



Quality of life in Haryana: A Case Study of Six Districts

Dr. Lalit Sharma¹

Abstract

Haryana is claimed to be economically developed, but it is still a socially backward state of India. Haryana is one of the wealthiest states of India and has the per capita income in the country at Rs. 162,034 in 2016-17. Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) of Haryana at current prices has been about Rs. 5, 47,396.06 crore in 2016-17 with rate of growth 12.8 per cent (Economic Survey of Haryana, 2016-17). But in terms of the main social indicators of development like housing conditions, level of literacy, sex ratio, position of women, infant mortality ratio, cleanliness; and availability of other facilities such as drinking water, bathroom, kitchen, latrine etc. Haryana is a backward state of India. The study is expected to throw light on the distribution of Households according to different socio-economic attributes of the households and on the relationship between different attributes if any.

Key Words: *Quality of Life, Poverty, Literacy*

Introduction

Development means improves the quality of life of people. Every state seeks to improve the quality of life of its citizens (Sharma and Chakravarty, 2015). The main quality of life indicators reflecting level of the people in a country in terms of the level of per-capita income, income distribution, expenditure pattern, housing conditions, and level of literacy, sex ratio, and position of women, cleanliness, and availability of other facilities such as drinking water facility, bathroom facility, kitchen facility, and latrine facility. The indicators of good quality of life can be quantitative as well as qualitative in nature. The quality of life invariably differ from one rural area to anthers areas. It influences by the extent of, low income, less income generation opportunity and non-availability of basic amenities such as low level of access to clean water, adequate Sanitation, health, and educational facilities persist.

Haryana is claimed to be economically developed, but it is still a socially backward state of India. Haryana is one of the wealthiest states of India and has the per capita income in the country at Rs. 162,034 in 2016-17. Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) of Haryana at current prices has been about Rs. 5, 47,396.06 crore in 2016-17 with rate of growth 12.8 per cent

¹ Assistant Professor, G. B. P.G. College, Rohtak.



(Economic Survey of Haryana, 2016-17). But in terms of the main social indicators of development like housing conditions, level of literacy, sex ratio, position of women, infant mortality ratio, cleanliness; and availability of other facilities such as drinking water, bathroom, kitchen, latrine etc. Haryana is a backward state of India.

According to Census of India, 2011 Haryana's sex ratio of the population is only 879 females per 1000 males which is the lowest in India. About 38.8 per cent households live in kuccha houses; while 30.9 per cent households do not have any toilet facilities. Only 29.6 per cent households use Liquid Petroleum Gas as fuel for the purpose of cooking while most of the remaining households (61.4 per cent) still depend on dung-cake, kerosene and coal for cooking food. Information regarding the ownership of assets shows that 8.9 per cent households do not have any assets such as radio, transistor, colour television etc. Literacy is also low in Haryana state; about 23.4 per cent of its population has not completed education up to metric and above. While the social indicators show a depressing picture of Haryana, its economic scenario shows that poverty in Haryana is relatively less than in other states. It was 40 per cent in 1970 -71, which reduced to 11.16 per cent in 2011-12 (Planning Commission, 2014). The study is expected to throw light on the distribution of Households according to different socio-economic attributes of the households and on the relationship between different attributes if any. The main objective of the study is, to analysis the quality of life of households in terms of their income and its distribution, source and nature of loans, cleanliness, caste distribution, ownership and sources of assets, type and fuel usage.

Objective of Study

The main objective of the present study aims at discussion and analysis of the living conditions of households in Haryana.

Research Methodology

For fulfillment of the objective of the study, primary data in respect of the Haryana state as available in nation level Census Survey, state Level Household Studied and District level Statics etc. were used. The study used composite standard score to select the sample size in rural Haryana. The sample size for the study consists of 300 households from six districts in Haryana.

The whole sample design consists of four stages of random sampling. The selection of the districts as the first stage in sampling includes Mahendragrh, Mewat, Jhajjar, Faridabad, Rohtak and Sonipat selected purposively to represent the study. Further, out of these six districts, one block from each district is selected and these six blocks are Narnaul, Ferozpur Jhirka Beri, Faridabad, Sampla, and Ganaur respectively. Further, twelve villages are selected out of the six blocks taking two villages from each block.

The study uses simple tools and techniques like percentage, Chi square test.

Results and Conclusion

Socio-Economic conditions reflect quality of life of the society as well as that of its members. The main socio-economic indicators reflecting the quality of life of the people are the level of, housing conditions, level of literacy and cleanliness and availability of other facilities such as drinking water, bathroom, kitchen, latrine, sewerage etc.

Table: 1 Frequency Distributions of Households by Level of Education

Districts	Level of Education			Total
	Upto X_{th}	X_{th} to Graduation	Above Graduation	
Mewat	37 (74)	08 (16)	05 (10)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	36 (72)	12 (24)	02 (4)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	25 (50)	16 (32)	09 (18)	50 (100)
Faridabad	24 (48)	13 (26)	13 (26)	50 (100)
Sonipat	19 (38)	11 (22)	20 (40)	50 (100)
Rohtak	14 (28)	09 (18)	27 (54)	50 (100)
Total	155 (52)	69 (23)	76 (25)	300 (100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Table 1 presents the data portraying the level of education of 300 households of six sample districts of Haryana by three educational standards, namely up to tenth standard, up to graduation

and above graduation. Around 52 percent of total households in these districts have studied to the level of xth standard, 23 percent up to Graduation, 25 percent above graduation. In Mewat and Mahendergarh districts a big majority of households (74 percent and 72 percent respectively) have studies only upto 10th standard followed by Jhajjar and Faridabad districts (50 percent and 48 percent respectively), Sonipat 38 percent and Rohtak 28 percent.

By educational standard of households Rohtak district is the best amongst the six sample districts with 50 percent of its households having studied upto above graduation level, followed by Sonipat 40 percent Faridabad 26 percent, Jhajjar 18 percent, Mewat 10 percent and Mahendragarh 4 percent. Households who have studied up to graduation are nearly evenly distributed with best in Jhajjar 32 percent followed by Faridabad 26 percent, Mahendragarh 24 percent, Sonipat 22 percent, Rohtak 18 percent and Mewat 16 percent respectively.

Taking the districts individually, Mewat has the largest proportion of households 74 percent who are simply matriculates, followed by graduates 16 percent and post graduates 10 percent. So Mahendragarh with 72 percent matriculation, 24 percent graduates and only 4 percent post graduates, Jhajjar and Faridabad seem to be well balanced with 50 percent matriculates and 32 percent graduates and 18 percent postgraduates and 48 percent matriculates and 26 percent each postgraduates respectively. Rohtak and Sonipat, on the other hand are better off in terms of having 54 percent postgraduates, 18 percent graduates and 28 percent matriculates and 40 percent post graduates 22 percent graduates and 38 percent matriculates respectively of their households.

Table: 2 Frequency Distributions of Households by the type of work

Districts	Government Job	Private Job	Agriculture only	Others	No Work	Total
Mewat	6 (12)	03 (06)	2 (4)	37 (74)	2 (4)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	3 (6)	07 (14)	4 (8)	32 (64)	4 (8)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	5 (10)	08 (16)	3 (6)	34 (68)	0 (0)	50 (100)
Faridabad	13 (26)	20 (40)	5 (10)	12 (24)	0 (0)	50 (100)
Sonipat	17	11	12	10	0	50

	(34)	(22)	(24)	(20)	(0)	(100)
Rohtak	19	15	9	7	0	50
	(38)	(30)	(18)	(14)	(0)	(100)
Total	63	64	35	132	6	300
	(21)	(22)	(12)	(44)	(2)	(100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Rural households earn their income by being engaged in different types of economic activities. They are dependent upon various sources of income in order to maintain their livelihood. Generally, they get involved in more than one economic activity. An analysis of the main source of their income from multiple sources of income, presented in Table 2 only 12 percent of the total households of these districts are engaged in agriculture which seems to be quite contrary to expectations as rural India is said to be primarily agrarian with nearly 70 percent of its population living in the rural belts. It does show that the process of urbanization seems to be in full throat in Haryana as nearly 43 percent of households in the sample six districts are gainfully employed in almost equally proportion in government (21 percent) and private (22 percent) jobs. Almost an equal chunk (44 percent) is engaged in other vocations in these districts where as just 2 percent have no work to do to earn their living. In other words, out of the total households, 2 percent were found to be unemployed, 44 percent were not able to find any regular source of work and they are categorized as being engaged in “other” occupation. Majority of them were agricultural labourers, small shopkeepers and daily wage earners.

After enquiring about these households from some other sources like neighbours, it came to be known that around 8 percent of these households living in joint family system are old persons who claim to have been separated from their families and they now constitute a separate family. However, the fact is that they continue to be fed and looked after by their families internally. They resort to this type of practice to be a part of and take advantage of below poverty line (BPL) provision.

Analyze the Table carefully; it becomes clear that in three districts i.e. Mewat, Mahendragarh and Jhajjar, the main occupation of households is “other” occupation. In Mewat district, around 74 percent of the households obtain their means of living by working as shopkeepers, agricultural labourer or daily wage earners. In Mahendragarh and Jhajjar district this figure was

64 percent and 68 percent respectively, which means that majority of the households are dependent upon irregular source of occupation to maintain their survival. This could be a possible reason for these three districts to have poor results on rest of the indicators of multidimensional poverty.

On the other hand, in Faridabad, Sonipat and Rohtak districts, the main source of occupation was observed to be job whether government or private. Individually as well as jointly, the main occupations in which maximum number of households is involved in these three districts are government and private jobs. The joint proportion of households involved in government or private jobs comes out to be 66 percent in Faridabad, 56 percent in Sonipat and 68 percent in Rohtak. Further, whereas in Faridabad district private job as an occupation is dominant as this district is most closely situated to national capital i.e. Delhi and there are larger avenues available for private jobs as compared to rest of the five districts; whereas, in Sonipat and Rohtak districts, the dominant occupation is a Government job (34 percent and 38 percent respectively). Another important fact is that the role of agriculture in occupational structure is largely significant in two districts Sonipat and Rohtak (24 percent and 18 percent respectively).

Table: 3 Frequency Distributions of Households by Ownership of Assets

Ownership of Assets	Mewat	Mahendragarh	Jhajjar	Faridabad	Sonipat	Rohtak	Total
Cooler / Fan	37 (74)	39 (78)	44 (88)	45 (90)	49 (98)	50 (100)	264 (88)
TV/Refrigerator/ computer/Washing machine	29 (58)	25 (50)	33 (66)	37 (74)	38 7(6)	42 (84)	204 (68)
Motor Cycle / Scooter/ Car/Jeep	17 (34)	11 (22)	23 (46)	28 (56)	33 (66)	39 (78)	151 (50)
Tractor / Combined Harvester/ Thresher	2 (4)	3 (6)	8 (16)	13 (26)	20 (40)	17 (34)	63 (21)
Cow/ Bull/ Buffaloes/ Horse/ Donkey/ Chickens/ Pig etc.	47 (94)	42 (84)	38 (76)	12 (24)	35 (70)	39 (78)	223 (75)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Information regarding ownership of assets by the households is depicted in Table 3. The assets acquired by the households are classified into three broad categories namely, (i) Durable Assets (ii) Agricultural Assets, (iii) Cattle and Livestock. The Table reveals that 264 out of 300 household (88 percent) are found to own one or more simple assets like a cooler and fan, about 68 percent of total household possess other durable assets like electronic gadgets TV, Refrigerator, Computer or Washing Machine, while nearly one-fifth 21 percent of total households own one or more agricultural assets like tractor, thresher or harvester. As a rural feature, 75 percent of the households raise cattle and livestock i.e. cow, bull, buffalo, horse, donkey, chicken, pig, etc to evince their tradition of being grounded to their soil.

Table: 4

Frequency Distributions of Households by Type of Fuel Used

Districts	Traditional Fuel	LPG	Total
Mewat	45 (90)	5 (10)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	36 (72)	14 (28)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	3 (74)	13 (26)	50 (100)
Faridabad	27 (54)	23 (46)	50 (100)
Sonipat	25 (50)	25 (50)	50 (100)
Rohtak	16 (32)	34 (68)	50 (100)
Total	186 (62)	114 (38)	50 (300)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

There was a time when cooking was done only by burning of dung cakes, firewood or coal, almost universally in rural Haryana, very like most other parts of the countryside in India and abroad. However, a lot of change, observed in the pattern of fuel consumption for cooking in the state in the last few decades seems to have taken place due to urbanization as a big factor. Table 4 presenting the data refers to these patterns of different types of fuels used for cooking. It shows that 186 (62 percent) of total households in these districts are still using the traditional fuels like dung cakes, coal, agricultural waste, firewood etc. For the purpose of cooking and allied uses whereas only 117 (38 percent) of total households use liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). Most households use a combination of both types of fuels. For example, the traditional fuels are used for boiling water and LPG for cooking food and boiling milk. District-wise traditional fuel is still found to be used extensively in Mewat, Mahendragarh, Jhajjar and Faridabad districts (90 percent, 72 percent, 74 percent and 54 percent respectively). In Sonipat district, both types of fuels were used equally. Only in Rohtak district, the majority of households (68 percent) use LPG for cooking. The remaining (32 percent) use only traditional fuel. In short, traditional fuels are found to be extensively used as there easily accessible and widely available in villages and semi-urban towns not only in Haryana but also in other parts of the country.

Table: 5

Frequency Distributions of Households by Availability of Toilet in the House

Districts	Existence of Toilet in the House		Total
	Yes	No	
Mewat	13 (26)	37 (74)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	14 (28)	36 (72)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	16 (32)	34 (68)	50 (100)
Faridabad	23 (46)	27 (54)	50 (100)
Sonipat	37 (74)	13 (26)	50(100)
Rohtak	35 (70)	15 (30)	50 (100)
Total	138 (46)	162 (54)	300 (100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Table 5 gives the data on the existence of a toilet in the house as a norm of standard of living in the sample of six districts of Haryana. Less than half (46 percent) of total households have a toilet in the house, that is to say, that the majority (54 percent) are still deprived of toilet facility in their house as a mark of modern living. It is also observed that households belonging to three districts i.e. Mewat, Mahendragarh and Jhajjar are badly facing due to deprivation of toilet facility (74 percent, 72 percent and 68 percent respectively) at their houses. In Faridabad district, too more than half (54 percent) of the households are deprived of having a toilet in their house. However, Rohtak and Sonipat districts seem to be well provided with toilet in the households (74 percent and 72 percent) respectively even though much still remains to be done. The main factors influencing the existence of a toilet in a house are income earned by the households size of plot on which house is built, location of house i.e. rural or urban, level of education, awareness about the significance of having a toilet, an electric connection in a house etc.

Table: 6

Frequency Distributions of Households by Availability of Electricity in the House

Districts	Availability of Electricity in the House		Total
	Yes	No	
Mewat	22 (44)	28 (56)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	26 (52)	24 (48)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	38 (76)	12 (24)	50 (100)
Faridabad	44 (88)	06 (12)	50 (100)
Sonipat	48 (96)	02 (04)	50 (100)
Rohtak	50 (100)	00 (00)	50 (100)
Total	228 (76)	72 (24)	300 (100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

The data regarding availability of electricity connection in the households is presented in Table 6 which shows that nearly three fourth (76 percent) households in the sample six districts of Haryana, the rest (24 percent) have remained deprived of it for one reason or the other. This deprivation is most severe in Mewat district, where 56 percent households are not having any electricity connection followed by Mahendragarh district also facing acute deprivation (48 percent) on this count. On the other hand, Faridabad and Sonipat districts to suffer deprivation of electricity connection but only in small measures, i.e. (12 percent) and 4 percent respectively. Only Rohtak district shows zero deprivation that is the entire lots of its households enjoy the benefit of electricity at the house.

Haryana government seems to be committed to provide an adequate level of electricity to all households belonging to all segments of society whether rural or urban. But it has yet a long way to go to meet the needs of its poor districts like Mewat and Mahendragarh to be equitable towards all its districts. Moreover, rapid economic growth demands more electricity for domestic as well as commercial uses. Government needs to intensity rural electrification schemes like Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Viduitkarn Yojana to meet the demands adequately throughout the state.

Table: 7

Frequency Distributions of Households by Source of Water

Districts	Ground Water	Water Supply	Other	Total
Mewat	00 (00)	19 (38)	31 (62)	50 (100)
Mahendragarh	00 (00)	21 (42)	29 (58)	50 (100)
Jhajjar	04 (08)	40 (80)	06 (12)	50 (100)
Faridabad	09 (18)	37 (74)	04 (08)	50 (100)
Sonipat	12 (24)	38 (76)	00 (00)	50 (100)
Rohtak	19 (38)	31 (62)	00 (00)	50 (100)
Total	44 (15)	186 (62)	70 (23)	300 (100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Table 7 indicates that only 15 percent of households in the six sample districts are using ground water as their main source of drinking water, whereas majorities (62 percent) of the households

have direct connection with water supplied by the government. Around 23 percent of the total households also use other sources including well ponds, other sources etc.

In Mewat and Mahendragarh districts, majority (62 percent) and 58 percent respectively of households are dependent upon other sources of water. There is no provision in these districts to utilize the ground water for domestic purpose despite the fact that govt. supply of drinking water is available only in 38 percent and 42 percent in there two respective districts. Other sample districts that are Jhajjar, Faridabad, Sonipat and Rohtak seem to be better off as they do have water supplied by the government as their major source of water (80 percent, 74 percent, 76 percent and 62 percent) households respectively.

Interestingly two districts i.e. Sonipat and Rohtak have zero dependence on other sources of drinking water supply as they supplement their drinking water needs on ground water (24 percent and 38 percent respectively).

It was also reported that the most deficient three districts i.e. Mewat, Mahendergarh and Jhajjar were found to have inconsistent water supply and to meet their need most of the households have to store their water in huge containers to be used in emergent time of unavailability of water supply. These people have to spend a considerable amount of money, labour and time in collection of water for their daily chores

Table: 8
Frequency Distribution of Households by holding size and
Level of Education

Land (Acres)	Education Level			Total
	Up to X _{th}	X _{th} to Graduation	Above Graduation	
0	100 (72)	30 (22)	7 (6)	137 (100)
1-2	36 (4)	15 (17)	34(40)	85 (100)
2-3	13 (43)	6 (20)	11 (37)	30 (100)
Above 3	6 (12)	18 (38)	24 (50)	48 (100)
Total	155 (51)	69 (24)	76 (25)	300 (100)

Source: Primary Survey

Note: Brackets Contain Percentage and percentage figures may not add exactly to hundred due to rounding off.

Table: 8.1

District- Wise Frequency Distribution of Households by holding size and Level of Education

Land (Acres)	Districts	Education Level			Total
		Upto Class	X th	X th to Above Graduation	
Not Applicable	Mewat	24	4	2	30
	Mehendragrh	15	9	0	24
	Jhajjar	19	2	1	22
	Fridabad	19	4	0	23
	Sonipat	17	6	3	26
	Rohtak	6	5	1	12
	Total	81	30	5	137
1-2	Mewat	7	1	2	10
	Mehendragrh	18	2	2	24
	Jhajjar	1	3	6	10
	Fridabad	2	7	13	22
	Sonipat	0	0	8	8
	Rohtak	8	2	3	13
	Total	36	15	34	85
2-3	Mewat	4	2	1	7
	Mehendragrh	2	1	0	3
	Jhajjar	2	1	2	5
	Fridabad	3	2	0	5
	Sonipat	2	0	3	5
	Rohtak	0	0	5	5
	Total	13	6	11	30
3- Above	Mewat	2	1	0	3
	Mehendragrh	1	0	0	1
	Jhajjar	3	10	0	13
	Fridabad	0	0	0	0
	Sonipat	0	5	6	11
	Rohtak	0	2	18	20
	Total	6	18	24	48



Table 8 shows that of the 85 households possessing 1-2 acre of land, 36 (40 percent) are postgraduate, 15 (17 percent) graduate and 36 (43 percent) are simply matriculates. Of 48 percent households possessing land holding above across of land 24 (50 percent) are postgraduates and just 6 (12 percent) are only matriculates. Similarly, of the 30 households possess 2-3 acres of land, 43 percent are matriculates, 37 percent are post graduates and only 20 percent are graduates. Interestingly, of the 137 households possessing no land at all, 72 percent are matriculates, 22 percent graduate and just 6 percent are postgraduates. The Table further shows that with increase in the size of holding the level of education also rises and vice versa. This may be true in case of households possessing above 3 acres of land holding but not exactly so in case of households possessing land holding lesser than that average. Possessing adequate land holding does help in earning more than enough and to spare to boost better education provision for the concerned household members. But does it nearly happen is a big question to be probed objectively and scientifically.

If we look at the Table carefully, the relationship between the two attributes appears to be positive or mixed. However, from the, it is evident that size of holding possessed by the respondents and their educational attainments are positively correlated. This follow from the last column which shows that with increase in the size of holding, the percentage of respondents having studied beyond graduation is increasing. The Chi-Square test, for testing the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between level of their educational and land holding size as applies in this study rejected this hypothesis at five percent level of significance, the calculated value of X^2 (76.16) being greater than the tabulated value (12.59) corresponding 6 degrees of freedom..

It is also possible to argue that ownership of land is a disincentive to the young people because of two reason one, that cultivation is labor intensive and services of young people are needed on the farm. Second those who possess land do not pursue their studies as they see their career secure in cultivation of their land. The opposite arguments on the other hand may be that possession of land would help in the pursuit of higher education as enough income from farming can finance their higher studies which argument holds well only in a particular situation.

District-wise households with above 3 acres of land holding in Rohtak and Sonipat districts are all postgraduates (90 percent and 55 percent) respectively and graduates (10 percent and 45 percent respectively) while in the remaining districts none of them are postgraduates or graduates except in Jhajjar districts which has about 78 percent graduates and 22 percent matriculates belonging to this group of households. On the other hand households with no land holding at all too have 8.5 percent postgraduates and 41.5 percent indicates in among them in Rohtak district, followed by Sonipat (11 percent and 23 percent) respectively so much so that even the most deficient district Mewat has 1 percent postgraduate and 14 percent graduates among this group with no land holding at all.

It may be thus evident that the relation between land holding and education can be used as clear cut criteria of standard of living.

Table: 9
Frequency Distribution of Households by holding size and
Level of Education

Land (Acres)	Education Level			Total
	Up to X_{th}	X_{th} to	Above Graduation	
0-5000	35	13	2	50
5000-10000	48	16	9	73
10000-15000	10	13	8	31
15000-20000	24	7	11	42
20000- Above	38	20	46	104
Total	155	69	76	

Source: Primary Survey

Table: 9.1

District-Wise Frequency Distribution of Households by Income and
Level of Education

Income (Monthly/Rs.)	Districts	Education Level			Total
		Up to X th Class	X th to Graduation	Above Graduation	
0-5000	Mewat	11	5	0	16
	Mehendragrh	7	1	0	8
	Jhajjar	9	2	0	11
	Fridabad	3	2	1	6
	Sonipat	1	3	1	5
	Rohtak	4	0	0	4
	Total	35	13	2	50
5000- 10000	Mewat	14	1	2	17
	Mehendragrh	12	2	0	14
	Jhajjar	9	5	0	14
	Fridabad	6	2	0	8
	Sonipat	0	1	6	7
	Rohtak	7	5	1	13
	Total	48	16	9	73
10000-15000	Mewat	5	1	1	7
	Mehendragrh	1	3	0	4
	Jhajjar	0	3	1	4
	Fridabad	1	2	2	5
	Sonipat	0	0	2	2
	Rohtak	3	4	2	9
	Total	10	13	8	31
15000-20000	Mewat	3	0	1	4
	Mehendragrh	9	0	0	9
	Jhajjar	0	1	2	3

	Fridabad	10	4	1	15
	Sonipat	2	2	3	7
	Rohtak	0	0	4	4
	Total	24	7	11	42
20000- Above	Mewat	4	1	1	6
	Mehendragrh	7	6	2	15
	Jhajjar	7	5	6	18
	Fridabad	4	3	9	16
	Sonipat	16	5	8	29
	Rohtak	0	0	20	20
	Total	38	20	46	104

For studying the relationship between income and level of education of households, Table 9 shows that of the 50 households with income upto Rs. 5000 per month, 70 percent have studied upto tenth class only followed by 26 percent graduation and 4 percent above graduation respectively. Among the income group between Rs. 5000 and 10000, of the 73 households in this range, a big majority of 48, (66 percent) are simply matriculates, followed by graduates (22 percent) and postgraduates (12 percent). Similarly, of the 31 households earning between Rs. 10000 and 15000 per month, nearly 31 percent are matriculates, followed by graduates (42 percent) and postgraduates (27 percent). Likewise, of the 42 households with income between Rs. 15000 and Rs 20000 per month 57 percent are just matrices, 19 percent graduates and 24 percent postgraduates. The highest income group of 104 households earning above Rs. 20000 per month further shows that their proportion on education map is matriculates (37 percent), graduates (19 percent) and postgraduates (44 percent). The overall status of the sample of 300 households shows matriculation (52 percent), graduates (23 percent) and postgraduates (25 percent). This analysis obviously does support the general impression that education and income are positively correlated in that as the income rises, the education attainment improves and with increase in education achievement income also rises in sue proportion.



The Chi-Square test, for testing the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between level of income of respondents and their educational achievement as applies in this study rejected this hypothesis at five percent level of significance, the calculated value of X^2 (48.13) being greater than the tabulated value (15.51) corresponding 8 degrees of freedom.

District-wise analysis of Table 9.1 may provide further evidence. Take for instance, Rohtak district where all the households in the Rs. 0- 5000 per month income bracket were simply matriculates; it had matriculates (58 percent) graduates (38 percent) and postgraduates (4 percent) with income bracket Rs. 5000 to 10000 per month; it had respectively matriculates (33 percent), graduates (44 percent) and postgraduates (23 percent) in the income bracket Rs. 10000 to 15000 per month; and it had all the households being postgraduates in the income bracket above Rs. 15000 and Rs. 20000 per month.

Bibliography

- Alagh, Y K (2010), "Estimation of Poverty and Identifying the Poor", Indian Journal of Human Development, Vol 4, No 1.
- Alkire, Sabina and Suman Seth (2009), "Measuring Multidimensional Poverty in India: A New Proposal," OPHI Working Paper No 15, September, Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI), Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford.
- Government of Haryana (2017), "Economic Survey of Haryana 2016-17", Department of Economic and Statistical Analysis, Publication No.1159.
- Government of India (1962), "Perspectives of Development India 1960-61 to 1975-76: Implications of Planning for a minimum level of living", Planning Commission New Delhi.
- Government of India (1979), "Report of the Task Force on Projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand", Planning Commission New Delhi.
- Government of India (1982), "Report of the Expert Group on programme for alleviation of Poverty", Planning Commission, New Delhi.
- Government of India (1984), "The concept and estimation of Poverty Line", Planning Commission, New Delhi.



- Government of India (1993), “Report of the Expert Group on Estimation of Proportion and number of Poor”, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi.
- Government of India (1997), “Press release on Estimate of Poverty”, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi.
- Government of India (2011), “Census of India 2011: Household Tables”, Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, India.
- Government of India (2011), “Press release on Estimate of Poverty”, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi.
- Government of India (2014), “Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Measurement of Poverty”, Planning Commission New Delhi.
- Government of India, (1981), “A Technical Note on the Sixth Plan of India (1980-1985)”, Planning Commission New Delhi.
- Nayyar, Gaurav and Nayyar Rohini (2016), “India’s Poverty of Numbers Revisiting Measurement Issues”, Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. LI No. 35.
- Patnaik, Utsa (2013), “Poverty Trends in India 2004–05 to 2009–10: Updating Poverty Estimates and Comparing Official Figures,” Economic & Political Weekly, Vol 48, No 40.
- Sharma, Lalit and Chakravarty, Kavita (2015) “Multidimensional Poverty in Haryana”, Indian Journal of Human Development, Vol. 9, No. 1.