percentage Distribution by Age					Sex Ratio
		0-6	7-20	21-60	60+	Total	
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	6.1	11.9	30.4	48.0	9.7	100.0	940
Bhumihars	6.3	11.0	28.5	50.5	10.1	100.0	925
Rajputs	6.4	12.2	29.5	49.0	9.2	100.0	911
Kayasths	6.0	11.2	27.7	51.6	9.5	100.0	916
All HUC	6.3	11.7	29.5	49.2	9.6	100.0	925
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	6.8	18.5	36.9	38.7	5.9	100.0	960
Syeds	6.4	14.3	37.7	41.8	6.2	100.0	934
Pathans	6.9	19.3	36.4	38.7	5.6	100.0	991
All MUC	6.7	17.8	36.9	39.4	5.9	100.0	963
All HUC + MUC	6.4	13.3	31.4	46.6	8.6	100.0	935
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	6.1	10.4	27.4	53.8	8.4	100.0	880
Bhumihars	5.9	8.8	27.7	55.2	8.3	100.0	910
Rajputs	6.5	10.1	25.7	56.3	7.9	100.0	891
Kayasths	5.5	7.4	21.8	56.3	14.4	100.0	841
All HUC	6.1	9.5	25.7	55.3	9.5	100.0	879
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	6.8	14.1	35.9	45.7	4.4	100.0	934
Syeds	6.3	12.1	28.1	52.9	6.9	100.0	945
Pathans	6.9	12.9	34.4	47.6	5.1	100.0	926
All MUC	6.8	13.3	33.8	47.8	5.2	100.0	934
All HUC + MUC	6.3	10.8	28.7	52.6	7.9	100.0	898

Note : According to 2011 census, the average household size for the general population is — rural (5.5 persons) and urban (5.7 persons). The share of children (0-6 years) for general population is — rural (18.8 percent) and urban (14.9 percent). The share of old persons for the general population is — rural (5.9 percent) and urban (5.7 percent). Finally, the sex ratio is — rural (895) and urban (921).

**Table 2.2 : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Marital Status**

Religion / Caste	Unmarried	Married	Widow or Widower	Divorcee	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	47.0	48.6	4.3	0.1	100.0
Bhumihars	43.6	51.8	4.5	0.1	100.0
Rajputs	48.0	47.5	4.4	0.1	100.0
Kayasths	48.7	46.6	4.6	0.1	100.0
All HUC	46.7	48.8	4.4	0.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	58.5	38.7	2.7	0.1	100.0
Syeds	58.9	38.2	2.8	0.0	100.0
Pathans	60.2	36.8	2.9	0.1	100.0
All MUC	59.1	38.0	2.8	0.1	100.0
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>					
All HUC + MUC	50.0	46.0	4.0	0.1	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	45.8	50.6	3.5	0.1	100.0
Bhumihars	42.8	54.3	2.9	0.0	100.0
Rajputs	46.0	50.1	3.9	0.1	100.0
Kayasths	44.0	51.3	4.5	0.2	100.0
All HUC	45.1	51.0	3.8	0.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	60.3	35.4	4.0	0.2	100.0
Syeds	54.4	39.7	6.0	0.0	100.0
Pathans	58.7	37.6	3.6	0.1	100.0
All MUC	58.6	37.1	4.2	0.1	100.0
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>					
All HUC + MUC	50.0	46.0	3.9	0.1	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the distribution of general population according to marital status in rural areas is — unmarried (50.4 percent), married (44.5 percent), widow/widows (3.2 percent) and divorced/separate (2.0 percent). The corresponding urban percentages are — 49.4 percent, 44.4 percent, 3.4 percent and 2.8 percent.



**Table 2.3A : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Activity Status (Male)**

Religion / Caste	Child (Less than 6 years)	Young and Attending School / College	Young, but not Attending School / College	Employed	Unemployed	Old / invalid	Total
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	10.4	32.8	0.7	31.6	8.5	16.0	100.0
Bhumihars	10.6	30.7	0.6	27.1	13.2	17.9	100.0
Rajputs	11.6	32.1	0.8	29.0	8.6	18.0	100.0
Kayasths	10.2	30.9	0.6	36.2	9.1	13.0	100.0
All HUC	10.8	31.9	0.7	30.1	9.6	16.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	15.9	31.0	3.7	30.9	7.5	11.0	100.0
Syeds	12.9	35.7	1.5	32.9	7.4	9.7	100.0
Pathans	16.0	30.6	4.2	30.1	8.7	10.3	100.0
All MUC	15.3	31.9	3.3	31.1	7.9	10.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	12.0	31.9	1.4	30.4	9.2	15.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	9.2	31.8	0.1	36.1	8.9	13.9	100.0
Bhumihars	9.5	29.8	0.3	33.5	10.4	16.5	100.0
Rajputs	9.0	31.1	0.3	35.7	10.5	13.3	100.0
Kayasths	6.5	26.9	0.0	37.1	14.1	15.4	100.0
All HUC	8.6	30.3	0.2	35.9	10.7	14.4	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	12.4	32.8	2.2	31.6	10.0	11.1	100.0
Syeds	11.6	30.9	0.3	30.9	11.3	15.1	100.0
Pathans	10.4	28.4	3.0	35.3	9.9	13.0	100.0
All MUC	11.5	30.8	2.1	32.8	10.2	12.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	9.6	30.5	0.9	34.8	10.5	13.7	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the percentages of works (employed and unemployed) among the males in general population is — rural (46.7 percent) and urban (44.9 percent).

**Table 2.3B : Percentage Distribution of Persons by Activity Status (Female)**

Religion / Caste	Child (Less than 6 years)	Young and Attending School/ College	Young, but not Attending School/ College	Employed	Unem- ployed	House wife	Old or invalid	Total
<b>RURAL</b>								
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>								
Brahmins	10.4	29.0	1.4	1.1	0.8	50.6	6.7	100.0
Bhumihars	8.4	27.1	1.2	1.4	1.7	53.8	6.4	100.0
Rajputs	9.8	29.1	1.5	1.1	1.2	51.3	6.0	100.0
Kayasths	8.9	29.1	1.5	3.1	2.0	47.9	7.6	100.0
All HUC	9.6	28.6	1.4	1.3	1.2	51.3	6.5	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>								
Sheikhs	17.2	28.5	5.0	1.0	1.4	41.0	5.9	100.0
Syeds	12.1	37.4	2.4	1.9	1.3	39.8	5.2	100.0
Pathans	18.2	30.3	4.9	1.0	1.3	38.9	5.3	100.0
All MUC	16.4	30.9	4.4	1.2	1.3	40.1	5.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	11.4	29.2	2.2	1.3	1.3	48.3	6.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>								
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>								
Brahmins	8.2	28.0	0.5	2.1	2.5	52.1	6.6	100.0
Bhumihars	6.0	26.7	0.6	5.1	4.4	48.9	8.3	100.0
Rajputs	8.2	27.1	0.6	3.1	4.2	51.0	5.8	100.0
Kayasths	6.4	23.3	0.0	6.2	6.0	50.5	7.7	100.0
All HUC	7.6	26.6	0.5	3.6	4.0	51.0	6.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>								
Sheikhs	11.7	37.4	2.8	3.1	2.3	36.6	6.1	100.0
Syeds	8.2	34.4	0.0	6.8	4.1	39.1	7.5	100.0
Pathans	12.3	30.7	4.0	1.8	5.8	40.6	4.9	100.0
All MUC	11.2	34.3	2.7	3.4	4.0	38.6	5.9	100.0
All HUC + MUC	8.9	29.5	1.3	3.5	4.0	46.4	6.5	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the percentage of works (employed and unemployed) among the females in general population is — rural (20.2 percent) and urban (10.4 percent).

**Table 2.4A : Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Employment Status (Male)**

Religion / Caste	Self-employed	Unpaid Family Worker	Salary/Wage-earner (Regular)	Salary/Wage-earner (Irregular)	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	24.8	0.2	29.1	39.4	6.5	100.0
Bhumihars	26.3	2.3	35.2	24.7	11.5	100.0
Rajputs	23.2	0.7	31.6	35.1	9.5	100.0
Kayasths	26.5	0.2	40.8	29.0	3.5	100.0
All HUC	24.7	0.8	32.3	34.0	8.2	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	14.1	0.2	24.1	60.5	1.1	100.0
Syeds	15.7	0.0	30.9	51.2	2.3	100.0
Pathans	18.5	0.8	17.8	60.4	2.5	100.0
All MUC	15.7	0.3	23.9	58.3	1.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC	22.3	0.7	30.1	40.4	6.5	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	22.2	0.3	64.9	11.6	1.1	100.0
Bhumihars	21.6	1.7	64.7	7.8	4.3	100.0
Rajputs	27.8	0.0	53.4	15.3	3.5	100.0
Kayasths	20.1	0.4	61.6	15.7	2.2	100.0
All HUC	23.3	0.4	60.7	13.2	2.4	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	24.0	0.9	35.5	39.6	0.0	100.0
Syeds	16.7	0.0	59.4	19.8	4.2	100.0
Pathans	15.6	0.5	39.3	42.7	1.9	100.0
All MUC	19.3	0.6	41.4	37.2	1.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	22.0	0.4	54.2	21.3	2.1	100.0

**Table 2.4B : Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Employment Status (Female)**

Religion / Caste	Self-employed	Unpaid Family Worker	Salary/Wage-earner (Regular)	Salary / Wage-earner (Irregular)	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	14.5	0.0	69.4	16.1	0.0	100.0
Bhumihars	6.0	0.0	86.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
Rajputs	6.7	0.0	75.0	13.3	5.0	100.0
Kayasths	10.0	0.0	77.5	12.5	0.0	100.0
All HUC	9.4	0.0	76.4	11.8	2.4	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	10.7	0.0	42.9	42.9	3.6	100.0
Syeds	8.3	0.0	75.0	16.7	0.0	100.0
Pathans	5.6	0.0	38.9	50.0	5.6	100.0
All MUC	8.6	0.0	52.9	35.7	2.9	100.0
All HUC + MUC	9.2	0.0	70.6	17.7	2.5	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	15.8	0.0	73.7	10.5	0.0	100.0
Bhumihars	18.8	0.0	75.0	6.3	0.0	100.0
Rajputs	4.2	0.0	87.5	8.3	0.0	100.0
Kayasths	31.3	0.0	56.3	9.4	3.1	100.0
All HUC	18.7	0.0	71.4	8.8	1.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	100.0
Syeds	5.0	0.0	90.0	5.0	0.0	100.0
Pathans	60.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	100.0
All MUC	22.0	0.0	54.0	24.0	0.0	100.0
All HUC + MUC	19.9	0.0	65.2	14.2	0.7	100.0

## CHAPTER III

### EDUCATIONAL AND HEALTH STATUS

The educational status of a population commands great significance in the context of not only its social and economic status, but its political and cultural status as well. Prima facie, the level of education determines the ability of a person to discharge various economic and social functions that contribute to his/her own well being as well as growth and prosperity of the community. In a wider sense, through deeper knowledge and higher levels of awareness, education also promotes transformation of traditional societies, leading to desired social changes. In addition, wider participation of people in both political process and cultural activities is also greatly facilitated by higher levels of education, raising their quality of life. In this context, an enquiry on the social and economic status of upper caste population in Bihar should include a specific enquiry on their educational status. Further, apart from education, health is also of prime importance for any population to achieve the desired social and economic goals. Life, at least as a biological phenomenon, should be secured for any social and economic progress and the health standards of a population is indeed an indicator of that biological security. This chapter, therefore, has a brief section on the health status of the upper caste population of Bihar.

#### **3.1 Literacy Rates and Levels of Education**

To begin with, it is first noted that the literacy rates for the upper caste population in Bihar is 75.6 percent in rural areas, and 85.9 percent in the urban areas. For the general population, the literacy rates are 59.8 percent (rural) and 76.9 percent (urban). It is, thus, obvious that the literacy rates for the upper caste population in Bihar is substantially higher than that for general population, in both the rural and urban areas. But simultaneously, it also needs to be underlined here that no less than one-fourth of the upper caste population in rural Bihar is still illiterate, and are obviously socially disadvantaged, in spite of the advantage they enjoy in caste hierarchy. In the urban areas, such disadvantage is relatively less, but even there, about one-seventh of the upper caste population lacks this elementary life-skill. Between the two religious groups, the literacy rates are higher for the upper caste Hindus, compared to their Muslim counterparts. In the rural areas, the literacy rates for upper caste Hindus and Muslims are 79.9 and 63.3 percent, respectively, implying a difference of 16.6 percentage points. In the urban areas this difference is reduced to 11.2 percentage points,

with a literacy rate of 90.0 percent for the upper caste Hindus and 78.8 percent for their Muslim counterparts.

Following the census practice, a person was considered to be literate in the present survey if he/she was able to read and write a small text. This is indeed a very liberal definition of literacy and, as such, many persons identified as literate in the present survey may be so only marginally. With only a marginal level of literacy, it is very unlikely that a person is able to reap the various advantages of education like wide knowledge, advanced skill or an enlightened attitude. It is, therefore, desirable that the educational standards of the upper caste population in Bihar is judged not just in terms of literacy rates, but in terms of percentage of population having a decent level of education, say, completion of higher secondary level of education. From **Table 3.1**, presenting the distribution of population by educational level, it is observed that the percentage of upper caste population having passed at least higher secondary is only 31.2 percent in rural areas; in urban areas, the figure is increased to 52.1 percent. These figures obviously indicate that the educational status of upper caste population of Bihar is not as high as is indicated by their higher literacy rates. Such low share of adequately educated persons (higher secondary and above) in the total population is also observed for upper caste population belonging to both the Hindus and Muslims. In the rural areas, the share of persons with at least higher secondary level of education among the upper caste Hindus is only 36.8 percent; for the upper caste Muslims, the share is much lower at 15.5 percent. In the urban areas, the educational levels are expectedly higher; but even here, among the upper caste Hindus, the share of persons with at least higher secondary level of education may be decent at 61.7 percent, but among the upper caste Muslims, the share is only 35.1 percent. These figures again underline the reality that, notwithstanding their higher status in caste hierarchy, many among the upper caste population in Bihar suffer for low educational status.

From the literacy rates presented in **Table 3.1** and the percentage distributions of persons by their educational level, one can also judge the relative educational status of different upper castes, either Hindu or Muslim. In the rural areas, among the upper caste Hindus, Kayasths enjoy the highest educational status, with a literacy rate of 85.4 percent, followed by Bhumihars (81.2 percent), Rajputs (79.6 percent) and Brahmins (78.2 percent). That the literacy rate is the lowest among the Brahmins is rather surprising, since it is this caste which traditionally is engaged in all knowledge-

related activities. Among the upper caste Muslims, it is the Syeds whose educational status is the highest, with a literacy rate of 76.5 percent, far ahead of other two castes, Pathans (60.7 percent) and Sheikhs (59.0 percent). Between the two religions, for the upper caste Muslims in rural areas, the literacy rate is 63.3 percent, substantially lower than that for upper caste Hindus at 79.9 percent. In the urban areas, the literacy rates are invariably higher for all the castes, but their relative position remains the same as in rural areas.

In the context of judging the educational status of a population, it is necessary to pay attention to the gender differences in literacy rates. Unless the spread of formal education reaches the female population, many of its expected gains are likely to remain unachieved, like social change, wider political participation or gender equality. For the general population, as per the 2011 census, the gender difference in literacy rate is 19.7 percentage points (71.2 percent for the males, minus 51.5 percent for the females). In the rural areas, this difference is slightly higher at 20.7 percentage point, while in the urban areas, it is considerably reduced at 12.1 percentage points. As is quite evident from **Tables 3.2A and 3.2B**, such gender differences are substantially lower for the upper caste population of Bihar, although they are not altogether absent. In the rural areas, the gender differences in literacy rates for the upper caste Hindus and Muslims are nearly the same at 10.5 and 9.5 percentage points, respectively. In the urban areas, these differences are further lowered — 2.9 and 5.0 percentage points for upper caste Hindus and Muslims, respectively. Since the current enrolment rates for boys and girls in schools/colleges are nearly the same, as is observed in the next section, it is obvious that the present gender differences in the literacy rates are the consequences of earlier educational practices which were biased against the girls. Now that this bias has disappeared, one would observe greater gender equality in literacy rates in near future. As regards the relative educational status of different Hindu and Muslim Upper Castes in terms of male and female literacy rates, the ranking remains unaltered for female literacy rates from what it was observed earlier with respect to overall literacy rates — Kayasths, Bhumihars, Rajputs and Brahmins. However, with respect to male literacy rates, the Brahmins are slightly ahead of the Rajputs. This indicates slightly wider gender difference among the Brahmins in terms of educational status.

### 3.2 Present Educational Practice

The present educational status of a population depends on many factors, including the educational practices in the past. Both in Bihar and most parts of India, there were huge lapses in those past educational practices, leading to the lower educational status of the population. But whether or not that burden of history continues for a population depends on the present educational practices, particularly in terms of enrolment of young people in schools/colleges. In this perspective, **Table 3.3** presents the distribution of young people (6-20 years) by their present educational practice for the upper caste population in Bihar. It is indeed satisfying that the percentage of young people pursuing education is very high for the upper caste population of Bihar. For young males, these shares are — upper caste Hindus in rural areas (90.8 percent), upper caste Muslims in rural areas (76.2 percent), upper caste Hindus in urban areas (96.5 percent), and upper caste Muslims in urban areas (79.2 percent). But, unfortunately, for none of these groups of people, the educational coverage is universal. For young upper caste Hindu males, 9.2 percent in the rural areas and 3.5 percent in urban areas are educationally excluded. For young upper caste Muslim males, the extent of educational exclusion is indeed very high — 23.8 and 20.8 in rural and urban areas, respectively. It is, however, very satisfying that this phenomenon of educational exclusion is only slightly more for the young females, both in the rural and urban areas. This points towards the disappearance of bias against girls' education, at least among the upper caste population in Bihar. From **Table 3.3**, one can also observe that the phenomenon of a boy/girl dropping out of education is wider than their non-enrolment. It probably indicates that, for many upper caste households in Bihar, the phenomenon of educational exclusion of their children is not due to their indifferent attitude toward education.

Apart from finding the extent of educational exclusion among the upper caste population in Bihar, the present survey had also tried to locate the reasons for such exclusion. For young males (**Table 3.4A**), it is interesting to note that it is the poverty of the households which is the main reason for some of them to remain outside the purview of formal education. Since most of the educational institutions in Bihar are run by the government even now where educational expenses are rather low, it is obvious that those upper caste households who do not send all their young members to school/college are not just poor, but they are indeed very poor. In rural areas, such severe poverty accounts for 49.0 percent of the young upper caste Hindus not going to school/college; for the



young upper caste Muslims, the figure is much higher at 61.8 percent. In the urban areas, the corresponding figures are 28.6 percent (young upper caste Hindus) and 62.1 percent (young upper caste Muslims). In other words, the poverty as a cause for educational exclusion is less relevant for upper caste Hindus in urban areas, but for their Muslim counterparts the problem is equally serious in both rural and urban areas. Secondly, ‘necessity of working at home’ is generally thought to be a reason for educational exclusion for girls, but as the figures in **Table 3.4A** show, it is also relevant for boys. The attitudinal problem (parents thought education is not necessary) is only marginally responsible for educational exclusion of boys at present. It is generally believed that, even in the recent past, this attitudinal problem had obstructed the spread of education in Bihar. The information on reasons for educational exclusion of girls is presented in **Table 3.4B**. Since ‘marriage’ and ‘lack of girls’ school nearby’ appear in this table as two additional reasons for educational exclusion of the girls, its figures are not really comparable to those in **Table 3.4A**, relating to the boys. But the important conclusion that poverty is the most important reason for educational exclusion is equally valid for girls belonging to the upper caste population, either Hindu or Muslim, in both rural and urban areas. The second most important reason for educational exclusion of girls is ‘marriage’ which, in a sense, is equivalent to the reason ‘necessity of working at home’. This pattern is again valid in both rural and urban areas, for upper caste population, belonging to either religion.

As yet another important dimension of present educational practices, the present survey has gathered information on the type of schools/colleges where the boys and girls go for their education (**Table 3.5**). Leaving out missionary schools and madarasas, each of which accounts for a small number of students, three important categories are — government institutions, costly private institutions, and low-cost private institutions. One may expect that a majority of the boys and girls belonging to the upper caste population in Bihar would opt for private educational institutions, be they costly or low-cost, thanks to their presumed better economic status. But this is not true, except for the upper caste Hindu population in urban Bihar. In their case, 32.7 of the students opt for costly private institutions, and another 23.7 percent for low-cost private institutions, totalling to 56.4 percent opting for private institutions. But even for them, it needs to be borne in mind that no less than 42.9 percent of students still opt for government institutions where the educational expenses are the least, indicating limited economic resources of their parents. For the upper caste

Muslims in urban areas, the option of private educational institution is limited to only 31.4 percent of the students. In the rural areas, the private educational institutions are not widely available and, as such, more than 80 percent of the students go to government institutions, whether upper caste Hindus or upper caste Muslims. In case of madarsas, it attracts only a small proportion of upper caste Muslim children, but interestingly, it is the children from Sheikh families that are more attracted to this institution, compared to other two Muslim Upper Castes.

As regards the medium of instructions in schools/colleges, one observes considerable variation both between the rural and urban areas, and between the two religious groups (**Table 3.6**). In the rural areas, 89.2 percent of the upper caste Hindu students receive their education in the Hindi medium, and others (10.8 percent) in English medium. But among the upper caste Muslims, Urdu appears as a third choice, through which 15.1 percent of the students receive their education, the shares of other two languages are — Hindi (78.8 percent) and English (6.1 percent), reiterating the dominance of Hindi as the medium of instruction for upper caste population of Bihar. However in the urban areas, English-medium education is far more prevalent. Among the upper caste Hindu students, the students learning through English (51.1 percent) outnumber those learning through Hindi (48.9 percent). Among the upper caste Muslims students, the option for an English-medium institution is rather limited, because of the limited economic resources of their parents. As such, the shares of students for three languages are — Hindi (63.8 percent), Urdu (10.1 percent) and English (26.1 percent). From these figures, one can conclude that, although a preference for English-medium education is clear among the upper caste population of Bihar, Hindi-medium education still covers the maximum number of students. Secondly, among the upper caste Muslims, Urdu-medium education still attracts a sizeable number of students, both in rural and urban areas.

An adequate availability of books is also a pre-requisite for students to acquire proper education. From **Table 3.7**, it is observed that although for most students belonging to the upper caste population, all the required books are available, this facility is not universal. In the rural areas, 8.2 percent of upper caste Hindu students suffer from either moderate or serious book-deficiency, the corresponding figure being a little higher (9.2 percent) for the upper caste Muslim students. In the urban areas, this deficiency is relatively less — 4.7 percent for upper caste Hindu students, and 8.0

percent for their Muslim counterparts, but the problem is not altogether absent here. Finally, **Table 3.7** also presents the information on the extent of private tuition at home. Since many of the upper caste students are indeed first generation learners and are not in a position to obtain teaching help from their parents or other senior members of the households, an arrangement for private tuition is often a critical necessity for many of them. In the rural areas, this facility is available to 42.8 percent of the upper caste Hindu students, and 30.5 percent of upper caste Muslim students. In the urban areas, this practice is expectedly wider — 60.1 percent of the upper caste Hindu students and 38.6 percent of the upper caste Muslim students enjoying this advantage. Interestingly, the practice of private tuition for students at home is wider in the urban areas, where the proportion of first generation learners is probably less. From these figures, one can conclude that the practice of private tuition for students is not limited to first generations alone for the upper caste population in Bihar; even educated parents provide this advantage to their wards, subject to their economic capacities. Further, one may also notice from **Table 3.7** that the practice of private tuition at home for the students is generally wider among those very castes which are relatively more educated — Kayasths (46.9 and 64.9 percent in rural and urban areas, respectively), Bhumihars (46.3 and 68.8 percent in rural and urban areas, respectively) and Syeds (31.8 and 56.1 percent in rural and urban areas, respectively). The relatively higher income status of the population belonging to these three castes may be one of the reasons for them to spend more on children's education, but it is quite likely that the educated persons put a higher premium on education than those who are not.

### **3.3 Present Health-Related Practices**

In the context of presenting the general demographic profile of the upper caste population of Bihar (Section 2.1), it was already noted that their health status is relatively better than that of the general population. This conclusion was based on the higher proportion of aged people (60+ years) in the overall population. The present survey did not collect any other information on health standards (like nutritional status or morbidity rates), except three aspects of their present health-related practices, each of which has significant implications for health standards — place of birth of recently born children, the coverage of different vaccinations for children, and the mode of treatment of illness for members of the household.

To begin with, **Table 3.8** presents the place of birth of recently born children (0-3 years) for the upper caste population of Bihar. The extent of institutional delivery (either in a government or private facility) is indeed very high — 79.3 percent in rural areas and 86.5 percent in urban areas; but here again it needs to be noted that the practice of an institutional delivery is not universal, even among the upper caste population in Bihar. The proportion of deliveries at home, albeit with a trained midwife, is 9.8 percent in rural areas and 8.5 percent in urban areas. The most unwanted practice of deliveries at home with a traditional midwife is again noteworthy — 11.0 and 5.0 percent in rural and urban areas, respectively. Between the two religious groups, the practice of non-institutional delivery is wider among the upper caste Muslims, more so in the rural areas.

In case of vaccination of the children, the present health practices are far more satisfactory than for institutional delivery (**Table 3.9**). Thanks to the nationwide programme for eradication of polio, the vaccination for this easily avoidable physical disadvantage is now near universal among the upper caste population in Bihar. Indeed, for the upper caste Hindus in urban Bihar, it is fully universal. However, in case of other three vaccinations — Measles, DPT and BCG, there remains a considerable gap, nearly 10 percent for all the three components. Surprisingly, even the upper caste population in urban areas lack the required awareness about complete vaccination of their children and the coverage of Measles, DPT and BCG vaccination is nearly the same in both rural and urban areas. It appears that near universalisation of polio vaccination is due to this service being available at doorsteps, unlike other vaccinations which require parents to reach a hospital or a private clinic.

The health-related practice with respect to which the upper caste population in Bihar are most disadvantaged is the mode of treatment, when a member falls ill (**Table 3.10**). Unani and homeopathy are utilised by only a small percentage of the households, in both rural and urban areas. Thus, the major mode of treatment of illness is allopathic, both in rural and urban areas, for upper caste population belonging to either religion. Within this mode of treatment, the share of government hospitals (33.9 percent) and private clinics (35.3 percent) are nearly the same in rural areas. But when it comes to the urban areas, the percentage of households opting for treatment at a government facility (29.8 percent) is much lower than for private clinics (60.5 percent). This change in preference pattern is due to the wider availability of private medical services in the

urban areas at one hand, and the relatively better economic status of urban population. What, however, needs to be stressed most in the context of mode of treatment of illness is that no less than 30.1 percent of the upper caste households in rural areas, either knowingly or unknowingly, approach a quack for treatment of illness of their members. This unwarranted, sometimes dangerous, dependence on quacks is equally observed for upper caste population belonging to both the religions. Surprisingly, even for those upper caste population in urban areas, where medical services of any kind are easily available, this dependence on quacks does not disappear altogether; 4.1 percent of the upper caste Hindus and 6.1 percent of the upper caste Muslims opt for a treatment by quacks, even in the urban areas. This choice of a quack by the upper caste households for medical treatment only indicates that, in spite of their higher literacy rate, for many such households, outmoded ideas on medical treatment are still practised.

Finally, one can also notice from the last column of **Table 3.10** that opting for the extremely traditional and wholly unscientific '*jharphuk*' for treatment is common not only in the rural areas, but in urban areas as well, albeit to a lower extent. In the rural areas, 20.2 percent of the upper caste Hindu households believe in '*jharphuk*', the corresponding figure being even higher at 35.0 percent for upper caste Muslim households. In the urban areas, the belief in '*jharphuk*' is admittedly lower, but it is not absent altogether. There, 12.7 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 24.2 percent of upper caste Muslim households still believe in that obnoxious practice.

**Table 3.1 : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level**

Religion / Caste	Literacy Rate	Percentage Distribution by Education Level					
		Illiterate	Less than Primary	Primary, but not Secondary	Secondary, but not Higher Secondary	Graduate and above	Total
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	78.2	21.8	18.0	26.5	25.2	8.5	100.0
Bhumihars	81.2	18.8	16.9	26.0	28.0	10.4	100.0
Rajputs	79.6	20.4	17.5	26.0	26.9	9.1	100.0
Kayasths	85.4	14.6	13.4	23.2	31.3	17.6	100.0
All HUC	79.9	20.1	17.2	25.9	26.9	9.9	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	59.0	41.0	26.8	20.9	8.8	2.5	100.0
Syeds	76.5	23.5	21.0	24.9	20.3	10.3	100.0
Pathans	60.7	39.3	25.3	24.1	8.9	2.3	100.0
All MUC	63.3	36.7	25.1	22.7	11.3	4.2	100.0
All HUC + MUC	75.6	24.4	19.3	25.1	22.8	8.4	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	88.4	11.6	13.9	17.6	27.9	28.9	100.0
Bhumihars	90.9	9.1	9.4	18.2	35.7	27.7	100.0
Rajputs	89.5	10.5	11.8	18.5	32.3	27.0	100.0
Kayasths	93.0	7.0	7.2	13.1	27.0	45.7	100.0
All HUC	90.0	10.0	11.3	17.0	30.0	31.7	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	77.4	22.6	22.6	25.5	19.9	9.4	100.0
Syeds	86.9	13.1	14.7	19.3	26.6	26.3	100.0
Pathans	76.1	23.9	19.3	24.3	18.7	13.9	100.0
All MUC	78.8	21.2	19.8	23.8	20.7	14.4	100.0
All HUC + MUC	85.9	14.1	14.4	19.5	26.7	25.4	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the literacy rate for the general population is — rural (59.8 percent), and urban (76.9 percent).

**Table 3.2A : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level (Male)**

Religion / Caste	Literacy Rate	Percentage Distribution by Education Level					
		Illiterate	Less than Primary	Primary, but not Secondary	Secondary, but not Higher Secondary	Graduate and above	Total
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	84.7	15.3	14.1	25.7	32.0	12.9	100.0
Bhumihars	85.5	14.5	14.3	25.2	32.0	14.1	100.0
Rajputs	84.3	15.7	14.3	24.0	32.5	13.5	100.0
Kayasths	87.7	12.3	9.7	21.1	34.5	22.3	100.0
All HUC	85.0	15.0	13.8	24.6	32.4	14.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	64.4	35.6	27.5	22.3	10.8	3.8	100.0
Syeds	79.6	20.4	18.2	25.5	21.9	14.0	100.0
Pathans	65.1	34.9	25.5	26.6	10.2	2.8	100.0
All MUC	67.9	32.1	24.9	24.3	13.1	5.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC	80.6	19.4	16.7	24.5	27.3	12.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	90.6	9.4	10.2	13.4	26.4	40.6	100.0
Bhumihars	91.0	9.0	8.1	15.3	35.0	32.7	100.0
Rajputs	90.8	9.2	9.7	15.3	29.3	36.5	100.0
Kayasths	93.7	6.3	6.0	11.7	22.5	53.5	100.0
All HUC	91.4	8.6	8.9	13.8	27.5	41.2	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	79.5	20.5	21.7	26.6	20.7	10.5	100.0
Syeds	86.8	13.2	10.9	17.7	25.4	32.8	100.0
Pathans	80.3	19.7	18.6	24.1	21.2	16.4	100.0
All MUC	81.2	18.8	18.4	23.9	21.8	17.0	100.0
All HUC + MUC	87.7	12.3	12.3	17.4	25.5	32.6	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the literacy rate for males for the general population is — rural (69.7 percent) and urban (82.6 percent).

**Table 3.2B : Literacy Rate and Percentage Distribution of Persons by Education Level (Female)**

Religion / Caste	Literacy Rate	Percentage Distribution by Education Level					
		Illiterate	Less than Primary	Primary, but not Secondary	Secondary, but not Higher Secondary	Graduate and above	Total
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	71.3	28.7	22.2	27.3	17.9	3.9	100.0
Bhumihars	76.5	23.5	19.6	26.9	23.6	6.4	100.0
Rajputs	74.4	25.6	21.0	28.2	20.8	4.4	100.0
Kayasths	83.0	17.0	17.4	25.4	27.7	12.5	100.0
All HUC	74.5	25.5	20.8	27.3	21.0	5.3	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	53.4	46.6	26.0	19.5	6.7	1.2	100.0
Syeds	73.2	26.8	24.0	24.3	18.6	6.3	100.0
Pathans	56.3	43.7	25.2	21.6	7.5	1.9	100.0
All MUC	58.5	41.5	25.3	21.2	9.5	2.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	70.2	29.8	22.0	25.7	17.9	4.6	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	85.8	14.2	18.1	22.4	29.7	15.7	100.0
Bhumihars	90.8	9.2	10.8	21.3	36.5	22.2	100.0
Rajputs	88.1	11.9	14.1	22.0	35.7	16.3	100.0
Kayasths	92.3	7.7	8.7	14.8	32.4	36.4	100.0
All HUC	88.5	11.5	14.0	20.6	33.0	20.9	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	75.1	24.9	23.5	24.3	19.0	8.3	100.0
Syeds	87.1	12.9	18.7	21.1	27.9	19.4	100.0
Pathans	71.7	28.3	20.0	24.5	15.9	11.2	100.0
All MUC	76.2	23.8	21.3	23.8	19.6	11.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	83.9	16.1	16.7	21.8	28.0	17.4	100.0

Note : According to 2011 census, the literacy for females for the general population is — rural (49.0 percent) and urban (70.5 percent).



**Table 3.3 : Percentage Distribution of Young Children (6-20 yrs) by Present Educational Practice**

Religion / Caste	Male			Female		
	Attending School or College	Left School after Joining	Never Joined School	Attending School or College	Left School after Joining	Never Joined School
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	91.2	5.9	2.9	89.0	7.9	3.1
Bhumihars	91.9	5.6	2.5	89.3	8.2	2.5
Rajputs	90.2	8.1	1.8	89.1	9.0	1.8
Kayasths	88.9	8.3	2.8	92.4	5.2	2.3
All HUC	90.8	6.8	2.4	89.4	8.1	2.5
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	74.0	15.1	10.8	73.1	15.5	11.4
Syeds	84.0	12.1	3.9	84.4	11.2	4.3
Pathans	74.3	14.1	11.6	74.7	13.5	11.7
All MUC	76.2	14.2	9.6	76.1	14.0	9.9
All HUC + MUC	86.3	9.0	4.6	85.2	10.0	4.8
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	95.8	2.9	1.3	92.1	7.1	0.8
Bhumihars	100.0	0.0	0.0	96.4	3.6	0.0
Rajputs	96.3	2.9	0.8	95.6	3.4	1.0
Kayasths	95.9	4.1	0.0	98.2	1.8	0.0
All HUC	96.5	2.7	0.7	94.7	4.7	0.6
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	79.8	12.5	7.7	88.3	8.6	3.1
Syeds	95.4	3.4	1.1	98.9	1.1	0.0
Pathans	72.1	21.2	6.8	79.4	12.4	8.2
All MUC	79.2	14.5	6.3	86.9	8.7	4.4
All HUC + MUC	89.5	7.5	3.0	91.2	6.5	2.3

**Table 3.4A : Percentage Distribution of Children Not Going to School by Reasons for the Practice (Boys)**

Religion / Caste	Reasons						
	Poverty	Parents Thought Education Not Necessary	Lack of School Nearly	Frequent Failure in Examination	Necessity of Working at Home	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	49.7	9.9	0.6	2.3	17.0	20.5	100.0
Bhumihars	43.2	6.3	1.1	5.3	20.0	24.2	100.0
Rajputs	52.0	10.1	0.6	4.5	15.1	17.9	100.0
Kayasths	46.8	12.8	2.1	2.1	17.0	19.1	100.0
All HUC	49.0	9.6	0.8	3.7	16.9	20.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	64.8	8.1	0.7	2.3	13.0	11.1	100.0
Syeds	54.9	4.9	0.0	6.1	19.5	14.6	100.0
Pathans	59.7	7.7	0.0	1.7	16.0	14.9	100.0
All MUC	61.8	7.5	0.4	2.6	14.9	12.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC	55.8	8.5	0.6	3.1	15.8	16.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	38.5	23.1	0.0	7.7	23.1	7.7	100.0
Bhumihars	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rajputs	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	55.6	100.0
Kayasths	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	100.0
All HUC	28.6	10.7	0.0	3.6	28.6	28.6	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	66.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	14.0	14.0	100.0
Syeds	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
Pathans	59.7	9.7	0.0	3.2	21.0	6.5	100.0
All MUC	62.1	6.9	0.0	2.6	19.0	9.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	55.6	7.6	0.0	2.8	20.8	13.2	100.0

**Table 3.4B : Percentage Distribution of Children Not Going to School by Reasons for the Practice (Girls)**

Religion / Caste	Reasons								
	Poverty	Parents Thought Education Not Necessary	Lack of School Nearly	Lack of Girls School Nearly	Frequent Failure in Examination	Necessity of Working at Home	Marriage	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>									
Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)									
Brahmins	37.0	10.9	1.0	5.2	2.6	12.0	25.5	5.7	100.0
Bhumihars	31.3	8.0	0.0	3.6	2.7	7.1	29.5	17.9	100.0
Rajputs	27.1	7.9	4.5	9.6	4.0	7.9	30.5	8.5	100.0
Kayasths	37.9	10.3	0.0	0.0	3.4	10.3	13.8	24.1	100.0
All HUC	32.4	9.2	2.0	6.1	3.1	9.4	27.5	10.4	100.0
Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)									
Sheikhs	56.5	7.5	0.7	2.1	0.3	13.0	11.3	8.6	100.0
Syeds	40.5	5.1	0.0	2.5	1.3	5.1	36.7	8.9	100.0
Pathans	56.0	8.4	1.2	5.4	1.2	9.6	9.0	9.0	100.0
All MUC	54.0	7.4	0.7	3.2	0.7	10.8	14.3	8.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC									
All HUC + MUC	43.5	8.3	1.3	4.6	1.9	10.1	20.7	9.6	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>									
Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)									
Brahmins	19.0	19.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	33.3	19.0	100.0
Bhumihars	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	100.0
Rajputs	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	22.2	100.0
Kayasths	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
All HUC	14.3	14.3	0.0	5.7	0.0	2.9	40.0	22.9	100.0
Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)									
Sheikhs	50.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	23.3	13.3	100.0
Syeds	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Pathans	62.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	12.5	100.0
All MUC	56.3	5.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	7.0	16.9	12.7	100.0
All HUC + MUC									
All HUC + MUC	42.5	8.5	0.9	1.9	0.0	5.7	24.5	16.0	100.0

**Table 3.5 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Type of School/College**

Religion / Caste	Type of School / College					
	Government	Private Costly School	Private Low-Cost School	Missionary School	Madarsas	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	87.0	4.9	7.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
Bhumihars	80.1	10.1	9.4	0.3	0.0	100.0
Rajputs	83.8	5.7	10.1	0.5	0.0	100.0
Kayasths	80.8	8.9	10.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
All HUC	83.9	6.6	9.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	79.7	1.9	4.9	1.4	12.1	100.0
Syeds	82.3	5.8	9.3	0.1	2.4	100.0
Pathans	84.6	2.9	5.8	1.5	5.2	100.0
All MUC	81.8	3.1	6.2	1.1	7.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC	83.3	5.7	8.2	0.6	2.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	49.4	25.7	24.3	0.6	0.0	100.0
Bhumihars	33.3	43.0	22.6	1.1	0.0	100.0
Rajputs	40.4	34.9	23.8	0.9	0.0	100.0
Kayasths	40.3	36.7	23.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
All HUC	42.9	32.7	23.7	0.6	0.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	68.0	9.2	17.4	0.9	4.5	100.0
Syeds	57.8	24.3	17.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Pathans	66.2	16.9	15.0	0.3	1.6	100.0
All MUC	65.5	14.7	16.7	0.5	2.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	51.8	25.7	20.9	0.6	1.0	100.0

**Table 3.6 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Medium of Instruction**

Religion / Caste	Medium of Instruction			
	Hindi	Urdu	English	Total
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	91.3	0.0	8.7	100.0
Bhumihars	85.7	0.0	14.3	100.0
Rajputs	90.2	0.0	9.8	100.0
Kayasths	85.6	0.0	14.4	100.0
All HUC	89.2	0.0	10.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	77.7	17.6	4.7	100.0
Syeds	77.5	11.0	11.5	100.0
Pathans	81.7	14.4	3.9	100.0
All MUC	78.8	15.1	6.1	100.0
All HUC + MUC	86.3	4.2	9.5	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	55.5	0.0	44.5	100.0
Bhumihars	38.7	0.0	61.3	100.0
Rajputs	46.0	0.0	54.0	100.0
Kayasths	47.2	0.0	52.8	100.0
All HUC	48.9	0.0	51.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	66.1	11.8	22.1	100.0
Syeds	53.8	7.5	38.7	100.0
Pathans	66.2	9.2	24.5	100.0
All MUC	63.8	10.1	26.1	100.0
All HUC + MUC	54.8	4.0	41.3	100.0

**Table 3.7 : Percentage Distribution of Children Going to School/College by Availability of Books and Extent of Private Tuition**

Religion / Caste	Percentage Distribution by Availability of Books				Percentage of Children Having Private Tuition at Home
	All Books Available	Most Books Available	Most Books Not Available	Total	
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	93.0	6.7	0.3	100.0	40.7
Bhumihars	90.7	9.0	0.2	100.0	46.3
Rajputs	91.2	8.3	0.5	100.0	41.8
Kayasths	92.2	7.4	0.4	100.0	46.9
All HUC	91.8	7.8	0.4	100.0	42.8
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	91.9	8.0	0.1	100.0	28.8
Syeds	92.3	7.2	0.5	100.0	31.8
Pathans	87.9	11.8	0.3	100.0	32.2
All MUC	90.8	8.9	0.3	100.0	30.5
All HUC + MUC	91.6	8.1	0.3	100.0	39.4
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	93.9	5.9	0.2	100.0	59.4
Bhumihars	91.9	8.1	0.0	100.0	68.8
Rajputs	97.7	1.8	0.5	100.0	54.5
Kayasths	96.8	2.4	0.8	100.0	64.9
All HUC	95.3	4.3	0.4	100.0	60.1
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	91.5	7.5	0.9	100.0	31.5
Syeds	95.4	4.6	0.0	100.0	56.1
Pathans	90.8	8.0	1.3	100.0	38.5
All MUC	92.0	7.1	0.9	100.0	38.6
All HUC + MUC	94.0	5.4	0.6	100.0	51.7

**Table 3.8 : Percentage Distribution of Children (0-3 years) by Place of Birth**

Religion / Caste	Government Hospital or PHC	Private Hospital	Home with Trained Midwife	Home with Traditional Midwife	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	55.5	30.4	7.6	6.5	100.0
Bhumihars	55.1	37.3	3.6	4.1	100.0
Rajputs	53.7	31.6	6.2	8.6	100.0
Kayasths	37.5	45.0	6.9	10.6	100.0
All HUC	53.3	33.4	6.2	7.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	46.8	16.5	19.9	16.9	100.0
Syeds	37.0	36.5	14.1	12.5	100.0
Pathans	45.9	18.8	12.1	23.2	100.0
All MUC	44.7	20.8	16.3	18.1	100.0
All HUC + MUC	50.3	29.0	9.8	11.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	25.7	67.6	5.7	1.0	100.0
Bhumihars	16.0	80.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Rajputs	34.1	63.4	1.2	1.2	100.0
Kayasths	7.8	92.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
All HUC	24.0	72.2	2.7	1.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	32.6	34.7	18.9	13.7	100.0
Syeds	15.4	74.4	2.6	7.7	100.0
Pathans	22.6	53.6	17.9	6.0	100.0
All MUC	25.7	49.1	15.6	9.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	24.7	61.7	8.5	5.0	100.0

**Table 3.9 : Percentage Distribution of Children(0-3 years) by Practice of Vaccination**

Religion / Caste	Vaccination			
	Polio	Measles	DPT	BCG
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	99.4	92.7	91.0	89.7
Bhumihars	99.7	90.4	92.1	92.6
Rajputs	99.3	91.7	94.0	91.8
Kayasths	99.4	88.8	87.5	91.3
All HUC	99.4	91.5	92.0	91.2
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	97.7	88.3	89.2	81.1
Syeds	97.9	90.1	91.1	90.1
Pathans	98.2	89.1	90.3	89.1
All MUC	97.9	88.9	89.9	85.3
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>				
	98.9	90.6	91.3	89.1
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	100.0	90.5	92.4	87.6
Bhumihars	100.0	88.0	100.0	100.0
Rajputs	100.0	95.1	98.8	93.9
Kayasths	100.0	88.2	90.2	86.3
All HUC	100.0	91.3	94.7	90.5
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	100.0	89.5	90.5	84.2
Syeds	97.4	87.2	89.7	94.9
Pathans	95.2	85.7	83.3	82.1
All MUC	97.7	87.6	87.6	85.3
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>				
	99.0	89.6	91.5	88.1



**Table 3.10 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Mode of Treatment of Illness**

Religion / Caste	Method of Treatment of Illness						Percentage of Households belonging in 'Jharphuk'
	Unani or Ayurvedic	Homeopathic	Allopathic (government)	Allopathic (Private)	Quacks	Total	
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	0.1	0.3	38.6	31.8	29.2	100.0	22.2
Bhumihars	0.0	0.3	31.7	40.0	28.0	100.0	20.0
Rajputs	0.0	0.5	33.1	34.8	31.6	100.0	18.7
Kayasths	0.0	0.4	20.0	46.9	32.8	100.0	17.8
All HUC	0.1	0.3	33.6	35.9	30.0	100.0	20.2
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	0.0	0.4	36.9	32.4	30.3	100.0	35.2
Syeds	1.0	2.1	37.0	40.3	19.5	100.0	23.5
Pathans	0.3	1.3	28.9	30.1	39.4	100.0	44.1
All MUC	0.3	1.1	34.6	33.6	30.4	100.0	35.0
All HUC + MUC	0.1	0.5	33.9	35.3	30.1	100.0	23.8
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	1.0	3.0	20.4	69.8	5.8	100.0	18.9
Bhumihars	0.8	2.3	24.8	69.8	2.3	100.0	8.5
Rajputs	1.3	3.3	31.6	60.2	3.6	100.0	10.9
Kayasths	1.7	8.0	23.1	64.3	2.9	100.0	7.1
All HUC	1.2	4.1	24.7	65.8	4.1	100.0	12.7
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	0.0	2.2	50.7	40.6	6.6	100.0	25.8
Syeds	1.8	2.6	19.3	71.1	5.4	100.0	22.8
Pathans	0.0	6.1	38.9	49.0	6.1	100.0	23.2
All MUC	0.4	3.7	39.7	50.1	6.1	100.0	24.2
All HUC + MUC	0.9	4.0	29.8	60.5	4.8	100.0	16.6

## CHAPTER IV

### ECONOMIC STATUS

The concept of human welfare incorporates many dimensions, of which economic status is one. But, although other dimensions of the concept, like educational, health, social, cultural or political status are very important, the economic status enjoys a precedence over others because people's ability to meet their other needs depends, to a large extent, on their economic conditions. It is only after people meet their primary needs, like food, clothing and shelter that they are able to pay attention to their health, educational and social needs. In this perspective, the present survey has collected information on a number of indicators of the economic status of the upper caste population in Bihar. Starting with Occupational Pattern (Section 4.1), these indicators have been grouped and discussed in five more sections in this Chapter — Land and Related Endowments (Section 4.2), Household Income Levels (Section 4.3) Indebtedness (Section 4.4), Migration Patterns (Section 4.5) and Standard of Living (Section 4.6). Together, this information base provides a comprehensive description of the upper caste population of Bihar, incorporating both its relative advantages at one hand and the challenges it still faces on the other.

#### **4.1 Occupational Pattern**

To begin with, the economic status of a household depends to a considerable extent on the specific sector which is the main source of its income. Since all the working members of the household may not be engaged in a single sector, its overall income level also depends upon the sectoral attachment of its individual workers. The present survey has, therefore, collected information both on the main occupation (principal source of income) of the upper caste households in Bihar (**Table 4.1**) as well as the occupation pattern of the workers, separately for males (**Table 4.2A**) and females (**Table 4.2B**).

In rural Bihar, it is true that for the majority of the upper caste Hindu households (46.3 percent) the main occupation is agricultural or related sectors. But for the upper caste Muslim households, the corresponding figure is extremely low at 12.2 percent, because of their extreme land poverty, as revealed in the next section. Secondly, because of the overwhelming dependence of the rural economy on the agriculture and related sectors, the percentage of households deriving most of

their income from trade or other self-employment (artisan or industry) is very low, both for upper caste Hindu households (9.0 percent) and upper caste Muslim households (11.7 percent). This leaves a huge number of upper caste households, more so among the Muslims, who are dependent on salary/wage earnings for their principal source of income. In low productivity agrarian economy of Bihar, the existing levels of salary/wage is likely to be very low, causing economic stress for the upper caste households, It also needs to be underlined here that, among the households dependent on salary/wage earnings, the dependence is higher on 'irregular' salary/wage earnings, which is even more disadvantageous. Of the 44.7 percent upper caste Hindu households dependent on salary/wage earnings, no less than 25.0 percent are dependent on irregular salary/wage earning. For the upper caste Muslim households, the corresponding figure are —55.5 percent out of 76.0 percent households. Among different upper caste Hindus, Bhumihar households are better placed, with only 33.4 of them being dependent on salary/wage income. Among the rest, the proportion of households with salary/wage earnings as the main source of their income are — Rajputs (44.4 percent), Brahmins (49.4 percent) and Kayasths (58.7 percent). Among the upper caste Muslim households, these proportion are nearly the same for three castes, around 75 percent.

In the urban areas, the dependence on agriculture and related sectors is obviously less for the upper caste households. Either artisan/industry/trade or other forms of self-employment appear as an important source of household income in urban areas, accounting for 26.9 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 30.0 percent of the upper caste Muslim households. The proportions of households with salary/wage earnings as their main source of income are — upper caste Hindu households (64.4 percent) and upper caste Muslim households (68.0 percent). Since the salary/wage levels are relatively higher in urban areas, salary/wage employment is not necessarily a disadvantageous occupation there. But if that salary/wage earning is irregular, it is indeed a disadvantage. Among the upper caste Hindus, such disadvantaged households are rather limited (13.3 percent), but among their Muslim counterparts, they constitute a major section (33.1 percent). Among the different castes, the advantage of regular earnings from salary/wage employment is enjoyed most by Kayasths among the Hindus, and Syeds among the Muslims.

When one examines the occupational profile of individual workers, it clearly emerges that salary/wage employment is much wider among them, both for the upper caste Hindu and Muslim households. For male workers (**Table 4.2A**), agriculture and related occupation accounts for only 18.1 percent of the total workers in case of upper caste Hindus in rural areas, the corresponding figure being only 4.9 percent of the upper case Muslim workers. This only implies that a large number of workers from those households, whose main source of income is agriculture or related activities, are indeed employed outside this sector. In other words, the relatively higher land endowments of the upper caste households are often not high enough to provide gainful employment to all its working population. That the problem of inadequate employment is fairly wide among the workers is further indicated by the fact that 18.1 percent of the upper caste Hindu workers in rural Bihar need a secondary occupation to sustain themselves; among the upper caste Muslim workers, the corresponding figure is 11.8 percent. In the urban areas, one again observes a similar pattern, viz., many working members of a household are not engaged in the occupation which is the main source of income of their respective households; they work elsewhere. As regards the practice of an employed worker having a secondary occupation, it is less prevalent in urban areas (12.9 and 5.3 percent of the workers belonging to upper caste Hindus and Muslims, respectively), but it is not altogether absent. The figures on percentage distribution of female workers by their main occupation (**Table 4.2 B**) again reiterates the considerable disadvantages that upper caste workers suffer from in their employment pattern in both rural and urban areas.

#### **4.2 Land and Related Endowments**

With 88.7 percent of its population residing in villages, Bihar is the most ruralised state in India. Further, in the face of very limited non-farm activities in the rural areas, it is the agrarian economy that provides nearly the only livelihood option to the rural populace. The present survey has, therefore, collected the relevant information on the land endowment of the upper caste population in rural Bihar, along with the information on the extent of multiple cropping. For a typical rural household, livestock endowment is also an important part of productive assets, along with various agricultural implements. Livestock endowment is particularly important for those rural households which are either landless or landpoor. The present survey has collected information on these two items as well. It was observed in the previous section that agriculture happens to be the main source of income for some urban households and, as such, they also have some land endowment;

but in view of its limited extent, the land-related information is analysed here only for the rural households.

In **Table 4.3** is presented the percentage distribution of rural households by their land endowments. The relatively better economic status of upper caste households in rural Bihar is first indicated by the fact that complete landlessness is a rare phenomenon for them. Only 0.1 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 0.8 percent of the upper caste Muslim households suffer from that acute economic disadvantage. But it is equally important to note that a large percentage of them (55.1 percent of upper caste Hindu households and 86.1 percent of upper caste Muslim households) have only marginal amount of land, measuring less than 1.0 acre. Thus, the average land endowment for upper caste Hindu households is only 2.64 acres and that for upper caste Muslim households is much lower at 0.55 acres.

The total land endowment of a household comprises homestead land, orchard, water bodies, uncultivable land, and cultivable land. Leaving out the first four categories, **Table 4.4** presents the percentage distribution of upper caste households by their ownership of cultivated land, which indeed provides a means of livelihood for them. It is observed from this table that no less than 33.4 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 72.8 percent of upper caste Muslim households do not possess any cultivable land. This is indeed a more appropriate measure of land poverty of the upper caste households. From the 2011 census data on occupational distribution of workers in rural Bihar, it appears that the proportion of landless households, in the general population is about 50 percent. Thus, it may be concluded that although upper caste Hindu households have higher land endowment than the general population, this is not true for upper caste Muslim households. It is also observed from this table that many of the cultivator households (27.0 and 16.4 percent among upper caste Hindus and Muslim households respectively) are only marginal cultivators operating less than 1 acre of land. If one considers at least 5 acres of cultivated land as an economic holding, only 8.6 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and a slender 1.1 percent of upper caste Muslim households are seen to be belonging to this fortunate category. The average amount of cultivable land per household is only 1.91 acres for the upper caste Hindus households and only 0.45 acres for their Muslim counterparts. A comparison of the ownership of cultivated land by different castes indicate that Bhumihar are most land-rich among

the Hindus, with an average landholding of 2.96 acres of cultivated land. The other castes in descending order are — Rajput (1.99 acres), Brahmins (1.40 acres) and Kayasths (1.01 acres). Among the three Muslim upper castes, the ownership of cultivated land is much lower — Pathans (0.48 acres), Sheikhs (0.46 acres) and Syeds (0.37 acres).

Bihar happens to be a part of the Gangetic plain where land fertility is high. Secondly, with the abundance of water resources, both surface and ground water, multiple cropping is quite common here. Therefore, for judging the land endowment of a rural household, it is more appropriate to take into consideration not its 'net' cropped area, but its 'gross' cropped area. **Table 4.5** presents the percentage distribution net cultivated area of upper caste households in rural Bihar by cropping pattern (single, double or multiple cropping). It emerges from table that, although the practice of multiple cropping is limited (less than 5 percent of cultivated area), double cropping is generally done on more than 60 percent of the net cultivated area. The overall cropping intensity (= Gross Cultivated Area/Net Cultivated Area) is above 1.60 for both Hindu and Muslim households, belonging to the upper castes. Among the different castes, the level of cropping intensity does not vary much, ranging from 1.60 to 1.74. One should note here that this level of cropping intensity for the upper caste households is substantially higher than the overall cropping intensity in Bihar which stands at 1.42, as per the latest Economic Survey (2014-15) of the state government. One can, therefore, conclude that upper caste households in rural Bihar are able to utilise their land resources more efficiently, compared to other rural households. But as the information on occupational pattern showed earlier, and the data on household income levels would show in the next section, land endowments of the upper caste households or its efficient utilisation by them is not adequate to provide enough employment and income opportunities for them.

Although the land endowment of upper caste households is relatively higher than of the general population, this economic advantage is gradually decreasing over the years. This is apparent from **Table 4.6** which presents the information on the extent of selling and buying of land by upper caste households in rural Bihar. Among all the upper caste households, both Hindus and Muslims, whereas 6.5 percent had sold some land in last 3 years, those who have bought some land constitute only 1.1 percent. Among the upper caste Hindu households, the percentage of selling households (7.5 percent) is higher than for upper caste Muslim households (3.4 percent). This is

probably because of higher land endowment of the former category of households. In case of purchase of land again, the percentage of households among upper caste Hindu households (1.2 percent) is higher than their Muslim counterparts (1.0 percent). Although the number of households is not very high for either sale or purchase of land, the amount of land sold or bought is quite substantial, as is evident from the average value of land sold per selling household, as well as the average value of land purchased per purchasing households. For upper caste Hindu households, the average value of land sold per selling household is as high as Rs. 2.55 lakh, and average value of land purchased per purchasing household is again very high at Rs. 3.24 lakh. For upper caste Muslim households, the corresponding figures are Rs. 2.52 lakh and Rs. 1.33 lakh, respectively. Among the households of different castes, the practice of selling land is relatively more among the Bhumihars and Rajputs among the upper caste Hindus, and Sheikhs among the Muslims. As mentioned before, the extent of purchasing land is much less and it is nearly uniform for all the upper caste households, either Hindu or Muslim.

For profitable utilization of the cultivable land, it is necessary to own appropriate agricultural implements, including modern implements like pumpsets, tractors, etc. From **Table 4.7**, it is observed that the average value of all agricultural implements is Rs. 24.0 thousand for the upper caste Hindu households. For the upper caste Muslim households, as noted before, the land endowment is much lower and, consequently, the average value of their agricultural implements is also much lower at Rs. 4.9 thousand. Among the four upper caste Hindus, Bhumihars are seen to be most eager to acquire adequate agricultural implements and, for them, the average value of such implements per household is as high as Rs. 40.1 thousands. For other three Hindu castes, the average values of agricultural implements in descending order are — Rajputs (Rs 32.7 thousand), Brahmins (Rs. 10.4 thousand) and Kayasths (Rs. 4.8 thousand). For upper caste Muslim households, the average values of agricultural implements, again in the descending order, are — Sheikhs (Rs. 5.6 thousand), Syeds (Rs. 4.4 thousand) and Pathans (Rs. 4.3 thousand). From these caste-wise details of ownership of agricultural implements, it emerges that, except for Bhumihar and Rajput households, all other categories of households probably suffer from inadequate endowment of necessary agricultural implements.

In rural Bihar, households generally own some livestock, either as a supplementary source of income, or provide draught power for agricultural operation. Since use of tractor is now quite common, the second necessity is now less relevant, but owning livestock is quite prevalent, at least for the first necessity. From **Table 4.7**, it is observed that the average value of livestock per household is Rs. 14.8 thousand for upper caste Hindus and much less at Rs. 4.6 thousand for upper caste Muslims. Among the Hindus, the livestock endowment is the highest for Bhumihar household (Rs. 23.6 thousand), followed by Rajputs (Rs. 15.2 thousand), Brahmins (Rs. 11.5 thousand) and Kayasths (Rs. 4.9 thousand). Among the Muslims, the livestock endowment is nearly equal among the three castes, the average value being about Rs. 4-5 thousand.

### **4.3 Household Income Levels**

The information on the annual income of the upper caste households, alongwith its distribution by different sectoral sources, is presented in **Table 4.8**. Before we analyse these income figures, one may first note that the Per Capita Income for Bihar is Rs. 33954, as per the latest estimates, reported in the Economic Survey (2014-15) of the state government. Since the average household size for the upper caste population, as reported in Section 2.2 before, is 6.3 persons, it implies an average annual household income of Rs. 2.14 lakh for the general population of the state. The average annual household income of different upper castes in both rural and urban areas, as reported in **Table 4.8**, may be compared with this benchmark.

In the rural areas, the average household income for upper caste Hindu household is Rs. 2.42 lakh, which is higher than that for general population. But, unfortunately, the upper caste Muslims, with an average household income of Rs. 1.99 lakh, are worse off than the general population. Within the upper caste Hindus, Bhumihars enjoy the highest income level, with an average household income of Rs. 2.59 lakh, followed by Kayasths (Rs. 2.58 lakh), Rajputs (Rs. 2.50 lakh) and Brahmins (Rs. 2.20 lakh). Within the upper caste Muslims, the Syeds enjoy the highest income level (Rs. 2.23 lakh), just above the level for general population. The average household income level for other two Muslim castes are much lower— Pathans (Rs. 1.98 lakh) and Sheikhs (Rs. 1.89 lakh).



In the urban areas, the average household income level is obviously much higher. For the upper caste Hindu households, the average household income stands at Rs. 4.46 lakh, 82 percent more than the rural income levels. For the upper caste Muslims again, the income level is higher (Rs. 2.95 lakh), but it is only 47 percent higher than the income level of their rural counterparts. Among the three castes, Syeds again enjoy the highest income levels (Rs. 3.60 lakh), followed by Pathans (Rs. 3.34 lakh) and Sheikhs (Rs. 2.27 lakh). It may be noted here that the income level of upper caste Muslims is higher than that of the general population, at least in the urban areas.

As regards the source of income of upper caste households in Bihar, self-employment is not very wide, either in the rural or urban areas (**Table 4.9**). In the rural areas, cultivation accounts for only 22.7 percent of income, even for upper caste Hindu households whose land endowment is rather high; for the upper caste Muslim households, the share is abysmally low at 5.4 percent. Consequently, salary/wage earnings (either regular or irregular) account for the largest share of household income — 45.4 percent for the upper caste Hindu households and 61.4 percent of the upper caste Muslim households. The upper caste Muslim households are particularly disadvantaged here, as the share of irregular salary/wage earnings is much higher for them.

In the urban areas, the economy is more diversified and one may expect higher share of income from self-employment, particularly when the educational levels are higher for the upper caste population. But even here, the combined share of self-employment in total income (agriculture, trade, artisan/industry, and other self-employment) is only 21.4 percent for upper caste Hindu households and 27.1 percent for upper caste Muslim households. One should note here that self-employment is a more important source of income for the upper caste Muslims in urban areas, than for their Hindu counterparts. In any case, this leaves salary/wage earnings as the most important source of income in urban areas, for both Hindu and Muslim upper caste households. The share of irregular salary/wage earnings is fortunately less in urban areas, but it is still 6.8 percent for the upper caste Hindu households, and much higher at 19.1 percent for the upper caste Muslim households.

In the context of source of income for households in Bihar, 'remittances' are very important since the practice of migration is very wide here for all sections of the population. The share of

remittances in the annual income of upper caste households is also indicated in **Table 4.9**. From there, it is observed that remittances account for 11.5 percent of the total income for upper caste Hindu households in rural areas; for the upper caste Muslim population, the share is even higher at 15.0 percent. In case of upper caste Muslim households, a similar estimate was also obtained from an earlier survey on Muslim population. In the urban areas, the contribution of remittances in total household income is lower — 6.5 and 4.1 percent for the upper caste Hindu and Muslim households, respectively. Among the upper caste Muslims in urban areas, remittance income is the highest for Pathans, for whom the share of remittances in the total income is as high as 19.6 percent.

With the estimates of households income and household size, the present survey has also prepared an estimate of population living below poverty line, among upper caste population in Bihar. The latest poverty estimates for Bihar and India, prepared by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) relate to the year 2011-12. In that estimate, for Bihar, the poverty line was fixed at Rs. 778 (rural) and Rs. 923 (urban) as the monthly per capita expenditure level. Taking into account the Consumer Price Index for Rural Labourers, the estimated poverty line would be Rs. 974 in 2013-14 for the rural population. Similarly, taking into account the Consumer Price Index for Industrial workers, the estimated poverty line would be Rs. 1156 in 2013-14 in urban areas. Ignoring the marginal difference between consumption (used by the NSSO) and income (used by the present survey), it is possible to prepare an approximate estimate of population below poverty line for the upper caste population in Bihar. These estimates have been presented in **Table 4.10**.

The poverty ratio for the overall population for Bihar was 34.1 percent in rural areas, and 31.2 percent in urban areas, implying an overall poverty ratio of 33.7 percent, relating to the year 2011-12. As per the present survey, the percentage of upper caste population living below poverty line is 10.4 percent in rural Bihar and 7.1 percent in urban Bihar. These poverty ratios, quite expectedly, are much lower than the ratios for the general population. However, between the two religions and among the different caste, these poverty ratios vary considerably. In the rural areas, the incidence of poverty is nearly the same for upper caste Hindus (10.3 percent) and upper caste Muslims (10.7 percent). Within the upper caste Hindus, the incidence of poverty is the highest among the Brahmins (13.2 percent), followed by Kayasths (10.4 percent), Rajputs (9.8 percent) and

Bhumihars (4.6 percent). This ranking of four Hindu castes is the same as was found for the average households income in rural areas. Among the upper caste Muslims, the poverty ratio is the highest for the Pathans (12.5 percent), followed by Sheikhs (11.0 percent) and Syeds (8.0 percent). This ranking of the three Muslim castes is slightly different from what was observed earlier in terms of average household income.

In the urban areas, the poverty ratio for the upper caste Hindu population decreases substantially to 5.4 percent, from 10.3 percent in rural areas. Secondly, among the four upper Hindu castes, it is the Kayasths among whom the incidence of poverty is the highest (7.6 percent), followed by Rajputs (5.3 percent), Brahmins (5.0 percent) and Bhumihars (3.1 percent). In case of upper caste Muslims, it is important to note that the incidence of poverty is nearly the same in rural (10.7 percent) and urban areas (10.4 percent). Parallel to their status in terms of average household income, the incidence of poverty is the highest among the Sheikhs at as high as 14.0 percent; among the Pathans and Syeds the incidence of poverty affects 8.6 and 6.1 percent of the population, respectively. These figures amply testifies that, in spite of their higher status in caste hierarchy, a significant portion of the upper caste population of Bihar is seriously disadvantaged in terms of their economic status.

One of the important interventions through which the government tries to help the poor population, both in Bihar and India, is the Public Distribution System, supplying subsidised commodities, particularly foodgrains. **Table 4.11** shows the position of the upper caste households in Bihar vis-à-vis their possession of a ration card. In the rural areas, only 14.2 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 16.7 percent of the upper caste Muslim households do not possess any ration card. Among those who possess a ration card, 36.6 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and a much higher 50.7 percent of the upper caste Muslim household have put efforts to obtain a BPL ration card, ensuring subsidised supply of foodgrains. In the urban areas, however, possession of a ration card is less frequent; but even here, 32.3 percent of the upper caste Muslim households possess a BPL ration card. From **Table 4.12**, one can also note that lifting of ration is a regular practice for those households who possess a ration card. This again is indicative of the poor economic status of at least part of the upper caste population in Bihar.

#### 4.4 Indebtedness

The extent of indebtedness of a household is also an important indicator of its economic status, besides its income level. **Table 4.13** presents this information for upper caste population of Bihar. In the rural areas, 35.3 percent of the upper caste Hindu households are indebted, the corresponding figure being 26.5 percent for their Muslim counterparts. Since the upper caste Hindu households are economically better off than their Muslim counterparts, a higher level of indebtedness among the former indicates that not all their loans are meant for consumption purposes; a substantial part of it is meant for production needs. Thus, it is not surprising that the percentage of indebted households is the highest among the Bhumihar (46.3 percent), the average loan per indebted household being as high as Rs. 1.03 lakh. For Bhumihar households, the outstanding loan as percentage of their annual income is also rather high at 18.5 percent. For the remaining castes, taking both Hindus and Muslims, the percentage of indebted households varies from 21.4 percent for the Syed households to 34.5 percent for the Rajput households. In terms of outstanding loan as percentage of annual income, it ranges between 7.2 percent (Pathans) and 15.9 percent (Syeds).

In the urban areas, the extent of indebtedness is much lower, with 24.9 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 20.3 percent of upper caste Muslim households reporting some outstanding debt. Among the upper caste Hindus, percentage of indebted households are — Bhumihars (32.6 percent), Rajputs (28.0 percent), Brahmins (23.4 percent) and Kayasths (19.3 percent). Among the upper caste Muslim households, the percentages are about 20 percent for all the three castes. Taking into account all the castes, both among the Hindus and the Muslims, the outstanding loan as a percentage of annual income ranges from 8.8 percent (Syeds) to 21.9 percent (Rajputs) in the urban areas.

The loan taken by upper caste households are from several sources — friends/relatives, moneylenders, employer, bank and other sources. The distribution of their total outstanding loan by different sources is presented in **Table 4.14**. Admittedly, banks account for the major share of the loans in both rural and urban areas; but loans from moneylenders who usually charge high interest rates is also substantial. In the rural areas, 14.4 percent of the outstanding loan taken by the upper caste households is from the moneylenders; for the upper caste Muslim households, the

share is much higher at 29.5 percent. In the urban areas, taking a loan from a moneylender by the upper caste households is much less frequent, but it is not altogether absent there, accounting for about 4 percent of the total outstanding loan. A loan from a relative/friend is also usually taken to meet consumption needs, and such loans are also quite substantial for upper caste households in Bihar, be they Hindu or Muslim.

From the collected information on the reasons for taking loan by the upper caste households in Bihar (**Table 4.15**), it is quite apparent that the pattern varies considerably between the rural and urban areas. In the rural areas, a major part of the upper caste Hindu households generally take a loan for production purposes (building or repairing house, or business, or agricultural operations), as no less than 50.5 percent of households report these to be the reason for their loan. But because of the lower income levels of some of the upper caste Hindu households, 16.2 percent of them also have to borrow for socio-religious functions (marriage/sradh) and another 15.6 percent for medical expenses. Among the upper caste Muslim households, 42.8 percent of the households take loan for production purposes, 27.1 percent for medical treatment and 20.3 percent for socio-religious functions (marriage/majlish). This higher share of loans for either medical treatment or socio-religious function for the upper caste Muslim households is because of their poorer income levels, compared to that of their Hindu counterparts.

In the urban areas, the reasons for taking loans display a different pattern, as educational loan emerges as an important reason there. For the upper caste Hindu households, 54.8 percent of them report production purposes as the reason for taking loan, followed by education (20.5 percent) and socio-religious function (14.8 percent). Taking loan for medical treatment is rather limited for this category of households. Among the upper caste Muslim households, 54.1 percent of them take loan for production purposes, followed by medical treatment (16.7 percent), socio-religious purpose (13.9 percent), and education (12.0 percent). That the upper caste population in Bihar is now very mindful of the educational needs of their children is indicated by their substantial eagerness for educational loan, at least in the urban areas. Among the urban Hindus, 26.7 percent of the Kayasth households have taken educational loan, followed by Bhumihars (25.0 percent), Rajputs (18.6 percent) and Brahmins (17.4 percent). Among the urban Muslims, the percentage of

households taking education loans are — Syeds (17.4 percent), Pathans (14.3 percent) and Sheikhs (7.0 percent). This is indeed a desired social change.

#### **4.5 Migration Patterns**

The practice of out-migration, either within or outside the state, to look for employment opportunities is quite common in Bihar. In the past, such out-migration for employment was relatively higher for workers belonging to the middle or lower castes; but in the recent decades, the practice has spread to upper caste workers as well. In addition to out-migration for employment, a large number of young people in Bihar also move out of their home (either within or outside the state) for educational purposes. In this perspective, the present survey has collected some relevant information on the migration pattern of the upper caste population in Bihar.

From **Table 4.16**, one may first note that, in the rural areas, the number of out-migrants per 100 households is as high as 45.0. Between the two religious groups, the phenomenon of migration is wider among the upper caste Muslim households, for whom the number of out-migrants per 100 households is higher at 49.5, the corresponding figure being 43.5 for the upper caste Hindu households. Most of them are very young, their average age ranging from 31-34 years. A majority of them (71.9 percent among the upper castes Hindu and 67.8 percent among the upper caste Muslims) are semi-permanent out-migrants who stay in their places of destinations for reasonably long period and then return to their home, probably to again migrate later. The second largest category comprises seasonal migrants, mostly workers who out-migrate for short period, but do so repeatedly over the years. The permanent out-migrants are relatively less in number in the rural areas.

In the urban areas, the practice of out-migration is much less, and there are only 23.3 out-migrants per 100 households. Between the two religious groups, unlike in the rural areas, out-migration is wider among the upper caste Hindus (25.4 out-migrants per 100 households), compared to the upper caste Muslims (19.2 out-migrants per 100 households). The average age of the out-migrants in urban areas is slightly lower at 30-32 years. As regards type of migration, semi-permanent out-migration is the widest in urban areas too, accounting for 70.9 percent of the urban out-migrants. But, unlike in the rural areas, it is the permanent out-migrants who constitute the second largest

category in urban areas. Among the different castes, the permanent out-migration is the widest among the Kayasths (30.0 percent) and Syeds (31.8 percent).

As regards the reasons for out-migration, the relevant information is presented in **Table 4.17**. For the rural out-migrants, it is employment or better employment that drive most of them out of their home. These reasons account for 85.8 percent of the upper caste Hindu out-migrants and 90.5 percent of the upper caste Muslim out-migrants. However, out-migration for education is quite noticeable for all upper caste Hindus (10.4 percent) and at least for Syeds among the upper caste Muslims (10.0 percent). In the urban areas, employment or better employment still remains the most important reason for out-migration of the upper caste population. This reason accounts for 68.0 percent of the upper caste Hindu out-migrants and 78.2 percent of the upper caste Muslim out-migrants. But, out-migration for reasons of education is far wider here than in the rural areas — no less than 25.0 of the upper caste Hindu out-migrants and 14.1 percent of the upper caste Muslims out-migrants move from their urban home for educational purposes. This tendency to migrate for education is particularly strong for the Brahmins among the urban Hindus (34.0 percent) and for the Syeds among the urban Muslims (22.7 percent).

The destinations of the upper caste out-migrants from Bihar vary considerably, depending on their places of origin, whether rural or urban, as is evident from **Table 4.18**. For the out-migrants from rural areas, remaining within their own districts or within the state, is rather limited. Thus, no less than 83.8 percent of them move outside the state to obtain either employment or education. In case of migrating out of the country, the overall share is rather limited, as only 3.4 percent of the rural out-migrants leave the country. But one observes a great difference here between the upper caste Hindu and Muslims. Among the former, only 1.3 percent of the out-migrants leave the country; in contrast, such out-migrants account for 8.7 percent of the latter group. Within the Muslims, the percentage of out-migrants leaving the country is the highest (12.3 percent) for the Syeds.

In the urban areas, one observes a similar pattern as regards the destination of the out-migrants. But the difference between the Hindu and Muslim out-migrants vis-à-vis migrating outside India is even wider here. In contrast to a mere 2.0 percent of the upper caste Hindus migrating to outside

the country, the corresponding figure is as high as 20.5 percent for the upper caste Muslims. Among the Syed out-migrants, this proportion is the highest at 27.3 percent.

In case of out-migration for reasons of employment, one of the advantages for the household is the remittances that the out-migrant members send. In Section 4.3, it has already been underlined that these remittances income is often substantial, helping the poor upper caste households to improve their economic status. While in the urban areas, income from remittance account for 5.9 percent of total income, this share is increased to 12.2 percent in the rural areas.

#### **4.6 Standard of Living**

The level of income of a household would generally indicate its 'ability' to pay for various consumption needs. But the extent to which the households are actually able to meet those consumption needs are indicated by their standards of living. Admittedly, such standards, can be judged through a large number of indicators; but the present survey has restricted its focus to 8 indicators — Type of House, Sources of Drinking water, Type of Toilet Facility, Sources of Light, Type of Fuel used for Cooking, Possession of Different Household Durables, Subscription of Newspaper and Financial Inclusion.

To begin with, the information on the housing conditions of the upper caste population is presented in **Table 4.19**. In the rural areas, most of them live in either semi-pucca or pucca houses, but there are also substantial number of households for whom the housing conditions are very poor. Among the upper caste Hindus, no less than 19.9 percent of them live in 'katcha' houses, and another 7.6 percent in hutments (jhopri). Among the upper caste Muslim households, the poor housing conditions are even more wide — 27.0 percent of them live in katcha houses and 11.3 percent in hutments. In the urban areas, even a semi-pucca house implies poor living conditions. The percentage of households living in a non-pucca house (semi-pucca, katcha or hutment) is 12.2 percent for upper caste Hindu households; for the upper caste Muslims, the conditions are indeed very poor, as no less than 39.4 percent of them are forced to reside in non-pucca houses.

By virtue of being a part of the Gangetic plain, it is much easy here to tap groundwater through tube wells for drinking purposes. Consequently, any deprivation in terms of an unsafe source of



drinking water (well) is limited in Bihar, and even more limited for its upper caste population (**Table 4.20**). But when it comes to the provision of proper toilet facility, many upper caste households are seen to lack it (**Table 4.21**). In the rural areas, 40.8 percent of upper caste Hindus and even higher 45.2 percent of the upper caste Muslims defecate outside their residences. Admittedly, not having a private toilet is sometimes the outcome of a traditional attitude, but it is almost certain that many upper caste households lack a private toilet for economic reasons. In the urban areas, the availability of a private toilet (generally septic ones) is much higher, but at least 9.3 percent of the upper caste Muslims there still do not have a private toilet, forcing them to defecate either in the open (7.8 percent) or use a public toilet (1.5 percent).

The economic distress of a considerable part of upper caste households is further indicated when one considers the source of light for their houses. In the rural areas, as high as 28.6 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and even higher 41.3 percent of the upper caste Muslim households depend on the traditional sources of light, a combination of 'dhibri' and lantern. The fact that most upper caste households use both lantern and electricity is because of irregular supply of electricity, not possibly due to their lower income levels. In the urban areas, fortunately, the combinations of dhibri and lantern is extremely limited.

In terms of most widely used fuel for cooking, the situation of the upper caste households is extremely poor (**Table 4.23**). In the rural areas, use of traditional fuel (leaves, plus wood, plus cowdung cake) account for 75.3 and 80.7 percent upper caste households, respectively for Hindus and Muslims. In the urban areas, upper caste Hindu households are much better off, 95.7 percent of them using cooking gas, but 24.6 of the upper caste Muslim household still depend on traditional fuel in urban areas.

Possession of such household durables like bicycle, scooter/motorcycle, car, tables/chairs, television, wrist watch/clock, refrigerator, mobile phone or almirah is quite necessary for present day life. **Table 4.24** presents the percentage of upper caste households in Bihar who possess these items. Apart from a mobile phone and a wrists watch/clock, both of which are owned by most households, possession of other items is limited. This deficiencies is particularly disadvantageous for table/chair which are needed for children's education and television which has now become

necessary as the most important component of mass media. Quite expectedly, possession of these household durables is relatively more among urban upper caste households, than among their rural counterparts. Similarly, between the two religious groups, possession of these items is more among the Hindus than among the Muslims. **Table 4.24** also provides the percentage of upper caste households having a car and refrigerator, the two items that are relatively more expensive. In the urban areas, possession of both these items is very limited; in the rural areas, however, possession of a refrigerator is reported by 48.0 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and 30.1 percent of the upper caste Muslim households.

The relatively modest standard of living of the upper caste population in Bihar is further indicated by their practice of subscribing to a daily newspaper (**Table 4.25**). In the rural areas, the percentage of households not buying a newspaper is 83.0 percent among the upper caste Hindus, the corresponding figure being 89.9 percent for their Muslim counterparts. In the urban areas, subscribing a newspaper is expectedly more, but even here 34.5 percent of the upper caste Hindu households and a much higher 66.7 percent of the upper caste Muslim households cannot afford to buy a newspaper daily.

In terms of financial inclusion, however, the status of the upper caste population in Bihar is rather satisfactory. In the rural areas, no less than 85.8 percent of the households have a bank account, the corresponding figure being 88.9 percent and 76.1 percent of the upper caste households, belonging to Hindus and Muslims, respectively. In the urban, having a bank account is even wider for the upper caste households. The extent of financial inclusion will be even higher, if one takes into account Post Office Accounts. An insurance policy is generally opted by relatively richer households and, as such, it is reported by limited number of households, rather low even in the urban areas, where only 45.1 percent households are reported to have an insurance policy. As regards Kisan Credit Cards in rural areas, it is again probably less prevalent than expected, except among Bhumihar households, 30.4 percent of whom have a Kisan Credit Card.

**Table 4.1 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Their Main Occupation**

Religion / Caste	Agriculture and Related	Artisan / Industry / Trade	Other Self-Employment	Wage Salary (Regular)	Wage Salary (Irregular)	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	37.7	2.3	10.7	18.9	30.5	100.0
Bhumihars	62.5	1.9	2.2	16.9	16.5	100.0
Rajputs	49.8	2.2	3.6	19.4	25.0	100.0
Kayasths	22.1	4.9	14.3	32.4	26.3	100.0
All HUC	46.3	2.4	6.6	19.7	25.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	13.7	3.2	6.7	19.9	56.6	100.0
Syeds	6.9	6.4	12.3	26.2	48.3	100.0
Pathans	14.2	4.6	4.6	16.7	59.8	100.0
All MUC	12.2	4.3	7.4	20.5	55.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	38.1	2.9	6.8	19.9	32.3	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	2.9	8.4	19.0	55.3	14.5	100.0
Bhumihars	17.5	8.7	15.5	51.5	6.8	100.0
Rajputs	15.4	13.5	14.3	43.2	13.5	100.0
Kayasths	3.0	11.4	15.1	55.4	15.1	100.0
All HUC	8.6	10.6	16.3	51.1	13.3	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	3.1	13.8	18.9	29.1	35.2	100.0
Syeds	1.0	12.0	18.0	49.0	20.0	100.0
Pathans	1.3	11.3	15.6	33.1	38.8	100.0
All MUC	2.0	12.5	17.5	34.9	33.1	100.0
All HUC + MUC	6.3	11.3	16.8	45.4	20.3	100.0

**Table 4.2A : Percentage Distribution of Worker by Their Main Occupation (Male)**

Religion / Caste	Agriculture and Related	Artisan/ Industry/ Trade	Other Self-Employment	Wage Salary (Regular)	Wage Salary (Irregular)	Total	Percentage of Workers Having Secondary Occupation
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	13.1	1.8	16.2	29.5	39.5	100.0	15.8
Bhumihars	32.1	1.9	6.1	34.9	24.9	100.0	22.0
Rajputs	18.5	2.4	11.9	32.1	35.2	100.0	18.3
Kayasths	7.4	3.5	19.3	40.4	29.4	100.0	17.4
All HUC	18.1	2.2	13.0	32.5	34.1	100.0	18.1
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	4.4	2.4	8.3	24.8	60.0	100.0	10.8
Syeds	3.7	3.0	10.4	30.9	52.1	100.0	8.5
Pathans	6.7	2.1	11.9	17.0	62.3	100.0	16.4
All MUC	4.9	2.5	9.8	24.0	58.8	100.0	11.8
All HUC + MUC	14.6	2.3	12.2	30.3	40.7	100.0	16.4
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	1.6	5.0	16.6	64.6	12.1	100.0	8.7
Bhumihars	9.5	6.0	12.9	64.7	6.9	100.0	15.5
Rajputs	6.4	8.6	15.3	54.3	15.3	100.0	11.5
Kayasths	1.3	6.1	14.4	62.9	15.3	100.0	20.5
All HUC	3.9	6.5	15.3	61.1	13.2	100.0	12.9
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	2.8	5.5	17.1	35.0	39.6	100.0	3.7
Syeds	4.2	6.3	12.5	57.3	19.8	100.0	3.1
Pathans	1.4	3.8	12.3	38.9	43.6	100.0	8.1
All MUC	2.5	5.0	14.3	40.6	37.6	100.0	5.3
All HUC + MUC	3.4	6.0	15.0	54.3	21.4	100.0	10.4

**Table 4.2B : Percentage Distribution of Worker by Their Main Occupation (Female)**

Religion / Caste	Agriculture and Related	Artisan/ Industry/ Trade	Other Self-Employment	Wage Salary (Regular)	Wage Salary (Irregular)	Total	Percentage of Workers Having Secondary Occupation
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	1.6	1.6	14.5	64.5	17.7	100.0	8.1
Bhumihars	4.0	0.0	6.0	86.0	4.0	100.0	14.0
Rajputs	5.0	0.0	6.7	75.0	13.3	100.0	5.0
Kayasths	0.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	100.0	15.0
All HUC	2.8	0.5	9.4	75.5	11.8	100.0	9.9
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	3.6	0.0	10.7	42.9	42.9	100.0	10.7
Syeds	0.0	0.0	4.2	75.0	20.8	100.0	8.3
Pathans	0.0	5.6	5.6	38.9	50.0	100.0	5.6
All MUC	1.4	1.4	7.1	52.9	37.1	100.0	8.6
All HUC + MUC	2.5	0.7	8.9	69.9	18.1	100.0	9.6
<b>URBAN</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	5.3	10.5	5.3	68.4	10.5	100.0	5.3
Bhumihars	0.0	0.0	12.5	81.3	6.3	100.0	0.0
Rajputs	4.2	4.2	0.0	79.2	12.5	100.0	4.2
Kayasths	0.0	9.4	21.9	59.4	9.4	100.0	31.3
All HUC	2.2	6.6	11.0	70.3	9.9	100.0	13.2
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	0.0	5.0	15.0	40.0	40.0	100.0	20.0
Syeds	0.0	0.0	5.0	90.0	5.0	100.0	5.0
Pathans	0.0	0.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	100.0	20.0
All MUC	0.0	2.0	20.0	54.0	24.0	100.0	14.0
All HUC + MUC	1.4	5.0	14.2	64.5	14.9	100.0	13.5

**Table 4.3 : Percentage Distribution of Rural Households by Their Land Endowment (Total Land)**

Religion / Caste	Total Land (in acres 0.00)						Average Total Land (in acres 0.00)
	0	0.01-1.00	1.01-2.00	2.01-5.00	Above 5.00	Total	
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	0.2	64.3	14.3	13.5	7.7	100.0	2.30
Bhumihars	0.0	38.9	19.0	24.1	17.9	100.0	3.50
Rajputs	0.1	51.4	19.3	17.8	11.3	100.0	2.48
Kayasths	0.0	73.6	11.7	10.1	4.6	100.0	2.47
All HUC	0.1	55.1	16.8	17.0	10.9	100.0	2.64
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	0.7	84.8	7.3	5.5	1.7	100.0	0.57
Syeds	0.6	89.3	5.6	3.1	1.4	100.0	0.47
Pathans	1.2	85.5	5.5	5.7	2.2	100.0	0.58
All MUC	0.8	86.1	6.4	5.0	1.8	100.0	0.55
All HUC + MUC	0.3	62.7	14.3	14.1	8.7	100.0	2.13

**Table 4.4 : Percentage Distribution of Rural Households by Their Land Endowment (Cultivated Land)**

Religion / Caste	Cultivated Land (in acres 0.00)						Average Cultivated Land (in acres 0.00)
	0	0.01-1.00	1.01-2.00	2.01-5.00	Above 5.00	Total	
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	41.7	27.4	13.9	10.8	6.2	100.0	1.40
Bhumihars	17.8	26.9	19.2	20.9	15.2	100.0	2.96
Rajputs	28.5	29.0	19.1	15.4	8.2	100.0	1.99
Kayasths	58.4	18.1	11.7	8.8	2.9	100.0	1.01
All HUC	33.4	27.0	16.6	14.4	8.6	100.0	1.91
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	68.5	19.3	6.8	4.3	1.1	100.0	0.46
Syeds	78.0	14.0	4.7	2.3	1.0	100.0	0.37
Pathans	75.8	13.4	6.0	3.7	1.2	100.0	0.48
All MUC	72.8	16.4	6.1	3.6	1.1	100.0	0.45
All HUC + MUC	43.1	24.4	14.0	11.7	6.7	100.0	1.55

**Table 4.5 : Percentage Distribution of Net Cultivated Area of Rural Households by Cropping Pattern**

Religion / Caste	Cropping Pattern				Average Net Cultivated Area (in acres 0.00)	Average Gross Cultivated Area (in acres 0.00)	Cropping Intensity
	Single-cropped	Double-cropped	Multiple-cropped	Total			
<b>RURAL</b>							
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>							
Brahmins	32.74	65.00	2.26	100.00	1.40	2.37	1.70
Bhumihars	36.65	59.95	3.40	100.00	2.96	4.94	1.67
Rajputs	37.31	57.42	5.27	100.00	1.99	3.34	1.68
Kayasths	34.42	59.82	5.76	100.00	1.01	1.73	1.71
All HUC	35.75	60.39	3.85	100.00	1.91	3.21	1.68
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>							
Sheikhs	41.68	56.61	1.72	100.00	0.46	0.74	1.60
Syeds	34.31	63.19	2.49	100.00	0.37	0.63	1.68
Pathans	30.34	65.47	4.19	100.00	0.48	0.84	1.74
All MUC	36.75	60.62	2.63	100.00	0.45	0.74	1.66
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>							
All HUC + MUC	35.82	60.41	3.77	100.00	1.55	2.61	1.68

**Table 4.6 : Information on Selling and Purchasing of Land by Rural Households**

Religion / Caste	Selling of Land			Purchasing of Land		
	Percentage of Household Selling Land	Average Value of Land Sold (Per Household) (Rs. '000)	Average Value of Land Sold (Per Selling Household) (Rs. '000)	Percentage of Household Purchasing Land	Average Value of Land Purchased (Per Household) (Rs. '000)	Average Value of Land Purchased (Per Purchasing Household) (Rs. '000)
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	5.8	13.6	234.5	1.2	2.9	246.0
Bhumihars	10.5	30.6	291.5	1.7	8.0	453.8
Rajputs	8.0	20.6	256.8	0.8	2.5	306.9
Kayasths	4.6	6.3	138.0	1.5	3.5	242.1
All HUC	7.5	19.1	255.3	1.2	3.9	324.8
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	4.6	14.4	313.5	0.8	0.6	78.8
Syeds	1.9	2.6	141.0	1.2	1.7	135.0
Pathans	2.5	3.3	130.1	1.2	2.3	195.0
All MUC	3.4	8.4	252.0	1.0	1.3	133.6
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>						
All HUC + MUC	6.5	16.5	254.8	1.1	3.3	283.4



**Table 4.7 : Average Value of Agricultural Implements & Livestock for Rural Households**

Religion / Caste	Total value of Agricultural Implements (Rs. '000)	Total Value of livestock (Rs. '000)
RURAL		
Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)		
Brahmins	10.36	11.46
Bhumihars	40.10	23.58
Rajputs	32.71	15.21
Kayasths	4.83	4.90
All HUC	23.96	14.85
Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)		
Sheikhs	5.57	4.81
Syeds	4.39	4.25
Pathans	4.29	4.46
All MUC	4.93	4.58
All HUC + MUC	19.28	12.33

**Table 4.8 : Average Annual Income of Households From Different Sources**

Religion/ Caste	Average Annual Income (in Rs. '00)								
	Agriculture and Related	Trade	Industry / Artisan's Work	Self-Employment	Wage Salary (Regular)	Wage Salary (Irregular)	Remittances	Other Sources	Total Income
<b>RURAL</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	338	33	10	215	613	491	239	98	2201
Bhumihars	756	50	13	193	667	312	259	100	2593
Rajputs	471	49	15	229	664	437	326	108	2502
Kayasths	153	83	0	315	901	486	295	163	2578
All HUC	460	46	11	223	666	433	277	107	2421
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	92	38	3	146	509	743	264	38	1894
Syeds	81	87	14	228	723	658	262	78	2230
Pathans	80	67	2	227	286	771	390	70	1985
All MUC	86	58	5	188	495	731	300	57	1998
All HUC + MUC	368	49	10	214	624	506	283	95	2317
<b>URBAN</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	46	107	6	527	2138	275	246	188	3734
Bhumihars	287	293	35	805	2846	231	380	387	5694
Rajputs	356	332	49	570	2232	268	348	243	4673
Kayasths	23	259	19	304	2754	433	234	341	4712
All HUC	158	227	25	523	2388	303	289	262	4456
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	21	174	31	431	754	586	85	92	2274
Syeds	28	317	0	484	1997	434	129	108	3605
Pathans	9	176	44	697	1462	611	155	93	3344
All MUC	18	205	29	540	1275	563	120	96	2946
All HUC + MUC	111	220	26	529	2014	390	232	206	3948

**Table 4.9 : Percentage Distribution By Annual Income of Households From Different Sources**

Religion / Caste	Percentage Distribution By Annual Income								
	Agriculture and Related	Trade	Industry/ Artisan's Work	Self-Employment	Wage Salary (Regular)	Wage Salary (Irregular)	Remittances	Other Sources	Total Income
<b>RURAL</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	18.4	1.5	0.4	9.8	27.8	22.3	10.9	8.9	100.0
Bhumihars	34.7	1.9	0.5	7.4	25.7	12.0	10.0	7.8	100.0
Rajputs	22.6	1.9	0.6	9.1	26.5	17.5	13.0	8.6	100.0
Kayasths	6.7	3.2	0.0	12.2	34.9	18.8	11.4	12.6	100.0
All HUC	22.7	1.9	0.5	9.2	27.5	17.9	11.5	8.9	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	6.1	2.0	0.2	7.7	26.9	39.2	13.9	4.0	100.0
Syeds	4.6	3.9	0.6	10.2	32.4	29.5	11.7	7.0	100.0
Pathans	5.2	3.4	0.1	11.4	14.4	38.8	19.6	7.1	100.0
All MUC	5.4	2.9	0.3	9.4	24.8	36.6	15.0	5.7	100.0
All HUC+MUC	19.0	2.1	0.4	9.3	26.9	21.8	12.2	8.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	1.5	2.9	0.2	14.1	57.3	7.4	6.6	10.1	100.0
Bhumihars	5.8	5.2	0.6	14.1	50.0	4.1	6.7	13.6	100.0
Rajputs	8.3	7.1	1.0	12.2	47.8	5.7	7.4	10.4	100.0
Kayasths	0.6	5.5	0.4	6.4	58.5	9.2	5.0	14.5	100.0
All HUC	4.0	5.1	0.6	11.7	53.6	6.8	6.5	11.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	1.3	7.7	1.4	18.9	33.2	25.8	3.7	8.1	100.0
Syeds	0.8	8.8	0.0	13.4	55.4	12.0	3.6	6.0	100.0
Pathans	0.4	5.3	1.3	20.8	43.7	18.3	4.6	5.6	100.0
All MUC	0.8	7.0	1.0	18.3	43.3	19.1	4.1	6.5	100.0
All HUC+MUC	3.2	5.6	0.7	13.4	51.0	9.9	5.9	10.4	100.0

**Table 4.10 : Percentage of BPL Households and Monthly Income Per Household**

Religion / Caste	Monthly Income Per Household (Rs.)	Percentage of BPL Households
<b>RURAL</b>		
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>		
Brahmins	18344	13.2
Bhumihars	21608	4.6
Rajputs	20853	9.8
Kayasths	21487	10.4
All HUC	20175	10.3
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>		
Sheikhs	15785	11.0
Syeds	18587	8.0
Pathans	16539	12.5
All MUC	16654	10.7
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>		
All HUC + MUC	19309	10.4
<b>URBAN</b>		
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>		
Brahmins	31115	5.0
Bhumihars	47453	3.1
Rajputs	38939	5.3
Kayasths	39263	7.6
All HUC	37131	5.4
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>		
Sheikhs	18951	14.0
Syeds	30046	6.1
Pathans	27869	8.6
All MUC	24553	10.4
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>		
All HUC + MUC	32902	7.1

**Table 4.11 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Possession of Ration Card**

Religion / Caste	APL	BPL	Anotoday / Annapurna	No ration card	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	44.4	41.5	0.5	13.5	100.0
Bhumihars	57.2	26.3	0.7	15.8	100.0
Rajputs	47.6	38.9	0.9	12.7	100.0
Kayasths	47.6	33.3	0.5	18.5	100.0
All HUC	48.6	36.6	0.7	14.2	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	30.1	52.7	1.4	15.8	100.0
Syeds	40.5	42.0	0.8	16.7	100.0
Pathans	26.2	54.4	1.2	18.2	100.0
All MUC	31.4	50.7	1.2	16.7	100.0
All HUC + MUC	44.4	40.0	0.8	14.8	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	31.0	13.6	1.5	53.9	100.0
Bhumihars	14.7	1.6	0.0	83.7	100.0
Rajputs	29.3	7.6	0.3	62.8	100.0
Kayasths	35.3	5.9	0.0	58.8	100.0
All HUC	29.5	8.7	0.7	61.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	21.4	36.2	1.3	41.0	100.0
Syeds	29.8	21.1	0.0	49.1	100.0
Pathans	20.2	34.3	0.5	44.9	100.0
All MUC	22.7	32.3	0.7	44.2	100.0
All HUC + MUC	27.2	16.7	0.7	55.4	100.0

**Table 4.12 : Percentage Distribution by Frequency of Lifting Ration**

Religion / Caste	Not Having a Ration Card	Regularly	Occasionally	Never	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	13.5	80.5	2.3	3.7	100.0
Bhumihars	15.8	75.3	3.2	5.7	100.0
Rajputs	12.7	80.6	2.2	4.5	100.0
Kayasths	18.5	74.3	2.8	4.4	100.0
All HUC	14.2	78.9	2.5	4.5	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	15.8	79.6	2.2	2.4	100.0
Syeds	16.7	78.6	0.9	3.8	100.0
Pathans	18.2	75.8	1.6	4.4	100.0
All MUC	16.7	78.3	1.7	3.3	100.0
All HUC + MUC	14.8	78.7	2.3	4.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	53.9	37.7	1.3	7.1	100.0
Bhumihars	83.7	6.1	1.4	8.8	100.0
Rajputs	62.8	22.4	2.5	12.2	100.0
Kayasths	58.8	25.6	4.6	11.0	100.0
All HUC	61.1	26.9	2.4	9.6	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	41.0	51.6	2.3	5.0	100.0
Syeds	49.1	42.6	4.2	4.2	100.0
Pathans	44.9	42.5	2.4	10.1	100.0
All MUC	44.2	46.3	2.7	6.9	100.0
All HUC + MUC	55.4	33.5	2.5	8.6	100.0

**Table 4.13 : Percentage of Households Indebted and Average Amount of Loan**

Religion / Caste	Percentage of Household Indebted	Average Amount of Loan (per Household) (Rs. '000)	Average Amount of Loan (per Indebted Household) (Rs. '000)	Average Amount of Loan (per Household) as Percentage of Average Annual Income
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	31.1	22.2	71.4	10.1
Bhumihars	46.3	48.0	103.6	18.5
Rajputs	34.5	33.3	96.5	13.3
Kayasths	26.6	25.4	95.7	9.9
All HUC	35.3	31.9	90.6	13.2
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	27.9	18.8	67.4	9.9
Syeds	21.4	35.5	165.9	15.9
Pathans	28.4	14.3	50.2	7.2
All MUC	26.5	21.4	80.6	10.7
All HUC + MUC	33.1	29.3	88.6	12.7
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	23.4	61.7	263.2	16.5
Bhumihars	32.6	95.9	294.7	16.8
Rajputs	28.0	102.3	366.0	21.9
Kayasths	19.3	53.7	277.8	11.4
All HUC	24.9	75.6	303.5	17.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	20.1	40.4	201.0	17.8
Syeds	20.2	31.7	157.2	8.8
Pathans	20.7	32.7	158.0	9.8
All MUC	20.3	35.7	175.8	12.1
All HUC + MUC	23.4	62.2	266.2	15.8

**Table 4.14 : Percentage Distribution of Loan by Different Sources**

Religion / Caste	Relative / Friend	Moneylender	Employer	Bank	Other Sources	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	20.5	20.7	3.1	53.6	2.2	100.0
Bhumihars	21.3	10.4	0.4	65.3	2.5	100.0
Rajputs	14.1	13.7	2.6	66.4	3.2	100.0
Kayasths	10.4	14.7	2.9	66.7	5.3	100.0
All HUC	17.9	14.4	2.0	62.9	2.9	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	29.9	33.7	1.0	32.6	2.7	100.0
Syeds	19.5	24.9	2.0	52.3	1.3	100.0
Pathans	28.0	29.5	4.9	33.3	4.3	100.0
All MUC	25.5	29.5	2.1	40.4	2.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	19.2	17.1	2.0	58.8	2.8	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	7.5	2.5	6.7	81.1	2.1	100.0
Bhumihars	15.2	5.0	3.2	75.8	0.8	100.0
Rajputs	9.0	1.8	2.3	84.7	2.2	100.0
Kayasths	13.7	9.1	10.3	66.4	0.5	100.0
All HUC	10.2	3.7	5.1	79.4	1.7	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	20.9	4.8	0.4	72.8	1.0	100.0
Syeds	31.5	0.0	13.8	52.8	2.0	100.0
Pathans	34.7	6.9	0.8	49.6	8.1	100.0
All MUC	27.5	4.6	3.0	61.3	3.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	13.6	3.9	4.7	75.9	2.1	100.0



**Table 4.15 : Percentage Distribution of Indebted Households by Reason for Loan**

Religion / Caste	Medical Treatment	Marriage/ Sradh/ Majlish	Building or Repairing of House	Agriculture/ Business	Agricultural Operations	Education	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>								
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>								
Brahmins	17.9	20.1	9.7	12.2	23.4	6.0	10.7	100.0
Bhumihars	11.9	11.0	5.7	12.2	38.8	3.1	17.3	100.0
Rajputs	15.7	16.3	6.3	11.0	32.0	5.8	13.0	100.0
Kayasths	20.1	20.1	5.6	19.4	18.5	7.6	8.6	100.0
All HUC	15.6	16.2	7.1	12.3	31.1	5.2	12.6	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>								
Sheikhs	23.9	21.4	17.1	10.0	16.8	2.9	7.9	100.0
Syeds	30.3	20.2	20.2	15.2	7.3	3.0	3.8	100.0
Pathans	30.5	18.6	9.6	13.8	18.5	1.8	7.2	100.0
All MUC	27.1	20.3	15.4	12.1	15.3	2.6	7.3	100.0
All HUC+MUC	17.9	17.0	8.7	12.3	27.2	4.7	12.4	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>								
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>								
Brahmins	4.3	17.4	37.0	5.4	12.4	17.4	6.0	100.0
Bhumihars	5.0	15.0	20.0	17.5	12.8	25.0	4.8	100.0
Rajputs	8.1	10.5	18.6	25.6	12.5	18.6	6.1	100.0
Kayasths	2.2	17.8	24.4	22.2	4.2	26.7	2.5	100.0
All HUC	5.3	14.8	26.2	16.7	11.9	20.5	4.4	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>								
Sheikhs	18.6	16.3	27.9	23.3	4.4	7.0	2.6	100.0
Syeds	21.7	8.7	13.0	26.1	8.6	17.4	4.4	100.0
Pathans	11.9	14.3	16.7	23.8	13.8	14.3	5.2	100.0
All MUC	16.7	13.9	20.4	24.1	9.6	12.0	3.4	100.0
All HUC+MUC	8.6	14.6	24.5	18.9	10.3	18.1	5.1	100.0

**Table 4.16 : Information on Migration of Household Members And Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Type of Migration**

Religion / Caste	Average Number of Outmigrants Per 100 Households	Average Age of Migrant	Percentage Distribution By Type of Migration			
			Seasonal	Semi Permanent	Permanent	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	38.07	33.14	17.9	71.0	11.1	100.0
Bhumihars	40.97	31.91	9.1	76.5	14.4	100.0
Rajputs	52.65	33.76	17.0	71.6	11.4	100.0
Kayasths	37.52	33.50	15.9	64.5	19.6	100.0
All HUC	43.54	33.15	15.5	71.9	12.5	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	48.62	33.12	21.3	67.3	11.4	100.0
Syeds	38.66	31.97	19.2	71.5	9.2	100.0
Pathans	59.90	32.19	19.1	66.4	14.5	100.0
All MUC	49.51	32.60	20.2	67.8	12.0	100.0
All HUC + MUC	45.03	32.99	16.8	70.7	12.4	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	19.69	30.09	9.4	67.9	22.6	100.0
Bhumihars	34.43	30.06	11.8	76.5	11.8	100.0
Rajputs	25.26	31.17	9.5	68.3	22.2	100.0
Kayasths	30.30	30.72	4.0	66.0	30.0	100.0
All HUC	25.39	30.59	8.5	69.0	22.5	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	13.66	31.44	12.0	80.0	8.0	100.0
Syeds	30.91	30.27	13.6	54.5	31.8	100.0
Pathans	18.97	31.55	9.7	87.1	3.2	100.0
All MUC	19.17	31.15	11.5	75.6	12.8	100.0
All HUC + MUC	23.27	30.74	9.4	70.9	19.8	100.0

**Table 4.17 : Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Reasons For Outmigration**

Religion / Caste	For Employment	For Better Employment	For Education	Others	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	67.7	16.6	10.8	5.0	100.0
Bhumihars	68.2	15.7	13.1	3.0	100.0
Rajputs	63.6	24.3	8.5	3.6	100.0
Kayasths	60.1	26.8	10.9	2.2	100.0
All HUC	65.6	20.2	10.4	3.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	74.4	18.2	3.4	4.0	100.0
Syeds	60.8	23.1	10.0	6.2	100.0
Pathans	71.4	19.5	5.0	4.1	100.0
All MUC	71.0	19.5	5.1	4.4	100.0
All HUC + MUC	67.1	20.0	8.9	4.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	41.5	18.9	34.0	5.7	100.0
Bhumihars	55.9	11.8	29.4	2.9	100.0
Rajputs	49.2	15.9	22.2	12.7	100.0
Kayasths	60.0	20.0	16.0	4.0	100.0
All HUC	51.0	17.0	25.0	7.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	72.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	100.0
Syeds	50.0	22.7	22.7	4.5	100.0
Pathans	58.1	22.6	12.9	6.5	100.0
All MUC	60.3	17.9	14.1	7.7	100.0
All HUC + MUC	53.6	17.3	21.9	7.2	100.0

**Table 4.18 : Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Place of Migration**

Religion / Caste	Whithin District	Out of District But Within State	Out of State	Out of Country	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	5.0	9.6	84.7	0.7	100.0
Bhumihars	8.3	10.9	80.8	0.0	100.0
Rajputs	3.8	8.7	85.0	2.5	100.0
Kayasths	8.0	15.2	74.6	2.2	100.0
All HUC	5.5	9.9	83.3	1.3	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	1.4	2.8	89.5	6.3	100.0
Syeds	0.8	10.8	76.2	12.3	100.0
Pathans	1.7	4.1	83.8	10.4	100.0
All MUC	1.4	4.7	85.2	8.7	100.0
All HUC + MUC	4.3	8.5	83.8	3.4	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	3.8	17.0	77.4	1.9	100.0
Bhumihars	0.0	20.6	76.5	2.9	100.0
Rajputs	6.3	14.3	79.4	0.0	100.0
Kayasths	4.0	12.0	80.0	4.0	100.0
All HUC	4.0	15.5	78.5	2.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	0.0	4.0	84.0	12.0	100.0
Syeds	0.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	100.0
Pathans	0.0	6.5	71.0	22.6	100.0
All MUC	0.0	3.8	75.6	20.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	2.9	12.2	77.7	7.2	100.0

**Table 4.19 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Type of House**

Religion / Caste	Hutment (Jhopari)	Katcha	Semi Pucca	Pucca	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	11.8	23.2	22.1	42.9	100.0
Bhumihars	5.0	16.9	24.8	53.2	100.0
Rajputs	5.4	17.9	27.3	49.4	100.0
Kayasths	5.3	21.4	25.8	47.4	100.0
All HUC	7.6	19.9	24.8	47.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	15.8	27.6	23.1	33.5	100.0
Syeds	3.9	22.6	28.4	45.1	100.0
Pathans	9.8	29.5	22.9	37.7	100.0
All MUC	11.3	27.0	24.3	37.4	100.0
All HUC + MUC	8.5	21.6	24.6	45.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	0.8	3.3	12.8	83.1	100.0
Bhumihars	0.0	1.6	7.8	90.7	100.0
Rajputs	0.7	2.0	6.6	90.8	100.0
Kayasths	0.4	2.1	7.1	90.3	100.0
All HUC	0.6	2.4	9.2	87.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	3.5	13.1	26.2	57.2	100.0
Syeds	2.6	4.4	20.2	72.8	100.0
Pathans	1.0	16.2	25.3	57.6	100.0
All MUC	2.4	12.4	24.6	60.6	100.0
All HUC + MUC	1.2	5.8	14.4	78.7	100.0

**Table 4.20 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Source of Drinking Water**

Religion / Caste	Well (inside)	Well (outside)	Tubewell (inside)	Tubewell (outside)	Government Tap	Total
<b>RURAL</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	2.7	3.3	83.2	8.2	2.6	100.0
Bhumihars	2.9	1.7	85.9	8.1	1.3	100.0
Rajputs	1.7	2.6	85.2	8.7	1.7	100.0
Kayasths	2.7	1.8	86.4	6.6	2.4	100.0
All HUC	2.4	2.6	84.7	8.2	2.0	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	5.4	4.1	71.4	14.7	4.5	100.0
Syeds	6.4	1.9	81.5	8.8	1.4	100.0
Pathans	5.3	2.8	73.6	17.2	1.0	100.0
All MUC	5.6	3.2	74.4	14.0	2.8	100.0
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>						
All HUC + MUC	3.2	2.8	82.2	9.7	2.2	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>						
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>						
Brahmins	0.5	0.5	90.7	0.5	7.8	100.0
Bhumihars	3.1	0.8	90.7	0.8	4.7	100.0
Rajputs	1.6	0.7	91.1	1.6	4.9	100.0
Kayasths	4.2	0.0	84.5	1.3	10.1	100.0
All HUC	2.0	0.5	89.4	1.0	7.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>						
Sheikhs	0.0	3.9	84.7	3.5	7.9	100.0
Syeds	0.9	2.6	73.7	3.5	19.3	100.0
Pathans	2.0	4.5	69.7	6.6	17.2	100.0
All MUC	0.9	3.9	76.9	4.6	13.7	100.0
<b>All HUC + MUC</b>						
All HUC + MUC	1.6	1.6	85.2	2.2	9.3	100.0

**Table 4.21 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Toilet Facility**

Religion / Caste	Outside	Inside (Traditional)	Inside (Septic)	Public Toilet	Total
<b>RURAL</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	47.0	8.4	43.9	0.8	100.0
Bhumihars	33.9	10.0	53.9	2.2	100.0
Rajputs	42.7	6.4	50.2	0.8	100.0
Kayasths	25.5	11.0	63.0	0.5	100.0
All HUC	40.8	8.3	49.8	1.1	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	52.8	11.7	34.5	1.0	100.0
Syeds	23.5	11.5	63.4	1.6	100.0
Pathans	49.9	11.7	37.9	0.5	100.0
All MUC	45.2	11.6	42.2	1.0	100.0
All HUC + MUC	41.9	9.1	48.0	1.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>					
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>					
Brahmins	1.0	3.5	95.2	0.3	100.0
Bhumihars	0.0	4.7	94.6	0.8	100.0
Rajputs	2.0	3.3	94.7	0.0	100.0
Kayasths	0.0	3.8	96.2	0.0	100.0
All HUC	0.9	3.7	95.2	0.2	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>					
Sheikhs	8.7	12.2	78.6	0.4	100.0
Syeds	0.9	2.6	94.7	1.8	100.0
Pathans	10.6	8.1	78.8	2.5	100.0
All MUC	7.8	8.7	82.1	1.5	100.0
All HUC + MUC	3.2	5.3	90.8	0.6	100.0

**Table 4.22 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Sources of Light**

Religion / Caste	Dhibri + Lantern	Lantern + Electricity	Electricity	Total
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	33.7	57.1	9.2	100.0
Bhumihars	26.2	62.4	11.3	100.0
Rajputs	25.9	62.5	11.6	100.0
Kayasths	23.8	69.4	6.8	100.0
All HUC	28.6	61.1	10.3	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	48.3	46.3	5.5	100.0
Syeds	27.8	66.0	6.2	100.0
Pathans	40.6	47.9	11.5	100.0
All MUC	41.3	51.3	7.4	100.0
All HUC + MUC	31.7	58.7	9.6	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	1.3	65.2	33.5	100.0
Bhumihars	1.6	62.0	36.4	100.0
Rajputs	0.7	50.0	49.3	100.0
Kayasths	1.3	58.8	39.9	100.0
All HUC	1.1	59.1	39.8	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	6.1	65.5	28.4	100.0
Syeds	2.6	70.2	27.2	100.0
Pathans	8.6	63.6	27.8	100.0
All MUC	6.3	65.8	27.9	100.0
All HUC + MUC	2.9	61.3	35.8	100.0



**Table 4.23 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Most Widely Used Fuel for Cooking**

Religion / Caste	Leaves+ Wood+ Cowdung Cake	Coal	Gas	Total
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	80.1	0.1	19.7	100.0
Bhumihars	76.4	0.0	23.6	100.0
Rajputs	74.6	0.0	25.4	100.0
Kayasths	54.8	1.3	44.0	100.0
All HUC	75.3	0.2	24.5	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	87.5	0.9	11.6	100.0
Syeds	63.8	0.6	35.6	100.0
Pathans	83.0	1.7	15.4	100.0
All MUC	80.7	1.1	18.2	100.0
All HUC + MUC	76.6	0.4	23.0	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	4.0	1.5	94.5	100.0
Bhumihars	2.3	0.0	97.7	100.0
Rajputs	5.6	0.7	93.8	100.0
Kayasths	0.8	0.0	99.2	100.0
All HUC	3.6	0.7	95.7	100.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	23.6	4.8	71.6	100.0
Syeds	7.9	1.8	90.4	100.0
Pathans	35.4	5.6	59.1	100.0
All MUC	24.6	4.4	71.0	100.0
All HUC + MUC	10.6	2.0	87.4	100.0

**Table 4.24 : Percentage of Households Possessing Different Household Durables**

Religion / Caste	Bicycle	Scooter / Motorcycle	Car	Table/ Chair for study	Television	Wrist watch / clock	Refrigerator	Mobile Phone	Wooden/ Steel Almirah
<b>RURAL</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	65.9	15.2	1.0	48.7	26.5	75.5	3.7	95.5	35.6
Bhumihars	68.1	24.6	2.2	44.6	33.7	77.6	7.0	96.4	38.9
Rajputs	63.8	22.0	2.2	43.7	35.9	77.9	4.9	96.7	40.1
Kayasths	68.1	25.8	1.6	51.6	44.3	83.9	6.4	97.4	48.9
All HUC	65.9	20.5	1.7	46.4	32.8	77.5	5.1	96.3	39.0
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	52.4	7.7	0.4	39.5	10.1	64.0	1.5	95.0	27.5
Syeds	63.8	17.3	2.3	57.0	30.2	78.2	8.8	97.9	50.6
Pathans	54.6	8.8	0.7	30.4	13.4	64.9	2.2	93.7	25.4
All MUC	55.7	10.2	0.9	40.9	15.7	67.6	3.4	95.3	32.3
All HUC + MUC	63.4	18.0	1.5	45.0	28.6	75.0	4.7	96.0	37.3
<b>URBAN</b>									
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>									
Brahmins	66.0	43.6	6.5	67.0	82.9	92.4	34.8	98.7	66.8
Bhumihars	58.1	54.3	13.2	62.8	88.4	97.7	50.4	98.4	65.9
Rajputs	62.5	60.5	11.8	67.1	87.5	97.4	51.0	99.7	71.7
Kayasths	57.1	61.8	12.6	79.0	92.9	97.1	65.1	98.3	85.3
All HUC	62.1	53.7	10.2	69.2	87.1	95.5	48.0	98.9	72.2
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>									
Sheikhs	54.6	25.3	1.3	56.8	58.1	86.0	24.5	94.8	47.2
Syeds	50.9	41.2	6.1	60.5	80.7	95.6	43.9	99.1	62.3
Pathans	62.6	24.7	4.5	57.1	59.1	84.8	28.8	97.5	50.0
All MUC	56.7	28.5	3.5	57.7	63.2	87.6	30.1	96.7	51.4
All HUC + MUC	60.3	45.2	8.0	65.3	79.1	92.9	42.0	98.1	65.2

**Table 4.25 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Subscription of Daily Newspaper**

Religion / Caste	Regular	Irregular	Never	Total
<b>RURAL</b>				
Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)				
Brahmins	5.4	9.6	85.0	100.0
Bhumihars	8.4	7.0	84.6	100.0
Rajputs	7.2	9.9	82.9	100.0
Kayasths	16.7	12.6	70.7	100.0
All HUC	7.6	9.4	83.0	100.0
Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)				
Sheikhs	2.2	4.9	92.9	100.0
Syeds	11.3	12.1	76.5	100.0
Pathans	1.8	2.3	95.8	100.0
All MUC	4.2	5.8	89.9	100.0
All HUC + MUC	6.8	8.5	84.7	100.0
<b>URBAN</b>				
Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)				
Brahmins	46.9	14.1	39.0	100.0
Bhumihars	52.7	8.5	38.8	100.0
Rajputs	56.6	4.9	38.5	100.0
Kayasths	71.4	9.2	19.3	100.0
All HUC	55.8	9.7	34.5	100.0
Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)				
Sheikhs	14.4	9.2	76.4	100.0
Syeds	40.4	14.0	45.6	100.0
Pathans	24.2	8.1	67.7	100.0
All MUC	23.5	9.8	66.7	100.0
All HUC + MUC	44.9	9.8	45.3	100.0

**Table 4.26 : Percentage Distribution of Households by Financial Details**

Religion / Caste	Number of Households Having			
	Bank Account	Post Office Account	Insurance Policy	Kisan Credit Card
<b>RURAL</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	87.3	7.8	24.0	11.0
Bhumihars	89.9	4.8	29.6	30.4
Rajputs	89.5	6.9	27.2	17.0
Kayasths	91.0	9.0	32.6	5.7
All HUC	88.9	7.0	27.1	16.9
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	75.7	7.3	13.5	3.2
Syeds	87.7	2.1	28.8	1.2
Pathans	67.3	3.3	11.0	2.8
All MUC	76.1	4.9	16.3	2.6
All HUC + MUC	85.8	6.5	24.4	13.4
<b>URBAN</b>				
<b>Hindu Upper Castes (HUC)</b>				
Brahmins	95.5	11.6	51.9	-
Bhumihars	99.2	10.1	59.7	-
Rajputs	94.4	8.9	50.7	-
Kayasths	98.3	15.1	54.2	-
All HUC	96.3	11.4	53.0	-
<b>Muslim Upper Castes (MUC)</b>				
Sheikhs	82.1	8.3	28.4	-
Syeds	92.1	13.2	36.8	-
Pathans	84.8	6.6	26.3	-
All MUC	85.2	8.7	29.4	-
All HUC + MUC	92.5	10.5	45.1	-

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even after nearly seven decades of independence, during which a number of development efforts by the government have improved the social and economic conditions of the Indian people, the overall scenario still leaves much to be desired. In Bihar, this aggregate deficit in development is much wider than in most other parts of the country. To add to this development deficit, there also exist wide disparities in terms of gains from development among the various social groups, identified along religion, caste, region or other characteristics. Those social groups which have been bypassed by the overall development process not only suffer from serious social and economic hardship, they also pose a threat to the social and political stability of the country, without which further development would be seriously hampered. One of the ways by which the government could meet this challenge is to be mindful of specific development needs of all sections of the people, whether they belong to traditionally disadvantaged communities or those who, in spite of belonging to a so-called privileged community, are still deprived of adequate economic opportunities and decent living standards. A substantial part of the upper caste population falls within the second category. In Bihar, nearly 20.0 percent of the total population belong to the upper castes, either Hindu (Brahmin, Bhumihar, Rajput and Kayasth) or Muslim (Sheikh, Syed and Pathan).

#### **5.1 Status of Upper Caste Population**

For investigating the status of upper caste population of Bihar, a primary survey was conducted in 20 districts of the state (for rural population) and 5 districts of the state (for urban population). The sample size for the survey was 10,099 households — 8490 households (rural) and 1609 households (urban).

The demographic profile of the upper caste population, as obtained from the survey, revealed a better sex ratio among them at least in the rural areas, and also higher average size of the household, the latter possibly due to the wider practice of extended or joint families among them.

The data also indicated that the growth rate of population is lower among them and their better health status. But the upper castes population was rather disadvantaged in terms of work participation rate of their adult male members, nearly equal in urban areas, but substantially lower in rural areas. For the female adults, the work participation rate was lower in both rural and urban areas. The notion that employed workers among the upper caste population are generally better placed in the labour market was also found to be untrue, as a large section of them were only salary/wage earners with irregular earnings.

From the information on the educational status of upper caste population, it was found that they are indeed better placed in terms of literacy rates, but nearly one-fifth of the upper caste population were illiterate, in both rural and urban areas. Secondly, among the literate population, there were many whose education level was so limited (below higher secondary) that they could not possibly have the advantage of higher skills for employment. Among the different castes, Kayasths among the Hindus and Syeds among the Muslims are relatively better placed in terms of educational status. Thanks to the strengthening of educational infrastructure in Bihar in recent years, attending school/college is now very wide among the young people (6-20 years), but it is still not universal — about 15 percent of the young in the rural areas and 10 percent in urban areas are still out of educational institutions. The most important reason for such educational exclusion (more than 50 percent in both rural and urban areas) was reported to be poverty. It is true that, thanks to higher income, many upper caste parents send their children to private schools (costly or low-cost), but more than 80 percent of the children in rural areas and more than 50 percent of them in urban areas still opt for government schools. The economic constraints of the upper caste population is also revealed when it is found that 8.4 percent of their children in rural areas and 6.0 percent in urban areas suffer from book-deficiency. The advantage of having a private tutor at home is also limited for the students — about 40 and 50 percent in rural and urban areas, respectively.

In terms of current health practices, the status of upper caste population may be better than that for the general population, but many of them still suffer because of poor health practices. For

example, birth of children at home (either with a trained or traditional midwife) is observed for 20.8 percent of children in rural and 13.5 percent of them in urban areas. Except for polio, the coverage of other vaccinations (Measles, DPT and BCG) are far from being universal. In the context of health practices, it is most distressing to find that 30.1 percent of the upper caste households in rural areas and 4.8 in the urban areas approach a ‘quack’ for medical treatment. Similarly, 23.8 and 16.6 percent of them in rural and urban areas believe the obnoxious practice of ‘jharphuk’.

The economic status of the upper caste households were analysed in terms of several indicators. For one, for a large number of upper caste households, the principal source of income is irregular salary/wage earnings, which is generally disadvantageous. It is true that, in the rural areas, the upper caste households enjoy an advantage in terms of land endowment, but for many of them, the present landholding is less than 5 acres, often regarded as the minimum size of an economic holding. It also emerges from the survey that selling of land is more common of them than purchasing of land, indicating the waning of this advantage.

The income level of a household is the most comprehensive single indicator of their economic status. The present survey finds that the average household income of upper caste households (Rs. 2.42 lakh) in rural areas is about 13 percent higher than that of general population (Rs. 2.14 lakh). Similarly, the average household of upper caste households in urban areas (Rs. 3.95 lakh) is 84 percent higher than that of the general population. But in spite of this higher average incomes, many upper caste households still live below poverty line. As per the present survey, poverty ratio for the upper caste population are — upper caste Hindus in rural areas (10.3 percent), upper caste Muslims in rural areas (10.7 percent), upper caste Hindus in urban areas (5.4 percent) and upper caste Muslims in urban areas (10.4 percent). These ratios are clearly indicative of serious economic disadvantages that many upper caste households suffer from in Bihar. It should be mentioned here that remittances sent by out-migrants from the households account for 12.2 percent of the income of rural households and 5.9 percent of urban households. In the absence of such remittance income, the poverty ratios would have been much higher, particularly in the rural

areas. In view of such poverty level, it is not surprising that about one-third of the upper caste households in rural areas and about one-fourth of them in urban areas are indebted.

If one tries to judge the economic status of upper caste households from their standard of living, it again emerges that many of them suffer because of inadequate housing, inadequate toilet facility, traditional sources of lighting and fuel for cooking, and absence of a simple table/chair, the last item being necessary for children's education. Because of their limited economic resources, even in the urban areas, nearly half the households do not subscribe to a daily newspaper. Only in case of the source of drinking water, possession of a mobile phone, and having a bank account, they are not much disadvantaged.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

Since educational and economic disadvantage is observed for many people in Bihar, any welfare measure taken to help the general population will also go a long way towards improving the conditions of the disadvantaged sections among the upper caste population. However, the State government also needs to undertake some specific steps to help the upper caste population.

- (a) Because of historical reasons, adequate attention has not been paid to the needs of the disadvantaged amongst the upper caste population. It is recommended that this mindset should be adequately changed to appreciate that the disadvantaged among the upper caste population also needs special attention while implementing various welfare programmes.
- (b) Although deprivation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, the State government should fix an income criterion to identify the disadvantaged population belonging to upper caste for operational purposes. The Per Capita Income of the general population in Bihar at current prices is Rs. 33954. With an average household size of 5.5 persons (2011 census), the average Per Household Annual Income comes to be Rs. 1.87 lakh. One may consider all upper caste households with an Annual Household Income below Rs. 1.50 lakh (approximately 20 percent less than the average for the general population) as seriously disadvantaged. Henceforth, all upper caste households having an Annual Household Income



of less than Rs. 1.50 lakh should be included in all welfare programmes meant for the disadvantaged population in the State.

- (c) The State government presently implements a number of welfare programmes, aimed at improving the socio-economic conditions of the disadvantaged population. These programmes broadly aim five needs — education, housing, toilet facilities, agriculture and social welfare. All these welfare programmes should be redefined to include the disadvantaged amongst the upper caste population. In particular, all Scholarship Schemes meant to incentivize education should be extended to the disadvantaged among the upper caste population. Similarly, the benefit of “Protsahan Yojna” for students passing matriculation examination in first division should also be extended to students belonging to upper caste population. These are only two illustrative welfare programme, but other programmes should also be redefined so that the disadvantaged among the upper caste population receive those benefits.