VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

Demographic Profile of the Families of School Going Girls Residing in Jaipur City

Abstract

This study was carried out to determine the demographic profile of the girls residing in slums of Jaipur city. An interview schedule was used to acquire information about profile of the families of school going girls. The mean family size was 5.1 ± 1.04 members per family. Most of the families (74.1%) had nuclear family structure. A majority of the adults (15.1% fathers and 45.2% mothers) were illiterate. Almost all the children were sent to school. Most of the fathers (31.6%) worked as construction workers and 22.1% of the mothers worked as maids. Majority of the families were earning between Rs 5,000 to Rs 10,000 per month.

Keywords: Slum Dwellers, Demographic Profile, School Going Girls, Jaipur.

Introduction

Slum dwellers belong to the most deprived section of the society.Due to lack of resources, poor education level and low financial conditions they are facing several challenges in their life.The purpose of this study was to understand and analyse the demographic profile of thefamilies of school going girls residing in slums of Jaipur city.

Review of Literature

Slums are an important part of the urbanized sector. According to Census (2011), 3, 83,134 households in Rajasthan have been identified as slums. The word slum is often used to describe informal settlements within cities that have inadequate housing and miserable living conditions (Tran et al., 2013). They are often overcrowded, with many people crammed into very small living spaces. Slums are generally the only type of settlements affordable and accessible to the migrants from rural to urban areas. The educational status of these slum dwellers is quite poor (NolanLB, 2015). A few studies which have been conducted in the slums of Indiahad revealed that most of the slum dwellers were illiterate, therefore, they either worked as construction labourers or as rickshaw pullers, tailors, washermen or worked in small factories, etc. (Pillai MN and JayagovindRL, 2017; Yasmin M, 2012; Goyle A, 2009; Sufaria C, 2007). Hence, slums represent the most compromised part of our community.

Aim of The Study

The present study was conducted to collectinformationregarding family structure, educational status, occupation and income of the families of school going girls residing in 2 slums of Jaipur city.

Materials and Methods Selection of Subjects

The school going girls (n=260) of 10-17 years studying in IInd to XIIth class of 2 private schools in Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur were considered as subjects of the study. These subjects were residing in two slums that is, Jawahar Nagar slum or Guru TegBahadur Nagar of JhalanaDoongrislum.

Data collection: An interview schedule was prepared to obtain information regarding the family structure, family composition, occupation and income of the families of the girls. A number of visits were made to thehome of the subjects slums for collection of data.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Profile of The Families of The Subjects

Most of the families (74.1%) had a nuclear family structure, and 25.9% of the families had extended and joint family structure (Table 1). The nuclear family structure was more prevalent because when male children got married and had children of their own, their parents would ask them to separate out and support their families on their own. In extended / joint

Aditi Bhargava

Research Scholar, Deptt. of Home Science, University of Rajasthan Jaipur, Rajasthan

Anuradha Goyle

Professor, Deptt.of Home Science, University of Rajasthan Jaipur, Rajasthan

RNI No.UPBIL/2016/67980

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

families, grandparents of the children or their uncle's families stayed with the nuclear families.

In order to determine the size of the families, the data of only nuclear families of the subjects was used. The mean size of nuclear families was 5.1±1.04, comprising of 1.9±0.29 adults and 3.2±1.01 children. The ratio of adult males and females was similar; however, the female children were 1.5 times more than the male children. This situation was observed not because these families preferred to have female children but because in want of a male child, they kept on producing female children. In the case of extended / joint families, the mean family size was higher being 7.2±1.84, the ratio of adult females was higher than that of adult males, because of grandmothers living with them due to longer lifespan. Here, too, the number of female children was higher than male children.

Most of the families were Hindus (91.5%) and the rest were mainly Sikhs (8.1%) (Table 3) The mother, as respondent, was queried on the caste of the family and the same was noted down. With the help of sixth economic census 2012- 13 given by the Economic and Statistics Directorate, Rajasthan, the families were classified into scheduled caste (SC), scheduled tribe (ST) and other backward caste (OBC) categories. The SC category included castes as Valmiki, Khatik, Kholi, Navak, Dhobhi, Jatav, Jatava and Chamariya; ST Categories included castes as Meena, Dhanka, Damariya and Vaswa and OBC categories castes as Teli, Mali, Rawat, Nai, Saini, Kumhar and Jogi. About 17% of the families were in the general category while the rest belonged to SC (32.3%), ST (18.9%) andOBC (31.9%) categories (Table 2).

| Table 1: Family Profile of The Subjects | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| Type of Families | Total families | | | |
| | (n=228) | | | |
| Nuclear ^a | 169 (74.1) | | | |
| Extended/Joint ^b | 59 (25.9) | | | |
| Mean family size of | 5.1±1.04 | | | |
| nuclear ^c families (n=228) | | | | |
| Adults | 1.9±0.29 | | | |
| Male | 0.9±0.24 | | | |
| Female | 1.0±0.18 | | | |
| Children | 3.2±1.01 | | | |
| Male children ^d | 1.2±0.69 | | | |
| Female children ^d | 2.0±1.01 | | | |
| Number of adults and | Total | | | |
| children in the nuclear | members | | | |
| family (n=228) | (n=1172) | | | |
| Adult male ^a | 212 (18.1) | | | |
| Adult female ^a | 221 (18.9) | | | |
| Male children ^e | 279 (23.8) | | | |
| Female children ^e | 460 (39.2) | | | |
| Mean family size of | 7.3±1.84 | | | |
| extended/ joint families (n= | | | | |
| 59) | | | | |
| Adults | 3.8±1.05 | | | |
| Male | 1.8±0.74 | | | |
| Female | 2.0±0.55 | | | |
| | | | | |

VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

| 3.5±1.34 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1.6±0.8 | | | |
| 1.9±0.86 | | | |
| Total | | | |
| members | | | |
| (n=428) | | | |
| 105 (24.5) | | | |
| 118 (27.6) | | | |
| 92 (21.5) | | | |
| 113 (26.4) | | | |
| Female children ^e 113 (26.4)Figures in parentheses denote percentages. | | | |
| | | | |

Mean ± SD.

^a Nuclear families included husband, wife and their children (Ahuja, 1999).

^b Extended/joint families included husband, wife, their parents, unmarried children, married sons' families, unmarried brother, married brother's families sharing the same kitchen (Ahuja, 1999).

^c Nuclear families of all the subjects included here.

^d 12 fathers and 7 mothers were not alive and 4 fathers were separated.

^e All male and female children even above 18 years were included.

| Table 2: | Distribution | of | Subjects' | Families | Into |
|-----------|---------------|------|------------|----------|------|
| Different | Categories of | i Re | ligion And | Caste | |

| erent categories of Kengion And Caste | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Religion | Subjects (n=260) | |
| Hindu | 238 (91.5) | |
| Sikh | 21 (8.1) | |
| Muslim | 1 (0.4) | |
| Caste category | | |
| General | 44 (16.9) | |
| SC | 84 (32.3) | |
| ST | 49 (18.9) | |
| OBC | 83 (31.9) | |
| | • • • | |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages. Agewise Distribution of Family Members of The Subjects

A majority of the fathers and mothers of the subjects (57.5% and 57.0%) were in the age category of 31-40 years, while a higher percentage of fathers were in the older age group of 41-60 years (33.5% vs 20.8%) as compared to mothers and a higher percentage of mothers as compared to fathers (22.2% vs 8.9%) were in the lower age group of 20-30 years (Table 3). Most of the male and female children were in the age group 10-20 years (56.6% and 79.6%), this was because the subjects of the present study were in the age group of 10^+ -17⁺ years. The percentage of male children was higher in both the younger and older age groups as compared to female children as a large number of female children were in the 10-20 years of age group.

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

| Table 3: Ag | gewise Dis | stribution of | f Family I | Members |
|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| of The Sub | jects | | | |

| | Total families (n=228) |
|--|---|
| Age of the fathers ^a | Fathers ^a (n=212) |
| (years) | |
| 20-30 | 19 (8.9) |
| 31-40 | 122 (57.5) |
| 41-50 | 64 (30.2) |
| 51-60 | 7 (3.3) |
| Age of the | Mothers ^a (n=221) |
| mothers ^a (years) | |
| 20-30 | 49 (22.2) |
| 31-40 | 126 (57.0) |
| 41-50 | 46 (20.8) |
| | |
| Age of the male | Male children (n= 279) |
| Age of the male children (years) | Male children (n= 279) |
| - | Male children (n= 279) 5 (1.8) |
| children (years) | |
| children (years) 0-2 | 5 (1.8) |
| children (years) 0-2 3-9 | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) |
| children (years) 0-2 3-9 10-20 21-30 Age of the female | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) 158 (56.6) |
| children (years) 0-2 3-9 10-20 21-30 | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) 158 (56.6) 29 (10.4) |
| children (years) 0-2 3-9 10-20 21-30 Age of the female | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) 158 (56.6) 29 (10.4) Female children (n= |
| children (years)0-23-910-2021-30Age of the femalechildren (years) | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) 158 (56.6) 29 (10.4) Female children (n= 460) |
| children (years)0-23-910-2021-30Age of the femalechildren (years)0-2 | 5 (1.8) 87 (31.2) 158 (56.6) 29 (10.4) Female children (n= 460) 6 (1.3) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages. ^a 12 fathers and 7 mothers not alive and 4 fathers were separated.

Marital status of the parents of the subjects: It was found that 205 fathers and mothers were staying together in their families. Seven men and 12 women had lost their spouses. Four women were separated and were living with their families (Table 4). The cause of death in most of the men was alcoholism or road accidents and in most of the women, it was child birth.

Table 4: Marital Status of The Parents of the Subjects

| Marital status | Father (n=212) | Mother (n=221) |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Married | 205 (96.7) | 205 (92.8) |
| Widow | - | 12 (5.4) |
| Widower | 7 (3.3) | - |
| Separated | - | 4(1.8) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

Educational Status of The Family Members of The Subjects

The educational status of the fathers of the subjects was better as compared to their mothers. The percentage of mothers who were illiterate was about 3 times than that of the fathers (45.2% vs 15.1%). This clearly depicted that female education is still not given a lot of importance. A higher percentage of fathers had received some form of education as compared to mothers (73.1% vs 39.8%) (Table 5).

Amongst the male children, 17 children who were in the younger age group of 0- 5 years were not studying and only a very small percentage of the adult male children (2.5%) were illiterate. About 78% of the male children were studying. However, 12.9% of male children had dropped out of school at different stages of education (Table 6). In the case of female children, 21 of them were not studying because they were in the younger age group of 0- 4 years. Six adult female children were found to be illiterate. About 94% of the female children were studying and 3 girls had dropped out from school.

It was heartening to note that the parents were aware that if their children were educated they would be able to find better jobs, therefore, even in slums the parents with small incomes were sending their children to school. However, there was still a high dropout rate of about 13% in male children. This was because male children are put to work at an early age to supplement the family's income. On the other hand girls after passing 12th standard worked as maids or in the parlours.

| Table 5: Educational | Status of | The Parents | of The |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|
| Subjects | | | |

| oubjects | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total families (n=228) | | | |
| Educational status of the fathers | Fathers (n=212) | | | |
| Illiterate | 32 (15.1) | | | |
| Can read and write | 25 (11.8) | | | |
| Class I st to V th | 49 (23.1) | | | |
| Class VI th to VIII th | 45 (21.2) | | | |
| Class IX th to XII th | 58 (27.4) | | | |
| Graduate | 3 (1.4) | | | |
| Educational status of the mothers | Mothers (n=221) | | | |
| Illiterate | 100 (45.2) | | | |
| Can read and write | 33 (14.9) | | | |
| Class I st to V th | 66 (29.9) | | | |
| Class VI th to VIII th | 16 (7.2) | | | |
| Class IX th to XII th | 6 (2.7) | | | |
| Figures in parentheses denote percentages. | | | | |

Table 6: Educational Status of The Male and Female Children of The Families

| Educational status of the Male Children | Male Children (n=279) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | 0-2 years (n=5) | | | | 21-30 years (n=29) | Total (n=279) |
| | | | 10-17 years (n=125) | 18-20 years (n=33) | | |
| Not studying | 5(100.0) | 12 (13.8) | | | | 17 (6.1) |
| Illiterate | | | | 3 (9.1) | 4 (13.8) | 7 (2.5) |
| Nursery classes | | 4 (4.6) | | | | 4 (1.4) |
| Class I st to V th | | 71 (81.6) | 55 (44.0) | | | 126 (45.2) |

RNI No.UPBIL/2016/67980

VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

| | | | - | | 6.9 | <i>J L i v j L i v w</i> | |
|--|-----------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------|--------------------------|------------|
| Class VI th to VIII th | | | 37 (29.6 | 6) | | | 37 (13.2) |
| Class IX th to XII th | | | 31 (24.8 | | 27.3) | | 40 (14.3) |
| Studying in college | | | x | | 27.3) | 3 (10.3) | |
| Dropouts total | | | | | | | 36 (12.9) |
| Dropouts: Class I st to V th | | | 2 (1.6 | 6) | | | 2 (0.7) |
| Dropouts: Class VI th to VIII th | | | | 5() | 15.2) | 7 (24.1) | 12 (4.3) |
| Dropouts: Class X th pass | | | | 3 | (9.1) | 5 (17.2) | 8 (2.9) |
| Dropouts: Class XII th pass | | | | 4 (* | 12.1) | 10 (34.5) | 14 (5.0) |
| Educational status of the female | | | Female c | hildren (n= | 460) | · · · · | |
| children | | | | , | , | | |
| | 0-2 years | 3-9 years | 10-20 | years | 2 | 1-30 years | Total |
| | (n=6) | (n=81) | (n=3 | 66) | | (n=7) | (n=460) |
| | | | 10-17 | 18-20 | | | |
| | | | years | years | | | |
| | | | (n=338) | (n=28) | | | |
| Not studying | 6(100.0) | 15 (18.5) | | | | | 21 (4.6) |
| Illiterate | | | | 6 (21.4) | | | 6 (1.3) |
| Nursery classes | | 34 (42) | | | | | 34 (7.4) |
| Class I st to V th | | 32 (39.5) | 170 (50.3) | | | | 202 (43.9) |
| Class VI th to VIII th | | | 115 (34.0) | 10 (35.7) | | | 125 (27.1) |
| Class IX th to XII th | | | 53 (15.7) | 4 (14.3) | | | 57 (12.4) |
| | | | | | | | |
| Studying in college | | | | 8 (28.5) | | 2 (28.6) | 10 (2.2) |
| Post Graduate | | | | | | 2 (28.6) | 2 (0.4) |
| Dropouts: Class XII th pass | | aranthasas d | | | | 3(42.8) | 3 (0.7) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

Occupational Status of the Fathers and Mothers of The Subjects

It is apparent from Table 7, that about 31.6% of the fathers were construction labourers, 19.8% were drivers, 7.5% each were painters or plumbers and 6.1% were welders. The rest of the fathers worked as peons, electricians, cooks, washermen, carpenter, RO service men, etc. As the educational status of the father was not good, they were engaged in jobs where less education was required. Seven fathers were unemployed and did not contribute anything to the family's income. About 50% of the mothers were housewives (43.4%) and the rest were engaged in some income generating activities. The mothers worked as maids (22.1%), peons (8.5%), cooks (7.2%), construction labourers (4.9%), and tailors (2.7%) (Table 8). Here again, the occupational status of the mothers can be related to their educational status. Most of the women were illiterate or less educated, therefore, were engaged in low paying jobs.

 Table 7: Occupational Status of the Fathers of The Subjects

| Occupation | Fathers (n =212) |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Construction labourer | 67 (31.6) |
| Driver (car, auto, bus, truck) | 42 (19.8) |
| Painter | 16 (7.5) |
| Plumber | 16 (7.5) |
| Welder | 14 (6.6) |
| Peon | 8 (3.8) |
| Electrician | 7 (3.3) |
| Cook | 5 (2.4) |
| Washermen | 4 ((1.9) |
| Car washer | 3 (1.4) |
| Salesman | 3 (1.4) |
| Car painter | 2 (0.9) |

| nete per contagoor | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| RO serviceman | 2 (0.9) |
| Shopkeeper grocery | 2 (0.9) |
| Tailor | 2 (0.9) |
| Butcher | 1(0.4) |
| Car mechanics | 1 (0.5) |
| Carpenter | 1 (0.5) |
| Cloth shop | 1 (0.5) |
| Glass factory | 1 (0.5) |
| Rickshaw puller | 1 (0.5) |
| Sweeper | 1 (0.5) |
| Tea shop | 1 (0.5) |
| Waiter | 1 (0.5) |
| Hospital ward boy | 1 (0.5) |
| Watchman | 1 (0.5) |
| Works in printing press | 1 (0.5) |
| Unemployed | 7 (3.3) |
| | |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages. Occupational Status of the Male and Female Children

About 15% of the male children were engaged in an income generating activity. Two young boys of about 15-16 years were working at a cloth shop or were polishing naginas. Adult male children mainly worked as drivers (3.5%), construction labourers (3.2%), salesmen (1.4%), and the others were engaged as electricians, household helper, barber, painter, peon, carpenter, waiter, teacher etc. (Table 9). It was observed that these male children due to low financial condition of the families started working at an early age to support their families

A very small percentage of girls worked to add on to the family's income. Thirteen girls worked as maids and 3 girls worked in the parlours (Table 10). The girls who worked in the parlours, did so after passing 12th standard as they wanted to learn a

RNI No.UPBIL/2016/67980

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

technical course which could help them to start their own business later.

| Table | 8: | Occupational | Status | of | The | Mothers | of |
|-------|-----|--------------|--------|----|-----|---------|----|
| The S | ubi | ects | | | | | |

| Occupation | Mothers (n= 221) |
|----------------------|------------------|
| Maid | 49 (22.1) |
| Peon | 19 (8.5) |
| Cook | 16 (7.2) |
| Labourer | 11 (4.9) |
| Tailor | 6 (2.7) |
| Puts border on saris | 6 (2.7) |
| Washer woman | 4 (1.8) |
| Gardener | 3 (1.3) |
| Boutique helper | 2 (0.9) |
| Anganwadi worker | 1 (0.5) |

VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

| Factory worker | 1 (0.5) |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Handkerchief maker | 1 (0.5) |
| Irons clothes | 1 (0.5) |
| Shopkeeper | 1 (0.5) |
| Sweeper | 1 (0.5) |
| Tea shop | 1 (0.5) |
| Vegetable seller | 1 (0.5) |
| Hospital wards lady | 1 (0.5) |
| Housewife | 96 (43.4) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

| | Table 9: Occupational Status of The Male Children of The Families |
|----------|---|
| O | |

| Occupation Male children | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | 0-2 years (n=5) | 3-9 years (n=87) | 10-20 years (n=158) | | 21-30 years (n=29) | Total (n=279) |
| | | | 10-17 years (n=125) | 18-20 years (n=33) | | |
| Driver (car, auto, bus, truck) | | | | 3 (9.1) | 7 (24.1) | 10 (3.6) |
| Labourer | | | | 2 (6.1) | 7 (24.1) | 9 (3.2) |
| Salesman | | | | | 4 (13.8) | 4 (1.4) |
| Electrician | | | | | 3 (10.3) | 3 (1.1) |
| Works at cloth shop | | | 1 (0.8) | 2 (6.1) | | 3 (1.1) |
| Servant | | | | 1 ((3.0) | 1 (3.4) | 2 (0.7) |
| Barber | | | | | 2 (6.9) | 2 (0.7) |
| Tea shop | | | | 2 (6.1) | | 2 (0.7) |
| Painter | | | | 1 (3.0) | | 1(0.35) |
| Peon (school, office) | | | | 1 (3.0) | | 1 (0.35) |
| Carpenter | | | | 1 (3.0) | | 1 (0.35) |
| Waiter | | | | 1 (3.0) | | 1 (0.35) |
| Hospital ward boy | | | | | 1 (3.4) | 1 (0.35) |
| Mechanic | | | | 1 (3.0) | | 1 (0.35) |
| Nagina worker | | | 1 (0.8) | | | 1 (0.35) |
| Teacher | | | | | 1(3.4) | 1 (0.35) |
| Not studying | 5 (100.0) | 12(13.8) | - | - | - | 17 (6.1) |
| Studying | 0 (0.0) | 75 (86.2) | 123 (98.4) | 18 (54.6) | 3 (10.3) | 219 |
| | . , | . , | . , | , , , | . , | (78.5) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

Table 10: Occupational status of the female children of the families

| Occupation | Female childre | n | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| | 0-2 years | 3-9 years | 10-20 years (n=366) | | 21-30 years | Total |
| | (n=6) | (n=81) | | | (n=7) | (n=460) |
| | | | 10-17 years | 18-20 years | | |
| | | | (n=338) | (n=28) | | |
| Studying + maid | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 7 (2.1) | 0 (0.0) | 7 (1.5) | 7 (1.5) |
| Maid | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 6 (21.4) | 6 (1.3) | 6 (1.3) |
| Parlour | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (0.7) | 3 (0.7) |
| Not studying | 6 (100) | 15 (18.5) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 21 (4.6) | 21 (4.6) |
| Studying | 0 (0.0) | 66 (81.5) | 331 (97.9) | 22 (78.6) | 423 (91.9) | 423 |
| | | | | | | (91.9) |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

Income Data of The Families of The Subjects Table 11 presents income data of families of the subjects. The mean total monthly income of all the nuclear families (n=228) was Rs 9163±5225.19. The mean total monthly income of the extended / joint

families was higher than that of the nuclear families (Rs 13276±9853.10 vs 8902±442.17). This could be because of higher number of earning members in the extended / joint families. However, the ratio of earning members to total family members was quite the same

VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

ranging between 0.32 to 0.34. There were two families who had a monthly income in the range of Rs 1000-2000. In one family, the father had passed away and the girl was staying with her mother. The mother and the daughter did small jobs and did not earn Table 11: Income Data of The Families of The Subjects

much. In the other family, girl was alone with her grandmother, here too, the earnings were meagre. A majority of the families earned Rs 5,000 to Rs 10,000 per month. A few families also earned more than Rs 10,000 per month.

| | Nuclear families ^a (n=228) | Nuclear families | Extended/joint families |
|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|
| | families (n=226) | (n=169) | (n= 59) |
| Total monthly income (Rs) | | | |
| 1000 to 2000 | 2 (0.9) | 2(1.2) | - |
| 2000 to 5000 | 33 (14.5) | 26(15.4) | 4 (12.5) |
| 5000 to 10000 | 140 (61.4) | 112(66.3) | 28 (50.0) |
| 10000-20,000 | 46 (20.2) | 27(15.9) | 19(25.0) |
| >20,000 | 7 (3.1) | 2(1.2) | 8(12.5) |
| Mean total monthly | 9163±5225.19 | 8902±4472.17 | 13276±9853.10 |
| income(Rs) ^b | | | |
| Mean number of total family members | 5.1±1.04 | 5.3±1.01 | 7.3±1.84 |
| Range of total monthly income (Rs) | 1,000-39,000 | 1,000-39,000 | 3,000-50,000 |
| Per capita monthly income (Rs) | 1796.7 | 1679 | 1818.6 |
| Earning members/ family | 1.7±0.66 | 1.7±0.59 | 2.5±1.02 |
| Ratio of earning members to total family members | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.34 |
| Income from other sources (house rent) | • | • | • |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Mean house rent (R | s) | |
| Families (n=25) | | • | 1260±488.19 |

Figures in parentheses denote percentages.

Mean ± SD.

Total is calculated from data of all nuclear families (nuclear families + nuclear families extracted from extended and joint families).

Total monthly income inclusive of other sources which included only house rent.

In the families, where the income was higher, it was because the mother of the family was also contributing to the family's income. The total income of the family was calculated from the jobs, the father and the mother were engaged in and from other sources which included only house rent. Twenty five families rented their accommodation usually on the first floor to augment their incomes. In 25 families, the house rent contributed to the total family income which was Rs1260±488.19 (Table 11).On the whole, the earnings of the families was just enough to fulfill their basic needs. The income of the families was not very substantial because the heads of the families were mainly engaged in low paying jobs which were of a temporary nature and not providing work for all 30 days in a month.

Goyle A (2009) had observed that majority of the families of school going girls (n=; age=) residing in slums of Jaipur city had nuclear family structure. Majority of the girl's fathers were working as construction labourers and rest worked as tailors, vegetable vendors, drivers, hair dressers, mechanics etc. About 54.7% of the mother's were contributing to family's income.Sufaira C (2013) from Kannur had reported that majority (68.4%) of the slum dwellers were involved in daily wage works like construction labourers, coolies, painters, fishers, where not much education was required as only 45% were literate with primary or secondary education. Similar results were observed in Gwalior slums by Kumar N and AggarwalSC (2008) where 41% of the slum dwellers had any form of education. Here also, 74% of the

slum population was engaged in casual or daily wage earning, mainly, that of labourers and their monthly income was Rs 5538. The picture of the present study is quite similar to the studies mentioned above. Nuclear family structure was found in most of the families. Majority of the fathers had primary or secondary education and were engaged in daily wage earning occupations like construction laborers, drivers, painters, peons, etc.

Conclusions

Therefore, it can be concluded that majority of the families had a nuclear family structure with the mean family size of 5.1 ±1.04 members. Most of the families (91.5%) were predominantly Hindu and mainly belonged to SC (32.3%) and OBC (31.9%) caste categories. It was noticed that, 73.1% of the fathers and 39.8% of the mothers had some form of education. However, in children, educational status was better, as only 2.5% of boys and 1.3% of girls were illiterate. The reflection of less educational status of the families was depicted in their occupational status. Most of the families were engaged in daily wage jobs such as construction laborers, drivers, painters, etc. Hence, the mean total monthly income of all the nuclear families was Rs 9163±5225.19 and majority were earning between Rs 5,000- Rs 10,000 per month.

References

- 1. Ahuja R. (1999) Indian Social System. Rawat Publication, New Delhi, pp: 25 -38.
- Census. (2011). Census of India. Retrieved from http://www.censusindia.gov.in/

RNI No.UPBIL/2016/67980

E: ISSN NO.: 2455-0817

- Goyle A. (2009) A Profile of Families of Girls Studying in a Government School in Jaipur City. J SocSci, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp: 95-101.
- Kumar N. and Aggarwal S. C. (2008) Level of Poverty and Employment Pattern in Slums: A Case of Gwalior in Central India. The Ind J Labour Eco, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp: 324:338.
- Nolan L.B. (2015) Slum Definitions in Urban India: Implications for the Measurement of Health Inequalities. PopulDev Rev, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp: 59– 84.
- Pillai M.N. and Jaya govind R.L. (2017) Socio Economic Status of the Slum dwellers in Trivandrum. International Journal of Informative & Futuristic Research, Vol. 4, No. 11, pp: 8165-8178.

VOL-3* ISSUE-6* September- 2018 Remarking An Analisation

- 7. Sixth Economic Census. (2012-2013) Economic and Statistics Directorate, Rajasthan, pp: 80-81.
- Sufaira C. (2013) Socio Economic Conditions of Urban Slum Dwellers in Kannur Municipality. Journal Of Humanities And Social Science, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp: 12-24.
- Tran K.V., AzharG.S., Nair R., Knowlton K., Jaiswal A., Sheffield P., Mavalankar D., Hess J (2013) A Cross-Sectional, Randomized Cluster Sample Survey of Household Vulnerability to Extreme Heat among Slum Dwellers in Ahmedabad, India. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, Vol.10, pp 15-18.
- Yasmin M. (2017) Occupational Mobility among Slum Dwellers: A Case Study of Delhi. Developing Country Studies, Vol. 2, No.11.