

## A Study on Status of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rural Society

Dr. Lokesh Kumar

Department of Geography  
Government College, Pipalrawan  
Dist. Dewas (M.P.), India  
lokeshsagar.k2010@gmail.com

Dr. Priyam Singh

Department of Botany  
Government College, Pipalrawan  
Dist. Dewas (M.P.), India  
drpriyamsingh13@gmail.com

---

**Abstract:** - The present study is an empirical investigation of "A Study on Status of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rural Society". Various studies have been highlighted concerning this issue. How far the opportunities are being extended to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people for their personal growth and development to establish their identity, self-sufficiency, dignity, education for their children, and enjoy equality, freedom, and rights.

**Key Words:** - Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Social Status, Economic Status, Social Groups

---

Date of Submission: 26-06-2022

Date of Acceptance: 08-07-2022

---

### I. INTRODUCTION: -

Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are those castes named in the order of the Government of India, promulgated in August 1950. Hence, a person is considered a member of a scheduled caste and a Scheduled Tribe if they belong to a caste which, under the Constitution, has been declared to be a Scheduled Caste or Tribe for the area for which they are a resident. The Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes population is the most backward section in the Hindu Caste ridden of India: we all know that these sections are famous in our society as the "Disadvantages Section", which is socially, economically and politically backward. Those who belong to the last Varna, namely the Sudra and avarna, include many caste groups which have suffered socially and financially inequity since the age. These castes were systematically listed in the 1931 census of India. These untouchable Castes in India were officially defined as depressed caste in 1932. The expression Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes was first coined by the Simon commission and embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935. Under Article 341 (1) of the Constitution of India; the President of India, after consultation with the Governor Article 341 (1), may specify "the castes, races, tribes, or part of groups within castes or races tribes which shall be deemed to be Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for the Constitution. Article 330, 332, 335, 338, 342, and the entire fifth and sixth schedule of the Constitution deal with special provisions for implementing the objectives set for Article 46. The state shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker section of the people, particularly Scheduled Castes, and shall protect them from social injustice and exploitation.

The complex stratification system in India has given rise to a diversity of social categories, which further obscure the relative status of women and men within the more disadvantaged segments of the population. Considering the diversity and heterogeneity within the complex stratification system, it is essential to understand the variations and inter-regional differences among castes, tribes, and strata, which serve as interlocking systems of domination in the society (Hooks, 1989, p.22).

The Hindu majority population (besides some non-Hindu groups), nearly 82 per cent of the country's people, is characterised by a rigid, hierarchical caste system. (Das, 1982; Mukhopadhyay, 1984). The bulk of the scheduled caste population lives in rural areas. It is employed as agricultural labourers or marginal farmers. Only about 11 per cent of the scheduled caste members are in urban areas, residing most often in slums and performing marginal labour. (Das, 1982; Galanter, 1984), have the lowest ritual standing and economic position in society and suffer from severe social and civic disabilities. Though most of them have given up the

'stigmatised occupation', they may still not enjoy a status equal to the higher castes. While caste is determined based on birth, it, in turn, determines the distribution of scarce goods and resources such as Income, health, and education (Chanana, 2004). Besides the population encompassed within the caste system, India has a large number of aboriginal tribes constituting over 7 per cent of the total population (Dube, 1977; Chattopadhyay, 1978; Debi, 1978), mainly in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and in the North-eastern hill states; ranging from hunter-gatherers 'outside the caste society' to settled agricultural groups that are in the process of assimilation into the caste society (Ghurye, 1980; Sinha, 1983). These tribal groups comprise the other major disadvantaged section of the Indian society besides the 'Scheduled Castes'. They are characterised by geographical isolation from mainstream society and low economic status (Mandelbaum, 1970). Further, the regions with high populations of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the country are known to have low literacy rates (Chanana, 2004).

Article 341 of the Indian Constitution designates certain disadvantaged tribal and caste populations as 'Scheduled Castes' and 'Scheduled Tribes' (Gallanter, 1984). The scheduled groups are thereby granted special safeguards and concessions that include reservations in the legislature proportionate to strength in the population and educational grants and scholarships (Gallanter, 1984; Mandelbaum, 1970; Mies, 1986), though the constitutional guarantee of protection for these scheduled caste groups has not substantially improved their position in the Hindu society (Gallanter, 1984), while resentment against the special provisions for the scheduled groups has become apparent in the larger population over the past few decades (Souza, 1982; Kumar, 1988).

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE RELATED TO STUDY:** -Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes around the world have received much research attention with different lines of research emphasising various factors. It is vital in any study to collect up-to-date information about what has been thought and done in that area. The present study is taken up to bridge this gap; an attempt has been made to synthesise the findings of the earlier studies on the evaluation of socio-economic conditions, educational conditions and various government programmes for the improvement of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

**George Rosen (1966)** The Scheduled Castes are generally in the lowest economic position compared to any other caste group. **Suma Chitnis (1972)**, various programmes for improving the status of the Scheduled Castes have concentrated heavily on their education. More specifically, education has been viewed as the instrument through which members of the Scheduled Castes can be equipped for a social structure in which status is determined, not by ascription but by individual achievement and worth. **Puran Singh (1989)** concluded that the Scheduled Caste students feel that the facilities provided by the governments to them are also needed and satisfactory, but they are not administered properly. **Wankhede (2001)** analysed that despite a century-old struggle for social and political reform and independence, literacy levels remain discouragingly low among substantial sections of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. **Biradar and Jayasheela (2007)** found an unequal distribution of education among social groups has an adverse impact on society, such as unequal access to better job options, meagre earnings, the incidence of poverty, health hazards, thereby resulting in powerlessness, etc.

Other studies have tried to evaluate the challenges and attainments of Scheduled Castes in India. (S. Lakshmi 1989), (Rao, Reddy and Naryana 2004), (Salim 1997), (Sinha & Joshi 2011), (Gupta and Dmele 2013), etc. All these studies stated that Scheduled Castes' educational, occupational, social and economic conditions are still backward in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century due to their illiteracy, low Income, landlessness, poverty, discrimination, unemployment, etc. Despite affirmative action, the status of Scheduled Castes has not improved to the desired level.

**THE PROBLEM:** -The main Socio-Economic problems affecting the bulks of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes population are landlessness; lack of education; forced labour; lack of employment; low wages, and the Problem of child labour. In the above circumstances, the present study mainly concentrates on knowing the status of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rural Society in the research area. It also brings out the factual position of the Problem and contributes to the generation of new knowledge for making headway towards its solution.

**THE OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:** - To Study on Status of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rural Society.

**DESIGN OF STUDY:** - The success of research depends upon selecting appropriate methods and tools for the study. Today it is accepted that identification and the solution to all social problems lie in the extensive and proper use of social research methods. These methods help in providing a theoretical framework to narrow down the fact to be studied. There are different types of research design, i.e., descriptive, exploratory, and explanatory. The present study is based on a descriptive research design.

**AREA OF STUDY:** - Sonkatch of Dewas district of Madhya Pradesh has been selected as the Area of Study.

**UNIVERSE OF THE STUDY:** - The total population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of the study area is considered the universe of the study.

**UNIT OF ANALYSIS:** - The individual (male and female) members of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes families constituted the unit of analysis.

**SAMPLING:** - Drawing a representative sample from the universe is an essential process for any kind of research. The part of the universe representing it and containing all the valuable characteristics and properties in the same proportion is called a sample of that universe. A total of 54 respondents were selected from Nagar Parishad, namely Pipalrawan, purposively in the study.

**SOURCES OF DATA COLLECTION:** - Primary as well as secondary data, is collected, used, and analysed for drawing inferences.

**PRIMARY DATA:** - Primary data is collected directly from the study area through direct interviews with respondents and also enacted field observation and group discussion with respondents. Besides, a structured interview schedule, group discussion, and observation have been used for primary data collection.

**SECONDARY DATA:** - The secondary data is collected from the concerned agencies, documented literature, research reports, statistical documents, newspaper, magazines, books, journals, and internet etc.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION:** - The collected data is scrutinised and coded to facilitate computerisation. Parameters were created for all the variables; accordingly, code is given to each variable to represent its characteristics. The data is then fed to a computer using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), which is designed to analyse data for research work in social sciences. The collected data is processed, tabulated, and analysed. Keeping the objective in view, a list of the cross and simple tables are prepared for analysis.

**Table 1**  
**Social Status of the Respondents (n=54)**

S. N.	Characteristics	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Gender	Male	50	92.6
		Female	4	7.4
2	Age Group	20 to 30 Years	10	18.5
		30 to 40 Years	18	33.3
		40 to 50 Years	10	18.5
		50 to 60 Years	12	22.2
		More than 60 Years	4	7.4
3	Social Groups	Scheduled Castes	43	79.6
		Scheduled Tribes	11	20.4
4	Literacy Status	Illiterate	20	37.0
		Literate	34	63.0
5	Education	Illiterate	20	37.0
		Primary	10	18.5
		Secondary	8	14.8
		Middle	5	9.3
		Higher Secondary	7	13.0
		12 + Tech Education	1	1.9
		PG + Technical Education	1	1.9
		UG + Tech Education	2	3.7

The data presented in the above table shows that among all the respondents, the majority, 92.6 per cent are male, and 7.4 per cent are female respondents. It is evident from the above table that the majority of 33.3 per cent of the respondents were from the age group of 30 to 40 Years, followed by 22.2 per cent in the age group of 50 to 60 Years. 18.5 per cent of the respondents were in the age group of 20 to 30 Years and also in the 40 to 50 years of age group. The remaining 7.4 per cent of the respondents were found above 60 years of age. It is clear from the table that 79.6 per cent were from Scheduled Castes, and 20.4 were from Schedule Tribes. The literacy status of the respondents under the study highlights that 63 per cent of the respondents were literate, followed by 37 per cent of the illiterate respondents. It is inferred from the study that the majority, 37 per cent, of the respondents, were illiterate; they were still using thumb impressions instead of signing their name, followed by 18.5 per cent of respondents who completed their primary schooling. There is 14.8 per cent of respondents who completed their secondary education, and 9.3 per cent of respondents completed their middle schooling. 13 per cent of the respondents passed higher secondary, and 1.9 per cent of the respondents were 12<sup>th</sup> + Tech Education. 3.7 and 1.9 per cent of the respondents were found to have their education up to graduation and post-graduation with technical education.

**H<sub>0</sub>**, there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Social Status.

To test the hypothesis "there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Social Status", ANOVA was done using the F test. The two categories of Social Groups considered in the present Study were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. The mean scores of the respondents of different social groups were found along with the standard deviation. Based on this, the F value was computed. The results are summarised in the table: -

**Table 1.1**  
**Social Status of the Social Groups (n=54)**

Social Status	Social Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Gender	Scheduled Caste	43	1.09	.294	1.086	.302
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.00	.000		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>.264</b>		
Age Group	Scheduled Caste	43	2.63	1.235	.207	.651
	Scheduled Tribes	11	2.82	1.250		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>1.229</b>		
Literacy Status	Scheduled Caste	43	1.37	.489	.003	.960
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.36	.505		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>.487</b>		
Education	Scheduled Caste	43	1.93	2.685	.035	.852
	Scheduled Tribes	11	2.09	1.814		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>2.518</b>		

Since P-value is more significant than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent of the level of significance with regards to gender (.302), age group (.651), Literacy Status (.960), and education (.852). Hence, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Social Status.

**Table 2**  
**Economic Status of the Respondents (n=54)**

S. N.	Characteristics	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Earning Sources	No Source	37	68.5
		Cattle	6	11.1
		Land	8	14.8
		Cattle + Land	3	5.6
2	Occupation	Agriculture	2	3.7
		Labour	38	70.4
		Govt Job	4	7.4
		Pvt Job	3	5.6
		Unemployed	1	1.9
		Agriculture + Business	1	1.9
		Ad hock Govt	5	9.3
3	Annual Income (Rs)	Less than Rs 20000	3	5.5
		Rs 20000to 40000	34	63.0
		Rs 40000to 60000	9	16.7
		More than Rs 60000	8	14.8

It is reflected in the study that 14.8 per cent of the respondents found land as earning source and 11.1 per cent of the respondents found cattle as earning source of the respondents. 5.6 per cent of the respondents were found to have Cattle + Land as earning sources in the study area, while 68.5 per cent of the respondents do not have any basis for their earnings.

It is evident from the table that the majority, 70.4 per cent of the respondents, are engaged in agriculture or construction labour, followed by skilled workers involved in private jobs, and agriculture constitutes 9.3 per cent, whereas 7.4 per cent of the respondents are doing government Job. 9.3 per cent of the respondents are doing the job on an ad-hoc basis in the study area, and 1.9 per cent of respondents are doing business and agriculture. The remaining 1.9 per cent of the respondents are unemployed and dependent on working members of their families.

In contemporary socio-economic structure, Income is one of the most important bases of social differentiation and distribution of power and privilege in society. The data presented in the table reveals that 63 per cent of respondents had Income between Rs 20,000-40,000 annually, followed by 16.7 per cent of respondents who earned their annual Income between Rs 40,000-60,000. A 5.5 per cent of respondents have their annual less than Rs 20,000, while 14.8 per cent of respondents earned more than Rs 60,000 annually in the study area.

**H<sub>0</sub>**, there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Economic Status.

To test the hypothesis "there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Economic Status", ANOVA was done using the F test. The two categories of Social Groups considered in the present Study were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. The mean scores of the respondents of different social groups were found along with the standard deviation. Based on this, the F value was computed. The results are summarised in the table: -

**Table 2.1**  
**Economic Status of the Respondents (n=54)**

Economic Status	Social Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Earning Sources	Scheduled Caste	43	.56	.934	.059	.809
	Scheduled Tribes	11	.64	1.027		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>.944</b>		
Occupation	Scheduled Caste	43	4.09	2.534	.672	.416
	Scheduled Tribes	11	3.45	.820		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>2.298</b>		
Annual Income (Rs)	Scheduled Caste	43	2.60	1.137	.396	.532
	Scheduled Tribes	11	2.36	1.120		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>1.127</b>		

Since P-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent of the level of significance with regards to earning sources (.809), Occupation (.416), and education (.532), and hence it is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their economic status.

**Table 3**  
**Agricultural Assets for Livelihood of the Respondents (n=54)**

S. N.	Characteristics	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Assets	Tractor	1	1.9
		Tube Well	2	3.7
		Assets	51	94.4
2	Agriculture Land	Landless	41	75.9
		>5 Bigah	8	14.8
		5-10 Bigah	4	7.4
		10-15Bigah	1	1.9
3	Type of Agriculture Land	Landless	41	75.9
		Fertile	1	1.9
		Infertile	12	22.2
4	Irrigation	Landless	41	75.9
		Irrigated	5	9.3
		Semi Irrigated	8	14.8

The data presented in the table showed facts about Assets for livelihood in the study area. It is pointed out that 1.9 per cent of the respondents were found to have tractors as Assets for livelihood, and 3.7 per cent of respondents were found to have Tube Well as Assets for livelihood. On the other hand, 94.4 per cent of respondents do not have any assets for their livelihood because either they depend on the assets or cannot afford such kinds of assets.

It is reflected in the study that 14.8 per cent of respondents have less than 5 Bigah agricultural land, while 7.4 per cent of respondents reported having agricultural land in a range of 5-10 Bigah. 1.9 per cent of the respondents were found to have 10 to 15Bigah agricultural land, and 75.9 per cent were landless in the study area.

Quality of land is crucial; it is evident that 1.9 per cent of respondents have fertile land, and 22.2 per cent of respondents have infertile land in the study area. The majority, 75.9 per cent, of the respondents were landless in the study area.

The data shown in the above table reflect facts about the status of irrigation facilities on the agricultural land of the study area. It is reflected from the data that 9.3 per cent of the respondents were found to have irrigation facilities on their agricultural land, and 14.8 per cent of the respondents were found to have semi-irrigation facilities on their agricultural land. The majority, 75.9 per cent, of the respondents were landless in the study area.

**H<sub>0</sub>**, there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their agricultural assets for livelihood.

To test the hypothesis that "there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their agricultural assets for livelihood", ANOVA was done using the F test. The two categories of Social Groups considered in the present Study were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. The mean scores of the respondents of different social groups were found along with the standard deviation. Based on this, the F value was computed. The results are summarised in the table: -

**Table 3.1**  
**Agricultural Assets for Livelihood of the Respondents (n=54)**

Agricultural Assets	Social Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Assets	Scheduled Caste	43	5.74	.978	.742	.393
	Scheduled Tribes	11	6.00	.000		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>5.80</b>	<b>.877</b>		
Agriculture Land	Scheduled Caste	43	1.35	.752	.004	.951
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.36	.505		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>.705</b>		
Type of Agriculture Land	Scheduled Caste	43	.95	1.704	.157	.693
	Scheduled Tribes	11	.73	1.618		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>.91</b>	<b>1.674</b>		
Irrigation	Scheduled Caste	43	.58	1.118	.354	.554
	Scheduled Tribes	11	.36	.924		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>1.077</b>		

Since P-value is more significant than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent of the level of significance with regards to Assets(.393), Agriculture Land (.951), Type of Agriculture Land (.693),and Irrigation(.554) and hence it is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their agricultural assets for livelihood.

**Table 4**  
**Production, Storage,and Availability of Market for Crops(n=54)**

S. N.	Characteristics	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Crop Production	Landless	41	75.9
		One Crop	2	3.7
		Two Crop	11	20.4
2	Crop Storage Facility	Landless	41	75.9
		Yes	3	5.6
		No Facility	10	18.5
3	Crop Storage Type	Landless	41	75.9
		Private	1	1.9
		Own	2	3.7
		No Storage	10	18.5
4	Availability of Market	Landless	41	75.9
		Yes	13	24.1

The data shown in the above table reflects facts about Crop Production, Storage, and Availability of the Market of the study area. It is reflected from the data that 3.7 per cent of respondents produced a single crop on their agricultural land, while 20.4 per cent of the respondents produced mixed crops on their agricultural land. The majority, 75.9 per cent, of the respondents were landless in the study area.

It was asked if the respondents had a crop storage facility in the study area. It was found that 5.6 per cent of respondents have crop storage facilities for their crop production, while 18.5 per cent of the respondents do not have crop storage facilities for their crop production. The majority of 75.9 per cent of the respondents were landless in the study area.

It is found that there is 3.7 per cent of the respondents have their own Storage facilities for their Crop production, while 1.9 per cent of the respondents have private storage facilities for their Crop production. However, 18.5 per cent of them do not have storage facilities for their Crop production, and the majority of 75.9 per cent of the respondents were landless in the study area.

It is revealed from the data given in the above table that 24.1 per cent of the respondents told about the availability of a market for their crop production. In contrast, the majority, 75.9 per cent of the respondents, were landless in the study area.

**H<sub>0</sub>**, there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their production, storage, and availability of market for crops.

To test the hypothesis "there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their production, storage, and availability of market for crops", ANOVA was done using the F test. The two categories of Social Groups considered in the present Study were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. The mean scores of the respondents of different social groups were found along with the standard deviation. Based on this, the F value was computed. The results are summarised in the table: -

**Table 4.1**  
**Production, Storage, and Availability of Market for Crops (n=54)**

Crops Facilities	Social Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Crop Production	Scheduled Caste	43	1.47	.827	.133	.717
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.36	.809		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>.816</b>		
Crop Storage Facility	Scheduled Caste	43	1.44	.796	.084	.773
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.36	.809		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>.792</b>		
Crop Storage Type	Scheduled Caste	43	1.60	1.198	.274	.603
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.82	1.250		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>1.200</b>		
Availability of Market	Scheduled Caste	43	1.77	.427	.075	.786
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.73	.467		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.76</b>	<b>.432</b>		

Since P-value is more significant than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent of the level of significance with regards to crop production(.717), crop storage facility (.773), and crop storage Type (.603) and availability of market (.786). Hence, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their production, storage, and availability of market for crops.

**Table 5**  
**Cultures and Rituals Followed by the Respondents (n=54)**

S. N.	Characteristics	Profile	Frequency	Percentage
1	Traditional Knowledge	Art & Craft Knowledge	3	5.5
		Food Knowledge	11	20.4
		No Knowledge	40	70.1
2	Ethnomedicinal Knowledge	Yes	7	13.0
		No	47	87.0
3	Cultures And Rituals Followed	Yes	52	96.3
		No	2	3.7

Traditional Knowledge and Utilisation of the respondents reflect that 5.5 per cent of respondents were found to have Art & Craft Knowledge, while 20.4 per cent of the respondents were found to have food knowledge. 70.1 per cent of the respondents do not have traditional knowledge and their utilisation.

The data about Ethnomedicinal Importance Knowledge of the respondents reflect the fact that 13 per cent of respondents have Ethnomedicinal Importance Knowledge, and 87 per cent do not have Ethnomedicinal Importance Knowledge in the study area.

The data about Cultures and Rituals Followed by the respondents reveals that 96.3 per cent of respondents followed their Cultures and Rituals, and 3.7 per cent of respondents do not follow their Cultures and Rituals.

$H_0$ , there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning cultures and rituals followed by the respondents.

To test the hypothesis "there is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their cultures and rituals followed by the respondents", ANOVA was done using the F test. The two categories of Social Groups considered in the present Study were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes. The mean scores of the respondents of different social groups were found along with the standard deviation. Based on this, the F value was computed. The results are summarised in the table: -

**Table 5.1**  
**Cultures and Rituals Followed by the Respondents (n=54)**

Cultures and Rituals	Social Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Traditional Knowledge	Scheduled Caste	43	2.72	.504	.807	.373
	Scheduled Tribes	11	2.55	.820		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>.577</b>		
Ethnomedicinal Knowledge	Scheduled Caste	43	1.88	.324	.323	.572
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.82	.405		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>.339</b>		
Cultures And Rituals Followed	Scheduled Caste	43	1.05	.213	.517	.475
	Scheduled Tribes	11	1.00	.000		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>.191</b>		

Since P-value is more significant than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent of the level of significance with regards to traditional knowledge(.373), ethnomedicinal knowledge (.872), and cultures and

rituals followed(.532), and hence it is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their cultures and traditions followed by the respondents.

## **II. Conclusions and Suggestions: -**

The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in India present a picture of considerable complexity and magnitude, basically the result of economic exploitation, educational inequalities, deprivation, and structural and organised inequalities over the centuries. After the independence, several protective and promotional measures were adopted through the Constitution and other legal measures and through successive Five-Year Plans to ensure Social Justice on the one hand and socio-economic and educational development of The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes at par with other sections of the society but The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes still far from their rights. The above data analysis gives the following conclusions: -

1. There is no significant difference between Social Groups concerning their Social Status.
2. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their economic status.
3. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their agricultural assets for livelihood.
4. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their production, storage, and availability of the market for crops.
5. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between social groups concerning their cultures and rituals followed by the respondents.

## **References**

- [1]. Aggarwal, Yash. (2000). An Assessment of Trends in Access and Retention. New Delhi: National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, November.
- [2]. Bose, A., D. Gupta & Raychaudhuri, G. (1977). Population Statistics in India New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- [3]. Chattopadhyay, K.C. (1978). Tribalism in India. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- [4]. Damle, Manjri, and Gupta, Kamlesh (2013), "Impact of Globalisation, Privatisation, and Liberalisation on Higher Education", (ed.) D. K. Verma, Ambedkar Journal of Social Development and Justice, Vol. XX.
- [5]. Das, B. (1982). Untouchability, Scheduled Castes, and nation-building, Social Action 32: 269-282.
- [6]. Debi, B. (1978). Tribal women: A study of modern conditions and future prospects. In: Ray et al. (eds.), Role and Status of Women in India. Calcutta: Firma KLM.
- [7]. Dreze, Jean and Sen, Amartya (1996) India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity: Oxford University Press.
- [8]. Dube, S.C. (1977) 'Tribal Heritage of India' New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- [9]. Dubey, S.M. (1975), 'Social mobility among professions', Bombay, Popular Prakashan Private Limited.
- [10]. Gallanter, M. (1984). 'Competing Inequalities: Law and the Backward Classes in India'. California: University of California Press.
- [11]. George Rosen (1966), "Democracy and Economic Change in India", University of California Press, California.
- [12]. Ghurye, G.S. (1980). The Scheduled Tribes of India, New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- [13]. Haq, Mahbubul & Haq, Khadija (1998) Human Development in South Asia 1998 Dhaka: Oxford University Press.
- [14]. Jain, D. (1984). India: A condition across caste and class. In: Morgan (ed.), Sisterhood is Global, New York: Anchor Books, 305-309.
- [15]. Karlekar, M. (1982). Some perspectives on the employment of scheduled caste women Social Action 32: 292-302.
- [16]. Kureel, R. S., Verma, D. K. and Bansal P.C. (2014), "Discrimination to Development", Dr. Ambedkar National Institute of Social Sciences, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar (MHOW), Indore.
- [17]. Mandelbaum, D. (1970). Society in India, Vols. 1 & 2. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [18]. Purn Singh (1989), 'Problem of Education among Scheduled Castes', Mittal Publications, New Delhi.
- [19]. Ramachandran, V. (2001) Reaching the Hardest to Reach. Reflections on DPEP. In: Ramachandran, V., Shukla, S., Cohen, P., Alexander, R. and Mercer, M., Reflections on Equity, Quality and Local Planning in the District Primary Education Programme. Occasional Paper. New Delhi: European Commission.
- [20]. Singh, Darshan. (2009). "Development of Scheduled Castes in India – A Review" Journal of Rural Development 28(4), 529-542.
- [21]. Sinha, B. (1983) Society in Tribal India. Washington, DC: World Priorities.
- [22]. Thorat Sukhadeo, Senapati Chittaranjan (2007), "Reservation in Employment, Education and Legislature – Status and Emerging Issues", Working Paper Series, IIDS, Vol. 2, No, 05.
- [23]. Thorat, S. and Lee, J. (2005). Caste Discrimination and Food Security Programmes. Economic and Political Weekly, 24-30 September, 40(39), 4198-4201.
- [24]. Tripathi, R.C. (2011), "Educational, Development and Happiness in Indian Village", Journal of Social and Economic Studies, Vol. XXI, No. 1, 2011, P.P. 55-74.
- [25]. Visaria, P. & L. Visaria (1981) India's Populations: Second and Growing. Washington DC: Population Reference Bureau.
- [26]. Wazir, Rekha. (2000). The Gender Gap in Basic Education. NGOs as Change Agents. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Dr. Lokesh Kumar, et. al. "A Study on Status of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Rural Society." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, vol. 11(07), 2022, pp 29-36. Journal DOI- 10.35629/7722