International Journal of Social Science and Humanities
www.humanitiesjournals.com
Online ISSN: 2664-8628, Print ISSN: 2664-861X
Received: 30-05-2021; Accepted: 15-06-2021; Published: 30-06-2021
Volume 3, Issue 1, 2021, Page No. 64-72

Quality of life of scheduled tribe in Jammu and Kashmir: A comparative study of Rajouri and Udhampur districts

Nagina Kousser[1], Shoket Hussain[2]
[1] Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India
[2] Ph.D. Scholar, Department of History, IGNOU, New Delhi, India

Abstract
The Scheduled tribes in the states are 1,493,299 comprising 11.9% of the total population of the state and constitute 1.5% of the total tribal population of the country [1]. In two selected district which is highly concentration of tribal population, quality of life of the tribal still very low as compared to the mainstream population and their socio-economic parameters are also low. Due to various problems, schemes launched by the government to fill the gap between scheduled tribes and others general population and amongst them, Tribal Sub plan is one of the most important. To improve the quality of life of the tribe is the main objective of TSP. The study focused on two main categorization i.e. Beneficiaries (availed the schemes) and Non Beneficiaries (not availed the schemes) under sub schemes of TSP. A sum of 480 households comprising 2450 individual (240 beneficiaries and 240 non beneficiaries from two districts) of Rajouri and Udhampur district, Rajouri and Udhampur district was selected purposively because of high concentration of scheduled tribe population and interviewed through the help of pretested scheduled for collecting information on the different parameters of quality of life of the tribe (Gujjars, Bakerwals, Gaddies and Sippies). The major findings reveal that the overall qualities of life of the tribal beneficiaries are much satisfactory as compared to the non-beneficiaries which are depicted through ten parameters. Majority of beneficiaries are those who are already well off sustained that caused the gap widened between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries among the tribal. Thus, there is imperative need to aware the tribal about programmes and multiple schemes of TSP so that needy and deserving tribes would be selected and the gap among the tribes would be eliminated. Chi-Square test and ANOVA test run in SPSS used for measuring differences and variation between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

Keywords: quality of life, purposively, parameters, multiple schemes

Introduction
Tribal Sub Plan also knows as Scheduled tribe component. In the fifth five year plan (1974-75) a multipronged strategy i.e. Tribal sub plan was launched. It was adopted by an expert committee under the chairmanship of S.C. Dube for the development and welfare of the scheduled tribe population. It plays a very important role in the welfare of scheduled tribes in various sphere of life that is why it exists till date. The main objective of Tribal Sub Plan is to reduce the poverty and unemployment. It also focused on education and health of tribes and creation of productive assets in favor of scheduled tribes. The main features of Tribal sub plan are (1) this scheme is exclusively for the welfare and development of tribal areas as many schemes come under Tribal sub plan. (2) Tribal sub plan is a part of the Annual of a State or Union Territory (3) it has been operational in 22 States and 2 UTs (4) Tribal majority states where population is more than 80%, TSP is not applicable because in these states Annual plan is itself a Tribal Plan [2]. Tribal sub-plan strategy introduced in J&K in 1991 and it is known as Tribal Sub schemes in state. It lays special emphasis on tribal development to ensure their socio-economic up liftmen. Various types of assets created under TSP in Jammu and Kashmir such as sustain income creating assets, agriculture land development related asset.

Review of Literature
The term quality of life is overall general well-being of an individual and society. It not only includes income which is the primarily used for standard of living but also expectations which are guided by the values, goals and socio-cultural context. In a nutshell, it includes everything such as physical health, religious belief, wealth, security of freedom and environment [4]. PQLI is an earliest attempt to measure the overall well-being replaced by the United Nation Development Program's Human Development Index [5] adopted ten parameter (Housing, Sanitary, health status, education, fuel availability, Assets possessed, transport assets, source of water, food nutrition intake and per capita income) of native and migrants tribe of Orrisa to examined the quality of life of tribal and measure through the score which was defined on a scale of 0 to 100. In the mid-1970s by Morris David Morris developed the PQLI for the purpose of measuring quality of life or well-being of a country. It is the average of the three statistics: base literacy rate, infant mortality and life expectancy and all are equally on a 0 to 100 scale [6]. This study also focuses on ten parameters.

Statement of the problem
Most of the explanations are available by and large and in these findings they clearly mention that tribal are still lagging behind

in comparison to the mainstream population. They also face exploitation in all forms and Lack of support of economic means of livelihood among the tribal. The impact and effectiveness of these programmes have not been thoroughly implemented in the country except few pockets and this leads to create not only intra-state but also intra-regional disparities. Tribal are not able to participate in the process of development, as they are not aware most of the programmes/ policies made for their up liftmen.

Sampling Design

Field survey has been carried out in the districts of Rajouri and Udhampur. The data for the present study has been collected from two districts. 120 beneficiaries and 120 Non beneficiaries selected from one district. 240 sample selected from one district and 240 sample selected from other district turn to be total 480 households. The research design followed for this study is explorative and descriptive in nature and the samples were selected purposively for collection of data. Those district are selected which are high concentration of scheduled tribe population.

Objectives

1. To examine the impact of Tribal Sub Plan on the socio-economic condition of Beneficiaries.
2. To know the quality of life of tribe under Tribal Sub plan in two selected districts.

Hypothesis

Ho: TSP has not been able to improve the quality of life of Beneficiaries

Parameters used for measuring the Quality of life and Socio-economic condition of Tribal under Tribal Sub Plan

After reviewing of literature and reports on United Nations Development, the following parameters are analyzed to know the quality of life.

Table 1

1.Housing types and numbers of rooms
2. Source of Water
3. Sanitary Facilities
4. Monthly expenditure on Food and Non- Food items (Food nutrition intake)
5. Health Conditions
6. Educational facilities
7. Availability of fuel for cooking purposes
8. Assets possessed (Household assets)
9. Transport assets
10. Per capita income

1. Housing and Number of Rooms

Table 2: Type of Houses (Housing Condition of Scheduled Tribes)

Type of Houses * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	
Type of Houses	Temporary tent or Kula	Count	4	6	10
		% within Type of House	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within Type of Respondent	1.7%	2.5%	2.1%
	Kucha	Count	97	164	261
		% within Type of House	37.2%	62.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Respondent	40.4%	68.3%	54.4%
	Semi Pucca	Count	50	33	83
		% within Type of House	60.2%	39.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Respondent	20.8%	13.8%	17.3%
	Pucca	Count	89	37	126
		% within Type of House	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
		% within Type of Respondent	37.1%	15.4%	26.2%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within Type of House	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Type of Respondent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

Note: % within type of houses show “row wise” and type of respondents show “column wise”

As regards to the data of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, most of the houses found in the study were Kucha houses as 54.4% of respondents were responded for Kucha houses. With regard to the data of beneficiaries (97) 40.4% had Kucha houses where as (164) 68.3% of non-beneficiaries had Pucca houses which were comparatively higher than the beneficiaries. The study revealed that the (50) 20.8% beneficiaries were live in Semi- Pucca houses whereas (33) 13.8% of non-beneficiaries were reside semi-Pucca houses which were found to be comparatively lesser.

As regards to the data of Pucca houses 37.1 % of beneficiaries and only 15.4% of non-beneficiaries were reside in Pucca house. As far as data of those respondents who were found to be without any shelter mainly resided under Tent or Kula mainly migrants tribal resided in this abode.

Table 3: Number of Rooms

Numbers of Rooms * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Numbers of Rooms	1-2	Count	50	94	144
		% within Numbers of rooms	34.7%	65.3%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	20.8%	39.2%	30.0%
	3-4	Count	108	102	210
		% within Numbers of rooms	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	45.0%	42.5%	43.8%
	5-6	Count	50	22	72
		% within Numbers of rooms	69.4%	30.6%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	20.8%	9.2%	15.0%
	6 and above	Count	28	16	44
		% within Numbers of rooms	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	11.7%	6.7%	9.2%
	None	Count	4	6	10
		% within Numbers of rooms	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	1.7%	2.5%	2.1%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within Numbers of rooms	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data
Note: % within numbers of Rooms show "row wise" and % within Respondents show "column wise"

Majority 43.8% of the beneficiaries had possession of 3-4 rooms. The table depicts that beneficiaries had more rooms as compared to the non-beneficiaries as 11.7% of beneficiaries had holding of 6 and above rooms.

2. Source of Drinking Water

Table 4: Source of Drinking Water

What is the Source of Drinking water * Type of respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Source of Drinking water	Tape water (within premise)	Count	121	91	212
		% within Drinking water	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	50.4%	37.9%	44.2%
	Shared tap	Count	10	3	13
		% within Drinking water	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	4.2%	1.2%	2.7%
	Well	Count	0	12	12
		% within Drinking water	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	0.0%	5.0%	2.5%
	Spring Water	Count	103	129	232
		% within Drinking water	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	42.9%	53.8%	48.3%
	Public hand pump	Count	6	5	11
		% within Drinking water	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	2.5%	2.1%	2.3%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within Drinking water	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data
Note: % within source of drinking water show "row wise" and % within respondent show "column wise"

The table 5 depicts the main source of drinking water and type of respondents. A glance at the table revealed that the main source of drinking water for the beneficiaries was Tape water which is second most available source after spring as 50.4% (121) of beneficiaries were used tape water whereas the main source of water for the non-beneficiaries was spring (Natural) Water which is known as "Bowli" in local language. It is clearly reflected from the table that the beneficiaries availed the benefits of tape water more than the non-beneficiaries as the beneficiaries were mostly economically sound as they got benefits of TSP because they were mostly covered under multiple schemes of TSP. Maximum majority (48.3%) were found to be used natural spring water for drinking purposes in rural areas by the tribal. As it is depicted from the table that (103) 42.9% of beneficiaries while (129) 53.8% of non-beneficiaries which were higher as their counterparts.

Public hand pump used by the number of beneficiaries were (2.5%) 6 while 2.1% of non-beneficiaries were used hand pump for drinking water, there is slightly difference between the two in this regard.

3. Sanitary Facility

For improving quality of life sanitation is utmost important for the socio-economic development and security.

Table 5: Availability of Toilet facility

Do you have toilet facility at home * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	
Do you have toilet facility	Yes	Count	137	92	229
		% within Toilet facility	59.8%	40.2%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	57.1%	38.3%	47.7%
	No	Count	103	148	251
		% within Toilet	41.0%	59.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	42.9%	61.7%	52.3%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within Toilet	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data
Note: % within Toilet facility show "row wise" and % within respondents show "column wise"

The table 6 depicts that majority (251) 52.3% of respondents were responded for having no toilet facility. As in case of availability of toilet facility among the tribal beneficiaries, 57.1% of beneficiaries were found to be used toilet facility while 38.3% of non-beneficiaries had no toilet facility at all. 42.9% of beneficiaries were reported that the toilet facility was not available whereas 61.7% of non-beneficiaries were preferred to open defecation on account of unavailability of toilet facilities.

Table 6: Kind of Toilet facility among the Beneficiaries and Non Beneficiaries

What kind of toilet facilities your Household have * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Kind of toilet facilities	Flush latrines	Count	112	79	191
		% within kind of toilet facility	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within Respondent	81.8%	85.9%	83.4%
	Pit	Count	1	3	4
		% within Kind of toilet facility	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondent	0.7%	3.3%	1.7%
	Public or community bathroom	Count	12	0	12
		% within Kind of toilet facility	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondent	8.8%	0.0%	5.2%
	Share (Joint families)	Count	12	10	22
		% within Kind of toilet facility	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within Respondent	8.8%	10.9%	9.6%
Total		Count	137	92	229
		% within Kind of toilet facility	59.8%	40.2%	100.0%
		% within Respondent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data
Note: % Within Kind of toilet facility show "row wise" and % within Respondents show "column wise"

Looking to the above table 7 it can be observed that 81.8% of beneficiaries were used flush latrines while 85.9% of non-beneficiaries were used the same. As regard the data related to pit facility, 0.7% of beneficiaries was used pit facility while 3.3% of non-beneficiaries were used this type of toilet facility. Pit toilet is a type of toilet that collects human feces in a hole in the ground. Figures shows that Public bathroom or community bathroom used by the number of beneficiaries were 8.8% while 0.0 % of non-beneficiaries. Public bathroom used by the various households in the village. It clearly pointed out that Public or community bathroom constructed under multiple schemes of TSP and on account of this only beneficiaries availed this type of toilet facility. Lastly, share bathroom used by the joint families or two or three households, 8.8% of beneficiaries were using share bathroom while 10.9% of non-beneficiaries had this type of toilet facility.

4. Availability of Fuel

Table 7: Distribution of Household and Availability of Fuel for cooking purposes

Fuel Availability		Respondents								
		Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Total		
		Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %
Wood as a fuel for cooking purposes	Yes	233	97.1%	49.7%	236	98.3%	50.3%	469	97.7%	100.0%
	No	7	2.9%	63.6%	4	1.7%	36.4%	11	2.3%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Coal	Yes	0	0.0%	0.0%	9	3.8%	100.0%	9	1.9%	100.0%
	No	240	100.0%	51.0%	231	96.2%	49.0%	471	98.1%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Kerosene (stove)	Yes	70	29.2%	40.0%	105	43.8%	60.0%	175	36.5%	100.0%
	No	170	70.8%	55.7%	135	56.2%	44.3%	305	63.5%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Cow dung	Yes	28	11.7%	31.5%	61	25.4%	68.5%	89	18.5%	100.0%
	No	212	88.3%	54.2%	179	74.6%	45.8%	391	81.5%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
LPG	Yes	220	91.7%	54.6%	183	76.2%	45.4%	403	84.0%	100.0%
	No	20	8.3%	26.0%	57	23.8%	74.0%	77	16.0%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Others source	Yes	26	10.8%	70.3%	11	4.6%	29.7%	37	7.7%	100.0%
	No	214	89.2%	48.3%	229	95.4%	51.7%	443	92.3%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

The estimate of poverty can be estimated through the use of cooking fuels. Maximum number of tribal household used wood as the main source of fuel for cooking purposes after that LPG used as fuel for cooking purposes. The governments provide LPG subsidy scheme to the rural tribal people has been successful to a large extent as it is indicated from the above table through the number of user. Cow dung cakes used very less among the tribal household.

Different fuels for cooking purposes.

5. Education status

Table 8: School going Children

Do you send Children to school * respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Do you send your Children to school	Yes	Count	198	184	382
		% within School going children	51.8%	48.2%	100.0%
		% within respondents	82.5%	76.7%	79.6%
	No	Count	42	56	98
		% within School going children	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within respondents	17.5%	23.3%	20.4%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within School going children	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

Note: % within school going children show "row wise" and % within Respondents show "column wise"

As regards the data related to the school going children of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Among the total school going children, 79.6% of tribal children were found to be going to school and 20.4% of children were not going to school. It reflected that maximum majority of tribal children were going to school and that there was no disparity.

Table 9: Educational Qualification (% of household)

		Respondents								
		Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Total		
		Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %
Educational Qualification Last year	Illiterate	464	38.9%	50.8%	449	40.1%	49.2%	913	39.4%	100.0%
	Primary	212	17.8%	51.7%	198	17.7%	48.3%	410	17.7%	100.0%
	Middle	174	14.6%	47.4%	193	17.2%	52.6%	367	15.9%	100.0%
	High	163	13.7%	52.1%	150	13.4%	47.9%	313	13.5%	100.0%
	Hr. Sec	89	7.5%	52.4%	81	7.2%	47.6%	170	7.3%	100.0%
	College and above	83	7.0%	63.8%	47	4.2%	36.2%	130	5.6%	100.0%
	Technical/Diploma/certificate	9	0.8%	75.0%	3	0.3%	25.0%	12	0.5%	100.0%
	Total	1194	100.0%	51.6%	1121	100.0%	48.4%	2315	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

Note: It is to be noted that the below 4 years children are excluded from the above table in order to calculate the educational qualification of all the members of household

As regards to the data of beneficiaries are concerned, 38.9% of beneficiaries were fall under illiterate category whereas 40.1% of non-beneficiaries were illiterate. Majority of beneficiaries (17.8%) and non-beneficiaries (17.7%) were studied up to primary education. In case of Higher Education College and above 7.0% of beneficiaries were fall under the category of college ad above whereas 5.6% of non-beneficiaries were enrolled in college and above. As regard to the data of technical education, 0.8% of beneficiaries were fall under the category of technical education and 0.3% of non-beneficiaries were getting technical education.

As beneficiaries are more in higher education as compared to the non-beneficiaries.

6. Health Status

Health is a defined as a state of complete physical, mental and spiritual well-being. It is very important parameter of quality of life.

Table 10: Availability of Health Centre or institution in Village

Availability of Health institution or Centre in your village * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Availability of Health centers in the village	Yes	Count	186	165	351
		% within Health center	53.0%	47.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	77.5%	68.8%	73.1%
	No	Count	54	75	129
		% within Health center	41.9%	58.1%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	22.5%	31.2%	26.9%
Total		Count	240	240	480
		% within Health center	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

Note: % within availability of health center show "Row wise" and % within respondents show "column wise"

Looking at the table it can be observed that (186) 77.5% of beneficiaries were responded that the health center was available in the village and (54) 22.5% of beneficiaries were responded that the health center was not available in the village. On the other hand, the data regarding to non-beneficiaries (165) 68.8% of non-beneficiaries were reported that the health center was available in the village while (75) 31.2% of non-beneficiaries were reported about unavailability of health center in the village.

Table 11: Kind of health institution available in village

What kind of health institution or center available in your village * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non- Beneficiaries	
Kind of Health centers in Village	PHC	Count	119	121	240
		% within Kind of health centers	49.6%	50.4%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	64.0%	73.3%	68.4%
	Sub-center	Count	64	43	107
		% within Kind of health Centers	59.8%	40.2%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	34.4%	26.1%	30.5%
	(CHs)	Count	3	1	4
		% within Kind of health centers	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	1.6%	0.6%	1.1%
Total		Count	186	165	351
		% within Kind of health centers	53.0%	47.0%	100.0%
		% within Respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

Note: % within kind of health centers show "row wise" and % within respondents show "Column Wise"

The table 12 presented above provides a vivid picture of the kind of health institutions available in village, as (119) 64.0% of beneficiaries responded for availability of Primary health center in village and (121) 73.3% of non-beneficiaries were reported of primary health center. As far as the data related to the Sub-center availability, (64) 34.4% of beneficiaries were asserted for availability of Sub-center and (43) 26.1% of non-beneficiaries were responded that sub center available in their village.

It has been observed through the others category which include dispensary and Community health center, as (3) 1.6% of beneficiaries were to be observed responded for others category and only (1) 0.6% of non-beneficiaries were reported for others category which were less as compared to the beneficiaries.

7. Household Assets

Table 12: Household Assets possession

Assets		Respondents								
		Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Total		
		Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %	Count	Column N %	Row N %
Television	Yes	110	45.8%	65.9%	57	23.8%	34.1%	167	34.8%	100.0%
	No	130	54.2%	41.5%	183	76.2%	58.5%	313	65.2%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Refrigerator	Yes	127	52.9%	62.9%	75	31.2%	37.1%	202	42.1%	100.0%
	No	113	47.1%	40.6%	165	68.8%	59.4%	278	57.9%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Table	Yes	179	74.6%	54.9%	147	61.2%	45.1%	326	67.9%	100.0%
	No	61	25.4%	39.6%	93	38.8%	60.4%	154	32.1%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Chairs	Yes	227	94.6%	50.8%	220	91.7%	49.2%	447	93.1%	100.0%
	No	13	5.4%	39.4%	20	8.3%	60.6%	33	6.9%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Sofa set	Yes	99	41.2%	64.3%	55	22.9%	35.7%	154	32.1%	100.0%
	No	141	58.8%	43.3%	185	77.1%	56.7%	326	67.9%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%
Others Household Assets	Yes	68	28.3%	64.2%	38	15.8%	35.8%	106	22.1%	100.0%
	No	172	71.7%	46.0%	202	84.2%	54.0%	374	77.9%	100.0%
	Total	240	100.0%	50.0%	240	100.0%	50.0%	480	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data

The table 13 depicts the household assets possession, (110) 45.8% of beneficiaries were responded for holding of television assets while 57 (23.8%) of non-beneficiaries were possession. It may also be observed that (127) 52.9% of beneficiaries had possession of refrigerator whereas (75) 31.2% of non-beneficiaries were holding refrigerator. In case of tables and chairs which were basic household items, (179) 74.6% of beneficiaries and (147) 61.2% of non-beneficiaries possessed these assets. As regards the data related to the sofa set (99) 41.2% of beneficiaries and (55) 22.9% of non-beneficiaries had ownership of sofa set. Finally, others household categories include cooler, computer and laptop (68) 28.3% of beneficiaries and (38) 15.8% of non-beneficiaries had ownership of these assets.

9. Per capita income

Per capita income measures the average income per individual or per person.

Table 13: Per capita income of Beneficiaries and Non Beneficiaries

Per capita income * Respondents Cross tabulation					
			Respondents		Total
			Beneficiaries	Non Beneficiaries	
Per capita income	Below 1000	Count	18	36	54
		% within Per capita income	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within respondents	7.5%	15.0%	11.2%
	1001 to 1400	Count	32	55	87
		% within Per capita income	36.8%	63.2%	100.0%
		% within respondents	13.3%	22.9%	18.1%
	1401 to 1800	Count	39	61	100
		% within Per capita income	39.0%	61.0%	100.0%
		% within respondent	16.2%	25.4%	20.8%
	1801 to 2300	Count	32	36	68
		% within Per capita income	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
		% within respondents	13.3%	15.0%	14.2%
	2301 to 5000	Count	72	33	105
		% within Per capita income	68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
		% within respondents	30.0%	13.8%	21.9%
	5001 to 10,000	Count	33	11	44
		% within Per capita income	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within respondents	13.8%	4.6%	9.2%
	10,001 to 20,000	Count	13	8	21
		% within Per capita income	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
		% within respondents	5.4%	3.3%	4.4%
	Above 20,000	Count	1	0	1
		% within Per capita income	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within respondents	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%

Total	Count	240	240	480
	% within Per capita income	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within respondents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey Data
Note: % within per capita income show "row wise" and % within name of responses show "Column wise"

The table depicts the per capita income of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries and it revealed that there was a greater degree of difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding the per capita income. As in case of higher per capita income, the numbers of beneficiaries were more as compared to the non-beneficiaries. Therefore, the impact of TSP on the socio-economic condition was significant and it was reflected from the per capita income of beneficiaries.

In short, the beneficiaries were fall in the higher per capita income class and these were the respondents who were came under different schemes of TSP whereas the numbers of non-beneficiaries were less in the higher income class.

Table 14: ANOVA: Household Expenditure of Tribal

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Monthly expenditure on food	Between Groups	299568000.000	1	299568000.000	34.514	.000
	Within Groups	4148865000.000	478	8679633.891		
	Total	4448433000.000	479			
Monthly expenditure on Medical	Between Groups	2546253.333	1	2546253.333	3.766	.053
	Within Groups	323168205.833	478	676084.113		
	Total	325714459.167	479			
Monthly expenditure on Education	Between Groups	84935770.823	1	84935770.823	7.612	.006
	Within Groups	4240117134.936	380	11158202.987		
	Total	4325052905.759	381			
Monthly expenditure on fuel for Cooking	Between Groups	304768.802	1	304768.802	11.784	.001
	Within Groups	12361979.179	478	25861.881		
	Total	12666747.981	479			
	Within Groups	4664719.331	442	10553.664		
	Total	4868274.775	443			
Monthly expenditure of rent on farm assets	Between Groups	147770.469	1	147770.469	2.459	.118
	Within Groups	18867182.148	314	60086.567		
	Total	19014952.617	315			
Monthly expenditure on rent leased land	Between Groups	2490032.619	1	2490032.619	1.670	.205
	Within Groups	52186724.138	35	1491049.261		
	Total	54676756.757	36			
Monthly expenditure on fodder	Between Groups	15930661.167	1	15930661.167	19.342	.000
	Within Groups	354992548.994	431	823648.606		
	Total	370923210.162	432			
Monthly expenditure on others things	Between Groups	8242520.833	1	8242520.833	1.333	.249
	Within Groups	2955779791.667	478	6183639.732		
	Total	2964022312.500	479			

Source: Survey Data

In order to measure the Quality of life, ANOVA was in the above table 17 performed on monthly expenditure of the household so that the quality of life of the beneficiaries came to known through the comparison between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. In the above table, the ANOVA test conducted individually on the expenditure of all household items. The ANOVA test shows vividly that there is significant difference between the beneficiaries and the non-beneficiaries in respect of monthly mean expenditure on food (.000), on education (.006), on fuel for Cooking (.001), on electricity (.000) and on fodder (.000) and on medical (.053) etc. In case of rent on farm assets (.118), rent on leased land (.205) and on other things (.249). The ANOVA test conducted on monthly expenditure items yield a significant result.

Concluding Observation

A detailed look into the different Parameter of quality of life which taken from the socio-economic characteristics of tribe households has been made, as this would be of immense help to analyze the impact of TSP on the quality of life of the beneficiaries. The study has found that majority of tribe has Kucha house. On an individual level, majority of beneficiaries are resided in Pucca houses with more rooms as compared to the non-beneficiaries who dwelled in Kucha houses with less number of rooms. In case of drinking water source, at an aggregate level, maximum tribe still use spring water for drinking purposes and in case of beneficiaries' majority have tape water source for drinking purposes while non-beneficiaries are used spring water. The study has shown thrown light into the poor toilet facility, majority of tribe have no toilet facility. At an individual level, maximum beneficiaries have toilet facility whereas non beneficiaries have no toilet facility. It indicated that open defecation still prevailed in the rural areas among the tribes. With regard to the availability of fuel for cooking purposes, the study has observed that majority of tribal used wood as a main source of fuel for cooking purposes and the main source of fuel for

beneficiaries is wood and second is LPG and the main source of fuel for non-beneficiaries is wood and very less numbers are reflected in case of having LPG. As far as the education or literacy is concerned, it has been noticed from the study that majority of tribe household send their children to school. Inspite of seeing good number of school going children among the tribe, there is less number of tribe in higher education. Maximum parents are unwilling to send their children to school beyond middle or primary education and as a result drop-out ratio and stagnation ratio reflected high. In case of higher education, the number of beneficiaries enrolled more as compared to the non-beneficiaries. In case of health status, majority of tribal has health center in their village. It has been found that beneficiaries have more health center as compared to the non-beneficiaries and beneficiaries have more sub center and community health center. Therefore, it is indicated the slight difference between the two. The data related to the basic amenities (Household assets and transport assets), beneficiaries have more high value assets as compared to the non-beneficiaries.

Least but not the last, per capita income of beneficiaries are more as compared to the counterparts. In case of higher income class, majority of beneficiaries are fall in this category. As far as the data of household monthly expenditure is concerned, mean or average monthly expenditure of beneficiaries is more as compared to the non-beneficiaries. In every indicator table Chi-Square test has shown that maximum indicators or parameters have shown significance difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. ANOVA on expenditure yield a statistically significant effect, thus the null hypothesis that the TSP has not improved the quality of life of the beneficiaries was rejected and accept the alternate hypothesis.

References

1. https://tribalsaffairs.jk.gov.in
2. Makwana HRD. “An impact of Tribal Sub Plan Scheme on Tribal community: A Sociological Study,” International Journal of Development Research, 2017:07, 07,13879-
3. Report on Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 2016-17.
4. https://en.m.wikipedia.org> wiki
5. Beck Mishra. “Socio-economic Profile and Quality of Life of Selected Oraon Tribal Living in and Around Sambalpur Town, Orissa,” Current Research Journal of Social Sciences,2010:2(6):340-349
6. https://en.m.wikipedia >wiki