IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Social Amenities In Karnataka

Dr. Kavita H.Kulkarni
Associate Professor
Department Of Sociology
Govt First Grade College Kittur, Dist Belagavi

Abstract

Recent interest in social indicators, notably in the United States since 1929 with the Hoover Committee on social trends, underscores the importance of comprehensive socio-economic measurement systems to inform public policy effectively. In Karnataka, a detailed study aims to assess social amenity levels at the district level, analyze their spatial distribution, identify regional development disparities, and propose priority areas for social amenity planning.

Introduction:

Societies constantly strive to meet their immediate needs, necessitating adaptation to local conditions for fundamental necessities. A critical initial step in any development program is establishing infrastructure in rural areas. Enhancing social amenities in rural settings can significantly improve both economic and cultural aspects of life, particularly relevant in India where approximately 80% of the population resides in rural areas. Social development, as defined in sociological literature, focuses on enhancing human relations. Regional development is typically assessed through various criteria such as health, education, transportation, communication, and power supply, reflecting the effectiveness of social systems and economic welfare.

Analyzing the spatial distribution of social amenities in Karnataka is crucial for understanding how human settlements organize and interact, influencing functional relationships among centers. Regional planning plays a pivotal role in integrating physical, economic, and social components across different levels of development, aiming to resolve conflicts arising from administrative boundaries, resource disparities, and developmental discrepancies within a country.

The study employs statistical methodologies, including composite weighted index methods, to categorize district-level social amenity data into five levels based on availability. This approach facilitates comprehensive analysis and planning to address spatial imbalances and promote balanced regional development in Karnataka.

The levels of development of social amenities

I. Very High : 6-21 and Above : Bangalore ®

II. High : 5.45 to 6-20 Chikkamagalore, Kodagu, Chamaraj Nagar, Hassan, Udapi, Kolar

III. Medium :4.69 to 5.44 Mysore, Tumakur, South Canara, North Canara, Bangalore (U), Shimoga, Mandya, Chitradurga.

IV. Low :3.93 to 4.68 Davanagere, Bijapur, Ramanagar, Gadag, Haveri.

V. very Low : 3.92 and Below Belguam, Bidar, Ballari, Chikkaballapur, Koppal, Bagalkot, Gulbarga, Dharwad, Raichur

Table No-6 COMPOSITE SCORES OF SOCIAL AMENITIES IN KARNATAKA: 2020-21

District	Educational Amenities	Medical Amenities	Drink water Amenities	Transp & Comm Amenities	Electricity Amenities	Comp score of social Amenities
Bangalore	0.65	0.16	1.23	2.01	0.96	5.01
Bangalore ®	1.30	1.16	1.17	0.75	2.31	6.69
Ramangar	1.27	1.20	1.17	0.32	0.18	4.14
Chitradurga	1.11	1.08	1.12	0.33	1.08	4.71
Davanagere	0.92	0.96	1.07	0.35	0.99	4.29
Kolar	1.26	0.80	1.13	0.43	1.86	5.48
Chikkaballapur	1.29	0.88	1.13	0.35	0.21	3.86
Shivamoga	1.18	1.08	1.12	0.60	0.98	4.96
Tumakur	1.30	1.00	1.21	0.34	1.23	5.08
Chikmaglore	1.30	1.68	1.41	0.73	1.05	6.17
S Canara	0.74	1.08	1.03	1.26	0.94	5.05
Udapi	0.82	1.40	1.08	1.25	0.98	5.53
Hassan	1.43	1.44	1.19	0.50	1.06	5.62
Kodagu	0.90	1.76	1.19	1.27	1.02	6.14
Mandya	1.06	1.16	1.19	0.26	1.05	4.72
Mysore	0.85	0.92	1.14	1.38	0.95	5.24
Chamarajnagar	0.84	2.52	1.18	0.27	1.10	5.91
Belgaum	0.82	0.68	0.99	0.44	0.97	3.90
Bijapur	1.08	0.80	1.01	0.34	1.00	4.23
Bagalkote	0.86	0.72	0.97	0.30	0.97	3.82
Dharwad	0.66	0.56	0.93	0.65	0.82	3.62
Gadag	0.79	0.96	0.98	0.43	0.89	4.05
Haveri	0.86	1.04	1.00	0.26	0.90	4.06
N Canara	1.40	0.64	1.07	0.96	0.98	5.05
Ballari	0.78	0.84	1.01	0.36	0.89	3.88
Bidar	0.98	0.84	0.92	0.30	0.86	3.90
Gulbarga	0.89	0.76	0.97	0.29	0.83	3.74
Raichur	0.87	0.64	0.81	0.25	0.87	3.52
Koppal	0.82	0.84	0.98	0.28	0.91	3.83
State	0.95	0.84	1.08	0.71	0.98	4.56

Source: Dept of Statistical and Economic Reports – 2020-21

Certainly! Here's a rewritten version:

Very High Level: Only Bangalore Rural district qualifies for this category, scoring a composite of 6.69. It ranks highest across all amenities, highlighting its exceptional development of social amenities.

High Level: This category includes Chikkaballapur (6.17), Kodagu (6.14), Chamarajnagar (5.91), Hassan (5.62), Udupi (5.53), and Kolar (5.48) districts. These districts, located in the southwestern part of the state, benefit from urban functions, political influence, and strong district economies.

Medium Level: Districts scoring between 4.69 to 5.45 fall into this category, such as Mysore (5.24), Tumakur (5.08), South Canara (5.05), North Canara (5.05), Bangalore Urban (5.01), Shimoga (4.96), Mandya (4.72), and Chitradurga (4.71). These districts are primarily situated in the southern and western regions of Karnataka.

Low Level: This category includes districts like Davanagere (4.29), Bijapur (4.23), Gadag (4.05), Haveri (4.05), and Ramanagar (4.14). These districts, located in the northern part of Karnataka, face challenges due to their drought-prone environments.

Very Low Level: Nine districts fall into this category: Bagalkot (3.90), Bidar (3.90), Bellary (3.88), Chikkaballapur (3.86), Koppal (3.83), Bagalkot (3.82), Gulbarga (3.74), Dharwad (3.62), and Raichur (3.52). These districts, located in remote and border areas, exhibit the lowest levels of social amenity development.

This analysis underscores the regional disparities within Karnataka, with higher development observed in the southern regions historically associated with the former state of Mysore, and lower development in newer regions like Hyderabad Karnataka and Mumbai Karnataka. It highlights the need for strategic planning to address these disparities and prioritize social amenity development based on district-level assessments.

CONCLUSION

This study identifies intra-regional variations in the spatial distribution of social amenities at the district level. The distribution of these amenities correlates significantly with population size. Based on existing levels of social amenities, the development status of different areas has been assessed, highlighting regions lacking certain amenities. It's important to note that this study, while theoretical, does not account for political or other interventions. Addressing deficits in social amenities is crucial for effective planning.

Key findings of the analysis include:

1. Environmental conditions like high temperatures and low rainfall in regions such as Mumbai and Hyderabad Karnataka correlate with fewer social amenities. Conversely, areas with abundant natural resources tend to have more amenities.

2. Social amenities are concentrated heavily in urban development areas and non-agricultural activities in the southern part of the state.

3. Development levels are categorized based on the availability of social amenities and population served in each district. Most districts fall into the medium development level. Bangalore Rural district (6.69) stands out with very high levels of development, while Raichur district (3.52) lags significantly in development.

4. Spatial distribution of social amenities is assessed using composite weighted index scores, considering both the number of amenities and district population.

5. The relative importance of social amenities is measured using mean and standard deviation methods, illustrating five distinct levels of development through choropleth maps.

6. This report focuses on addressing intra-regional disparities at the district level, prioritizing different categories of social amenities. It aims to establish an empirical framework for social infrastructure, laying the groundwork for informed decision-making on priority amenities at the district level.

Reference :

1. Bhat, L.S. et,al 1976, Micro Level planning – A case study of karnul Area, Haryana India, K.B. Publications, New Delhi.
2. Clout H.D.1969, Planning studies in Rural Areas–Integrated planning in the country –side, in cooke et.al, (eds), Trends in Geography, PP. 228-30.
3. V. Sundaram and V.L.S Prakasrao 1976, Regional Development planning in India. A new strategy, Vikas publishing House, Delhi PP. 4-5.
4. Singh K.N. 1966, Spatial pattern of central places in Middle Ganga Valley India, N.G.I.I PP.218-26.
5. Singh R.L. (ed) 1971, India Regional Geography, silver Jubilee publication National Geographical society of India, Varanasi.
6. Wanmali, S. 1970, Regional planning for social facilities. "An examination of central place concepts – A case study of Eastern Maharashtra," National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad.
7. Pathak, C R 1971, A Note on problems of Micro level planning for integrated Area Development, Indian Journal of Regional science Vol. II, No.2, PP. 85-90.
8. Mandal, R.B. 1981, statistics for Geographers and social scientists, concept publishing company, New Delhi.
9. Guha, B. The Rural Service Centers of Hoogly District,Geographical review of India, Culcatta, 1967, XXIX (4) PP.47-53.
10. Brahma S, "Approach to Rural Area Development" Indian Journal of Regional Science, Vol 2 No.1, 1972, PP.6-11.
11. Sharma S C and Sharma M. L. " Planning strategy for Development of social facilities – A case study of Tarabganj, District Gonda UP " The Decean Geographer, Vol, XXX Jan – June 1987, No.1.
12. Ranganath Geography of Karnataka, Mysore Book House, Pvt. Ltd First Edition, 2010 PP. 308-324.