

Working Paper 418

**Caste Discrimination
Practices in
Rural Karnataka**

**I Maruthi
Pesala Peter**

ISBN 978-81-7791-274-6

© 2018, Copyright Reserved

The Institute for Social and Economic Change,
Bangalore

Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC) is engaged in interdisciplinary research in analytical and applied areas of the social sciences, encompassing diverse aspects of development. ISEC works with central, state and local governments as well as international agencies by undertaking systematic studies of resource potential, identifying factors influencing growth and examining measures for reducing poverty. The thrust areas of research include state and local economic policies, issues relating to sociological and demographic transition, environmental issues and fiscal, administrative and political decentralization and governance. It pursues fruitful contacts with other institutions and scholars devoted to social science research through collaborative research programmes, seminars, etc.

The Working Paper Series provides an opportunity for ISEC faculty, visiting fellows and PhD scholars to discuss their ideas and research work before publication and to get feedback from their peer group. Papers selected for publication in the series present empirical analyses and generally deal with wider issues of public policy at a sectoral, regional or national level. These working papers undergo review but typically do not present final research results, and constitute works in progress.

Working Paper Series Editor: **Marchang Reimeingam**

CASTE DISCRIMINATION PRACTICES IN RURAL KARNATAKA

I Maruthi* and Pesala Peter†

Abstract

India is one of the fastest developing countries in the world. But Dalits face social discrimination in Indian society. The degree of caste discrimination varies from place to place and person to person, but exists across India. This study examines the caste discrimination in Karnataka. To study this situation, the authors chose the sample respondents by using a multistage random sampling technique. In the first stage, the entire state was divided into three main regions. In the second, regions with the highest SC population in two districts, based on the 2011 census, were chosen. In the third, two villages with the highest SC population were selected in each district. And finally, in each village 150 sample households were selected. The total sample size is 1,800. The main objective of the paper is to investigate caste discrimination against Dalit households in Karnataka. Our empirical results reveal that caste bias prevails in the villages, and some households even stated that there are separate plates and cups for SCs in working places. The study observed that caste practices are strong in all the study villages. It suggests that moral and ethical values are required at the individual, group and community levels to avert social discrimination in rural Karnataka.

Keywords: Caste discrimination, rural Karnataka

Introduction

India, a developing country, has vast human resources, minerals, mines, and cultivable land. It is multi linguistic, has different religions and is culturally rich. But Indian society practises the caste system. For generations, a few high castes have been enjoying social benefits and have been dominating socially and economically. Dalits‡ have been facing social discrimination from the dominate castes in different places and situations in India. After nearly 71 years of Independence, Dalits are still facing deep caste discrimination and this is being observed in working/non-working and public/private places. The SC/ST Atrocities Act is useful to some extent but visible and invisible caste discrimination is still being practised in rural and urban areas, in varying degrees, from place to place. In rural areas, only a few of the General/Other Castes (OCs) and Backward Castes (BCs) allow Dalit people into their houses. **This is really very shameful and unfortunate. Indians are staying abroad fighting for their equal rights there, but they forget to give equal rights to their own countrymen in their villages/urban areas.** Besides this, in villages, whoever has more land, is economically sound and enjoys high caste status gets recognition. Even though uncountable Dalits have land, are economically better off and educationally qualified, they still face caste discrimination in many places.

* Dr. I. Maruthi is Associate Professor & Head, ADRTC, ISEC, Nagarabhavi, Bengaluru.

† Dr. Pesala Peter is Consultant in ADRT Centre, ISEC, Nagarabhavi, Bengaluru; for corresponding email: drpesalapeter@gmail.com

Acknowledgement: It is part of a completed research project entitled "Assessment of Socio Economic Capabilities of Dalit Households in Karnataka". We thank ICSSR, New Delhi for sponsoring this project.

The authors thank two anonymous referees for their valuable comments on an earlier version of the paper. However, usual disclaimers apply.

‡ Scheduled Caste (SCs)

Methodology of the Study

Secondary data was used to access background information regarding the Dalit community in Karnataka. The sample respondents were selected by using the multistage random sampling technique and the entire sampling procedure is presented in **Table 1**. In the first stage, the entire state was divided into three main regions, namely North, Central, and South Karnataka. In the second stage, based on the 2011 census, the study area was narrowed to the highest SC population in each region in two districts. The selected districts were Belagavi and Kalaburagi in North Karnataka; Chitradurga and Davanagere in Central Karnataka; and Mysuru and Tumakuru in South Karnataka. In the third stage, two villages with the highest SC population were selected in each district. The selected villages are: Harugeri and Mugalkhod in Belagavi district; Srinivas Saradgi and Ravor in Kalaburagi; Naikanahatti and Adivala in Chitradurga; Towdur and Uchangidurga in Davanagere; Sosale and Muguru in Mysuru; Madalur and Kodigenahalli in Tumakuru (**Table 1**). And in the final stage, in each village 150 sample households were selected. The total sample size was 1,800 (Maruthi I and Pesala Busenna (2015a), Maruthi I and Pesala Busenna (2015b), Maruthi I and Pesala Busenna (2016), Maruthi I and Pesala Peter (2016), Maruthi I and Peter Pesala (2017), Maruthi I and Pesala Busenna (2017) and Maruthi I and Peter Pesala (2018)). The main objective of the paper is to investigate the caste discrimination against Dalit households in Karnataka.

Table 1: Population Details of the Selected Villages (in Numbers)

Regions	Districts	Name of the Village	Population	SC Population	Share of SC population in the total population	Share of village In the District's population
North Karnataka	Belagavi	Harugeri	28754	5846	20.3	1.30
		Mugalkhod	25835	5579	21.6	1.24
	Kalaburagi	Srinivas Saradgi	7523	4374	58.1	0.89
		Ravor	12117	3794	31.3	0.77
Central Karnataka	Chitradurga	Naikanahatti	15545	2759	17.7	0.83
		Adivala	7550	2692	35.7	0.81
	Davanagere	Towdur	6113	3387	55.4	1.07
		Uchangidurga	9781	2823	28.9	0.89
South Karnataka	Mysuru	Sosale	7260	5084	70.0	1.34
		Muguru	8393	2995	35.7	0.79
	Tumakuru	Madalur	6518	1951	29.9	0.45
		Kodigenahalli	7075	1764	24.9	0.41

Source: Karnataka Census, 2011.

Caste Discrimination/Bias in the Village

Our primary data results reveal that 34 per cent of the Dalit households reported that caste discrimination continued strong in their villages and this was especially high in Madalur village followed by Kodigenahalli, Nayakanahatti, Uchangidurga and Towdur (**Table 2**). In the same way, the caste

discrimination was very high in Tumakuru district as compared to other districts, followed by Davanagere, Chitradurga and Belagavi. The caste bias varies from village to village and district to district depending on the socio-economic conditions of the Dalits. Wherever education and economic status have improved, visible discrimination is also less, but invisible discrimination appears in different forms; wherever education and economic status are low, both visible and invisible discrimination remain very high. In Tumakuru district, caste discrimination was high due to poverty and illiteracy. The majority of OCs, BCs and STs were biased against Dalits in their respective villages. The STs have relatively better access to agricultural land; however, their productivity is rather low. Evidence shows that SCs also faced discrimination in employment in selected agricultural operations and some non-farm activities and jobs, as a result of which their unemployment rate was higher than their wage labour counterparts from the higher castes.

Table 2: Particulars of Caste Bias in Sample Villages

Village/ District	Is there any caste bias in your village?			Which caste people are biased?				
	Yes	No	Total	OC	BC	ST	OCs and BCs	Total
Harugeri	30 (20.0)	120 (80.0)	150	30 (100)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	30
Mugalkhod	53 (35.33)	97 (64.67)	150	53 (100)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	53
Belagavi	83 (27.67)	217 (72.33)	300	83 (100)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	83
Ravoor	30 (20.00)	120 (80.00)	150	29 (100)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	29
Srinivasa Saradgi	23 (15.33)	127 (84.67)	150	20 (90.91)	1 (4.55)	1 (4.55)	0 (0.00)	22
Kalaburagi	53 (17.67)	247 (82.33)	300	49 (96.08)	1 (1.96)	1 (1.96)	0 (0.00)	51
Adivala	26 (17.33)	124 (82.67)	150	17 (65.38)	0 (0.00)	1 (3.85)	8 (30.77)	26
Nayakanahatti	64 (42.6)	86 (57.33)	150	41 (64.06)	20 (31.25)	2 (3.13)	1 (1.56)	64
Chitradurga	90 (30.0)	210 (70.0)	300	58 (64.44)	20 (22.22)	3 (3.33)	9 (10.0)	90
Uchangidurga	60 (40.00)	90 (60.00)	150	50 (84.75)	0 (0.00)	9 (15.25)	0 (0.0)	59
Towdor	54 (36.00)	96 (64.00)	150	46 (85.19)	0 (0.00)	8 (14.81)	0 (0.00)	54
Davanagere	114 (38.)	186 (62.0)	300	96 (84.96)	0 (0.0)	17 (15.0)	0 (0.00)	113
Muguru	29 (19.33)	121 (80.67)	150	25 (92.59)	0 (0.00)	2 (7.41)	0 (0.00)	27
Sosale	37 (24.67)	113 (75.33)	150	24 (68.57)	11 (31.43)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	35
Mysuru	66 (22.0)	234 (78.0)	300	49 (79.03)	11 (17.74)	2 (3.23)	0 (0.00)	62
Kodigenahalli	77 (51.33)	73 (48.67)	150	42 (56.0)	0 (0.00)	31 (41.4)	2 (2.67)	75
Madalur	132 (88.0)	18 (12.00)	150	78 (59.54)	39 (29.77)	1 (0.76)	13 (9.92)	131
Tumakuru	209 (69.6)	91 (30.33)	300	120 (58.3)	39 (18.93)	32 (15.5)	15 (7.28)	206
Total	615 (34.17)	1185 (65.83)	1800	455 (75.21)	71 (11.74)	55 (9.09)	24 (3.97)	605

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Gender Bias in the Family and Village

Apart from caste discrimination, there is gender bias also in rural and urban areas. Usually people give more priority to men than women. According to our primary study results, the treatment of the two sexes differed. It was same (1,276 villages), good (327), not bad (169), male respected more (23), and no respect for women 5 (Table 3). At the family level, gender treatment was equal (1,737 villages), followed by good (42) and bad (21). A woman is discriminated against by family members in her own household. It means that many changes have to occur in the family itself.

Table 3: Particulars of Gender in Sample Villages

Village/ District	What is the attitude towards gender in the village?						What is the opinion towards gender among the family members?			
	All are same/ equal	Good	Not bad	Male respected than female	No respect for woman	Total	All are equal	Good	Not bad	Total
Harugeri	143 (95.33)	7 (4.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Mugalkhoda	123 (82.00)	23 (15.33)	1 (0.67)	0 (0.00)	3 (2.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Belagavi	266 (88.67)	30 (10.00)	1 (0.33)	0 (0.00)	3 (1.00)	300	300 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300
Ravoor	97 (64.67)	34 (22.67)	0 (0.00)	19 (12.67)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Srinivasa Saradagi	80 (53.33)	21 (14.00)	43 (28.67)	4 (2.67)	2 (1.33)	150	143 (95.33)	0 (0.00)	7 (4.67)	150
Kalaburagi	177 (59.00)	55 (18.33)	43 (14.33)	23 (7.67)	2 (0.67)	300	293 (97.67)	0 (0.00)	7 (2.33)	300
Adivala	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Nayakanahatti	100 (66.67)	37 (24.67)	13 (8.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	101 (67.33)	37 (24.67)	12 (8.00)	150
Chitradurga	250 (83.33)	37 (12.33)	13 (4.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300	251 (83.67)	37 (12.33)	12 (4.00)	300
Uchangidurga	141 (94.00)	9 (6.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Towdor	142 (94.67)	8 (5.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Davanagere	283 (94.33)	17 (5.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300	300 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300
Muguru	0 (0.00)	94 (62.67)	56 (37.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Sosale	0 (0.00)	94 (62.67)	56 (37.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	143 (95.33)	5 (3.33)	2 (1.33)	150
Mysuru	0 (0.00)	188 (62.67)	112 (37.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300	293 (97.67)	5 (1.67)	2 (0.67)	300
Kodigenahalli	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Madalur	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Tumakuru	300 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300	300 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	300
Total	1276 (70.89)	327 (18.17)	169 (9.39)	23 (1.28)	5 (0.28)	1800	1737 (96.50)	42 (2.33)	21 (1.17)	1800

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in the Work Places

According to our primary study, in work places, there was caste and gender bias in the selected villages. Forty households reported that there was caste bias in working places. Some of the women were afraid to tell the reality about day-to-day social discrimination in their working places. Our study results reveal that there were separate plates and glasses for SCs in working places (**Table 4**). Most (1751) of the households reported that water was provided at working places, but separately fetched by SCs. Nearly half of the households (853) said there were separate glasses in working places, and this was high in Muguru village followed by Madalur and Kodigenahalli villages. Similarly, caste discrimination was very high in Tumakuru district as compared to other districts, followed by Mysuru, Chitradurga and Belagavi district. Details are given in **Table 4**. Acharya Meena and Puspa Ghimir (2005) identified that in south Asian countries, the majority of women, poor and so-called lower caste people were excluded from participation in many socio-economic and political decision-making processes due to discrimination from the men.

Table 4: Particulars of Caste and Gender Sensitivity in Selected Villages

Village/ District	Do non-SC/STs provide water in work place?			Is there gender and caste bias at work place?			Is there any separate glass system at work place?		
	Yes	No	Total	No*	Yes**	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	142 (94.67)	8 (5.33)	150	0 (0.00)	1 (100.0)	1	51 (35.92)	91 (64.08)	142
Mugalkhod	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150	63 (87.50)	9 (12.50)	72	81 (54.36)	68 (45.64)	149
Belagavi	291 (97.00)	9 (3.00)	300	63 (86.30)	10 (13.70)	73	132 (45.36)	159 (54.64)	291
Ravoor	140 (93.33)	10 (6.67)	150	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	50 (35.71)	90 (64.29)	140
Srinivasa Saradgi	135 (90.00)	15 (10.00)	150	144 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	144	47 (34.81)	88 (65.19)	135
Kalaburagi	275 (91.67)	25 (8.33)	300	294 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	294	97 (35.27)	178 (64.73)	275
Adivala	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150	18 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	18	64 (42.95)	85 (57.05)	149
Nayakanahatti	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150	73 (80.22)	18 (19.78)	91	77 (51.33)	73 (48.67)	150
Chitradurga	299 (99.67)	1 (0.33)	300	91 (83.49)	18 (16.51)	109	141 (47.16)	158 (52.84)	299
Uchangidurga	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150	0 (0.00)	2 (100.00)	2	78 (52.00)	72 (48.00)	150
Towdor	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150	1 (9.09)	10 (90.91)	11	61 (40.67)	89 (59.33)	150
Davanagere	300 (100)	0 (0.00)	300	1 (7.69)	12 (92.31)	13	139 (46.33)	161 (53.67)	300
Muguru	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	95 (63.33)	55 (36.67)	150
Sosale	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150	148 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	148	74 (49.66)	75 (50.34)	149
Mysuru	299 (99.67)	1 (0.33)	300	298 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	298	169 (56.52)	130 (43.48)	299
Kodigenahalli	141 (94.00)	9 (6.00)	150	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0	85 (60.28)	56 (39.72)	141
Madalur	146 (97.33)	4 (2.67)	150	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0	90 (61.64)	56 (38.36)	146
Tumakuru	287 (95.67)	13 (4.33)	300	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0	175 (60.98)	112 (39.02)	287
Total	1751 (97.28)	49 (2.72)	1800	747 (94.92)	40 (5.08)	787	853 (48.72)	898 (51.28)	1751

Source: Primary data, 2014. *No casteism; **Yes there is casteism.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Lack of Two Square Meals Per Day in Dalit Houses

In India, 213.8 million people were undernourished during 2011-13. In the same manner, malnutrition prevails in Karnataka leading to high levels of infant, child and maternal mortality, anemia and other micronutrient deficiencies. According to Comber Stacey May et al. (2015), Karnataka ranked 10 in

Human Development Index, 11 in Hunger Index and 45 in Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) in 2008. This indicates that there is a serious problem in Karnataka. According to National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), the mortality rate for children under five per 1000 live births is 41. According to the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3), 42.5 per cent of children under five are underweight and this number declined to 31.9 per cent in 2015-16 (NFHS-4). Nearly 48 per cent are stunted reflecting chronic malnutrition, and 19.8 per cent are wasted reflecting acute malnutrition, and this declined to 17.2 overall (rural and urban) (NFHS-4). In Karnataka, 70 per cent of children between the ages of six and 59 months are anemic according to NFHS-3 and this declined to 58.6 per cent in 2015-16 (NFHS-4). Malnutrition leads to permanent physical and psychological consequences and generates a cyclical and inter-generational pattern. Our study results reveal that nearly three per cent of the households reported that their family members did not have sufficient food during the year 2013. Among the villages, Kodigenahalli villagers were not getting two square meals per day, followed by Harugeri and Mugalkhoda villages. In Tumakuru district, a few of the Dalit households were not able to get two square meals a day, with the situation slightly better in Belagavi and Davanagere districts (Table 5). In regard to availability of food, households stated that they adjusted with whatever food they had and some households brought food items from neighbours.

Table 5: Availability of Two Square Meals Per Day in Sample Villages

Village /District	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	143 (95.33)	7 (4.67)	150
Mugalkhoda	144 (96.00)	6 (4.00)	150
Belagavi	287 (95.67)	13 (4.33)	300
Ravoor	150 (100.00)	0(0.00)	150
Srinivasa Saradagi	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150
Kalaburagi	298 (99.33)	2 (0.67)	300
Adivala	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150
Nayakanahatti	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150
Chitradurga	297 (99.00)	3 (1.00)	300
Uchangidurga	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150
Towdor	146 (97.33)	4 (2.67)	150
Davanagere	294 (98.00)	6 (2.00)	300
Muguru	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150
Sosale	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150
Mysuru	298 (99.33)	2 (0.67)	300
Kodigenahalli	123 (82.00)	27 (18.00)	150
Madalur	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150
Tumakuru	273 (91.00)	27 (9.00)	300
Total	1747 (97.06)	53 (2.94)	1800

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in Eating Food and Visiting Dalit Houses

The majority of OCs do not eat food in Dalit houses in general, particularly in rural Karnataka. According to our primary data results, upper castes avoid taking food in Dalit houses. However, quite a few (603) also reported that they eat food in Dalit houses and this is high in Adivala village followed by Sosale and Muguru village. The practice was very high in Chitradurga district, followed by Mysuru, Belagavi and Kalaburagi (**Table 6**). As to the kind of foods they take, 'all kinds' came first, followed by roti, coffee/tea, sweets/snacks, non-vegetarian, fruits and special food ⁵. Here, if we closely observe the practice, only some eat all kinds of food and the rest only specific food (**Table 7**). The main reason for not eating all types of food is caste hierarchy and superstition. Though to all appearances, other caste people visit Dalit houses, most who do so are men (415), followed by all family members and women. Very few women visit Dalit households due to reasons of caste hierarchy, superstition, tradition and curbs by husbands. Table 8 takes a look at the mindset of OCs for not allowing their family members to visit Dalit houses, and the reasons cited are poverty, low caste status and non-invitation.

Table 6: Particulars of Food Habit in Sample Villages

Village/District	Do non-SC/STs eat food in your house?		
	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	57 (38.00)	93 (62.00)	150
Mugalkhod	53 (35.33)	97 (64.67)	150
Belagavi	110 (36.67)	190 (63.33)	300
Ravoor	50 (33.33)	100 (66.67)	150
Srinivas Saradgi	58 (38.67)	92 (61.33)	150
Kalaburagi	108 (36.00)	192 (64.00)	300
Adivala	91 (60.67)	59 (39.33)	150
Nayakanahatti	36 (24.00)	114 (76.00)	150
Chitradurga	127 (42.33)	173 (57.67)	300
Uchangidurga	44 (29.33)	106 (70.67)	150
Towdor	41 (27.33)	109 (72.67)	150
Davanagere	85 (28.33)	215 (71.67)	300
Muguru	59 (39.33)	91 (60.67)	150
Sosale	67 (44.67)	83 (55.33)	150
Mysuru	126 (42.00)	174 (58.00)	300
Kodigenahalli	38 (25.33)	112 (74.67)	150
Madalur	9 (6.00)	141 (94.00)	150
Tumakuru	47 (15.67)	253 (84.33)	300
Total	603 (33.50)	1197 (66.50)	1800

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

⁵ OCs, BCs and STs

Table 7: What Kind of Food Non-SC/ST People Take in Your House?

Village/District	All food	Coffee/ Tea	Fruits	Non- veg	Rice	Roti	Special food	Sweets/ Snacks	Total
Harugeri	46 (82.14)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.79)	0 (0.00)	9 (16.07)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	56
Mugalkhoda	20 (40.00)	5 (10.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (6.00)	0 (0.00)	20 (40.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (4.00)	50
Belagavi	66 (62.26)	5 (4.72)	0 (0.00)	4 (3.77)	0 (0.00)	29 (27.36)	0 (0.00)	2 (1.89)	106
Ravoor	17 (37.78)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.22)	0 (0.00)	22 (48.89)	1 (2.22)	4 (8.89)	45
Srinivasa Saradagi	21 (41.18)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	28 (54.90)	0 (0.00)	2 (3.92)	51
Kalaburagi	38 (39.58)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.04)	0 (0.00)	50 (52.08)	1 (1.04)	6 (6.25)	96
Adivala	71 (78.02)	11 (12.09)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.10)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	8 (8.79)	91
Nayakanahatti	23 (65.71)	5 (14.29)	2 (5.71)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	5 (14.29)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	35
Chitradurga	94 (74.60)	16 (12.70)	2 (1.59)	1 (0.79)	0 (0.00)	5 (3.97)	0 (0.00)	8 (6.35)	126
Uchangidurga	27 (61.36)	11 (25.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (13.64)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	44
Towdor	19 (46.34)	11 (26.83)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (26.83)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	41
Davanagere	46 (54.12)	22 (25.88)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	85
Muguru	26 (50.98)	14 (27.45)	2 (3.92)	0 (0.00)	3 (5.88)	4 (7.84)	1 (1.96)	1 (1.96)	51
Sosale	31 (48.44)	19 (29.69)	2 (3.13)	1 (1.56)	5 (7.81)	5 (7.81)	1 (1.56)	0 (0.00)	64
Mysuru	57 (49.57)	33 (28.70)	4 (3.48)	1 (0.87)	8 (6.96)	9 (7.83)	2 (1.74)	1 (0.87)	115
Kodigenahalli	38 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	38
Madalur	9 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	9
Tumakuru	47 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	47
Total	348 (60.52)	76 (13.22)	6 (1.04)	7 (1.22)	8 (1.39)	110 (19.13)	3 (0.52)	17 (2.96)	575

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Table 8: Particulars of those Visiting Dalit Households in Sample Villages

Village/ District	Who visits your house?				Reason for non-Dalits not visiting Dalit houses			
	All family*	Men	Women	Total	Low**	Poor	Due to***	Total
Harugeri	18 (32.73)	37 (67.27)	0 (0.00)	55	93 (98.94)	1 (1.06)	0 (0.00)	94
Mugalkhoda	12 (31.58)	26 (68.42)	0 (0.00)	38	98 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	98
Belagavi	30 (32.26)	63 (67.74)	0 (0.00)	93	191 (99.48)	1 (0.52)	0 (0.00)	192
Ravoor	8 (20.00)	32 (80.00)	0 (0.00)	40	78 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	78
Srinivasa Saradagi	8 (17.78)	37 (82.22)	0 (0.00)	45	30 (93.75)	1 (3.13)	1 (3.13)	32
Kalaburagi	16 (18.82)	69 (81.18)	0 (0.00)	85	108 (98.18)	1 (0.91)	1 (0.91)	110
Adivala	42 (46.15)	49 (53.85)	0 (0.00)	91	59 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	59
Nayakanahatti	6 (18.18)	27 (81.82)	0 (0.00)	33	112 (98.25)	1 (0.88)	1 (0.88)	114
Chitradurga	48 (38.71)	76 (61.29)	0 (0.00)	124	171 (98.84)	1 (0.58)	1 (0.58)	173
Uchangidurga	24 (54.55)	20 (45.45)	0 (0.00)	44	106 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	106
Towdor	19 (46.34)	22 (53.66)	0 (0.00)	41	109 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	109
Davanagere	43 (50.59)	42 (49.41)	0 (0.00)	85	215 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	215
Muguru	19 (25.68)	52 (70.27)	3 (4.05)	74	53 (94.64)	1 (1.79)	2 (3.57)	56
Sosale	12 (14.46)	68 (81.93)	3 (3.61)	83	20 (83.33)	4 (16.67)	0 (0.00)	24
Mysuru	31 (19.75)	120 (76.43)	6 (3.82)	157	73 (91.25)	5 (6.25)	2 (2.50)	80
Kodigenahalli	1 (2.63)	37 (97.37)	0 (0.00)	38	110 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	110
Madalur	1 (11.11)	8 (88.89)	0 (0.00)	9	141 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	141
Tumakuru	2 (4.26)	45 (95.74)	0 (0.00)	47	251 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	251
Total	170 (28.76)	415 (70.22)	6 (1.02)	591	1009 (98.82)	8 (0.78)	4 (0.39)	1021

Source: Primary data, 2014. *All family members; ** low caste; ***Due to poverty.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in Shaking Hands

We inquired whether Dalits eat food made by non-Dalits. They answered that almost all of them do, with a high positive answer in Nayakanahatti and Muguru, followed by Adivala, and Sosale. In the same way, the majority of Dalits in Chitradurga district eat non-Dalit food as compared to other sample districts, with Mysuru, Tumakuru and Davanagere districts following behind. But some (12%) of the Dalits said they do not take food in non-Dalit households as their treatment was not good. According to the sample households, non-Dalits (OC/BC) offer Dalits food in cattle houses, and do not give them a seating place. As a result, the Dalits have to sit on the floor and eat the food. Besides, they provide food in separate plates. In this situation, some of the Dalits realized that self-respect is more important than eating food in non-Dalit houses. In the same manner most of them were exchanging shake-hands with non-Dalit people. Thirteen (242) per cent of the households reported that they do not shake hands

with non-Dalit people due to caste discrimination in their respective villages (**Table 9**). However, 85 (1526) per cent of the households reported that they were able to sit in the village centres, and this was very surprising. Among the villages, Madalur village is more socially forward than other villages, followed by Srinivasa Saradagi and Ravoor and Sosale villages. In Kalaburagi district, most of the Dalits were able to sit with non-Dalits as compared to other districts, followed by Mysuru, Chitradurga and Belagavi districts. The unfortunate thing is that 54 (964) per cent of the households reported that they cannot enter non-Dalit households. Though 46 (836) per cent of the households reported that non-Dalits are allowed in their houses, they could not sit as equals with non-Dalits (**Table 10**). But a few of the Dalits enjoyed equality in sitting with non-Dalits if they were educated, employed, politically aware and rich. Whoever was not educated and poor was unable to sit with non-Dalits.

Table 9: Particulars of Eating Food Habit in Other Houses

Village/District	Do you eat food in non-Dalit houses?			Do non-SC/STs shake hand with you?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	102 (68.00)	48 (32.00)	150	127 (84.67)	23 (15.33)	150
Mugalkhoda	132 (88.00)	18 (12.00)	150	127 (84.67)	23 (15.33)	150
Belagavi	234 (78.00)	66 (22.00)	300	254 (84.67)	46 (15.33)	300
Ravoor	129 (86.00)	21 (14.00)	150	134 (89.33)	16 (10.67)	150
Srinivasa Saradagi	117 (78.00)	33 (22.00)	150	130 (86.67)	20 (13.33)	150
Kalaburagi	246 (82.00)	54 (18.00)	300	264 (88.00)	36 (12.00)	300
Adivala	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150
Nayakanahatti	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	147 (98.00)	3(2.00)	150
Chitradurga	299 (99.67)	1 (0.33)	300	297 (99.00)	3 (1.00)	300
Uchangidurga	119 (79.33)	31 (20.67)	150	118 (78.67)	32 (21.33)	150
Towdor	128 (85.33)	22 (14.67)	150	132 (88.00)	18 (12.00)	150
Davanagere	247 (82.33)	53 (17.67)	300	250 (83.33)	50 (16.67)	300
Muguru	150 (100)	0 (0.00)	150	150 (100)	0 (0.0)	150
Sosale	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150
Mysuru	298 (99.33)	2 (0.67)	300	298 (99.33)	2 (0.67)	300
Kodigenahalli	108 (72.00)	42 (28.00)	150	97 (64.67)	53 (35.33)	150
Madalur	147 (98.00)	3 (2.00)	150	98 (65.33)	52 (34.67)	150
Tumakuru	255 (85.00)	45 (15.00)	300	195 (65.0)	105 (35.0)	300
Total	1579 (87.72)	221 (12.28)	1800	1558 (86.56)	242 (13.44)	1800

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Table 10: Particulars of Equality in the Main Places of Sample Villages

Village/ District	Are you able to sit in the main places of the village?			Would OC/BC households allow you in their houses?			Do they (OCs/BCs) allow you to sit with them as equals in their houses?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	126 (84.00)	24 (16.00)	150	110 (73.33)	40 (26.67)	150	103 (93.64)	7 (6.36)	110
Mugalkhod	131 (87.33)	19 (12.67)	150	71 (47.33)	79 (52.67)	150	62 (87.32)	9 (12.68)	71
Belagavi	257 (85.67)	43 (14.33)	300	181 (60.33)	119 (39.67)	300	165 (91.16)	16 (8.84)	181
Ravoor	137 (91.33)	13 (8.67)	150	124 (82.67)	26 (17.33)	150	111 (89.52)	13 (10.48)	124
Srinivas Saradgi	142 (94.67)	8 (5.33)	150	103 (68.67)	47 (31.33)	150	78 (75.73)	25 (24.27)	103
Kalaburagi	279 (93.00)	21 (7.00)	300	227 (75.67)	73 (24.33)	300	189 (83.26)	38 (16.74)	227
Adivala	130 (86.67)	20 (13.33)	150	109 (72.67)	41 (27.33)	150	93 (85.32)	16 (14.68)	109
Nayakanahatti	128 (85.33)	22 (14.67)	150	48 (32.00)	102 (68.00)	150	45 (93.75)	3 (6.25)	48
Chitradurga	258 (86.00)	42 (14.00)	300	157 (52.33)	143 (47.67)	300	138 (87.90)	19 (12.10)	157
Uchangidurga	99 (66.0)	51 (34.00)	150	47 (31.33)	103 (68.67)	150	39 (82.98)	8 (17.02)	47
Towdor	116 (77.33)	34 (22.67)	150	56 (37.33)	94 (62.67)	150	51 (91.07)	5 (8.93)	56
Davanagere	215 (71.67)	85 (28.33)	300	103 (34.33)	197 (65.67)	300	90 (87.38)	13 (12.62)	103
Muguru	131 (87.33)	19 (12.67)	150	54 (36.00)	96 (64.00)	150	54 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	54
Sosale	137 (91.33)	13 (8.67)	150	73 (48.67)	77 (51.33)	150	67 (91.78)	6 (8.22)	73
Mysuru	268 (89.33)	32 (10.67)	300	127 (42.33)	173 (57.67)	300	121 (95.28)	6 (4.72)	127
Kodigenahalli	106 (70.67)	44 (29.33)	150	30 (20.00)	120 (80.0)	150	15 (50.0)	15 (50.0)	30
Madalur	143 (95.33)	7 (4.67)	150	11 (7.33)	139 (92.67)	150	5 (45.45)	6 (54.55)	11
Tumakuru	249 (83.0)	51 (17.0)	300	41 (13.67)	259 (86.33)	300	20 (48.78)	21 (51.22)	41
Total	1526 (84.78)	274 (15.22)	1800	836 (46.44)	964 (53.56)	1800	723 (86.48)	113 (13.52)	836

Source: Primary data, 2014

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in Marriage Halls/Places

Village people celebrate marriage in different ways, in accordance with their caste and tradition. In general, people invite their relatives, friends, neighbours and well-wishers for the marriage. Nearly 21 per cent (375) of the households reported that non-SC/ST communities do not invite Dalits to their marriages and other celebrations. Our study data reveals that most (1425) of the households reported that upper caste households invited Dalits for marriages and other celebrations in Adivala village, followed by Harugeri and Mugalkhod. District wise, Belagavi district Dalits got maximum marriage invitations from non-Dalit households, followed by Chitradurga, Tumakuru and Mysuru districts. Most (1193) of the households reported that they were provided chairs or cots, with Adivala village reporting the highest figure followed by Harugeri and Muguru village. In a similar way, Belagavi occupied first place in providing chairs to Dalits, followed by Chitradurga, Tumakuru and Mysuru districts. But as much as 674 households also reported that they were unable to sit with non-Dalit as equals. This means that Dalits have to sit separately during marriage functions of the upper castes. Some of the Dalits were given separate places due to hierarchy, low economic status and education level in a visible case of discrimination. Yet, our primary data reveals that the Dalits (1589) did not protest (**Table 11**) as they lacked economic strength and political power and were dependent on non-Dalit households. However, some of the households did protest, and the results were fruitful as they were allowed to enter the houses and provided suitable chairs.

Table 11: Particulars of Marriage Celebrations in Sample Villages

Village/ District	Do OC/BC households invite you for their marriages and other celebrations?			Do they (OCs/BCs) provide chairs to you?			Do you sit along with non-Dalits?			Did you protest against any of the above discrimination?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	129 (86.00)	21 (14.00)	150	117 (90.70)	12 (9.30)	129	65 (54.62)	54 (45.38)	119	12 (8.05)	137 (91.95)	149
Mugalkhod	128 (85.33)	22 (14.67)	150	105 (82.03)	23 (17.97)	128	41 (35.04)	76 (64.96)	117	1 (0.67)	148 (99.33)	149
Belagavi	257 (85.67)	43 (14.33)	300	222 (86.38)	35 (13.62)	257	106 (44.92)	130 (55.08)	236	13 (4.36)	285 (95.64)	298
Ravoor	125 (83.33)	25 (16.67)	150	102 (81.60)	23 (18.40)	125	66 (57.89)	48 (42.11)	114	27 (18.62)	118 (81.38)	145
Srinivas Saradgi	115 (76.67)	35 (23.33)	150	91 (79.13)	24 (20.87)	115	55 (54.46)	46 (45.54)	101	36 (26.87)	98 (73.13)	134
Kalaburagi	240 (80.00)	60 (20.00)	300	193 (80.42)	47 (19.58)	240	121 (56.28)	94 (43.72)	215	63 (22.58)	216 (77.42)	279
Adivala	138 (92.00)	12 (8.00)	150	126 (91.30)	12 (8.70)	138	58 (45.67)	69 (54.33)	127	4 (2.67)	146 (97.33)	150
Nayakanahatti	113 (75.33)	37 (24.67)	150	105 (92.92)	8 (7.08)	113	39 (35.78)	70 (64.22)	109	3 (2.14)	137 (97.86)	140
Chitradurga	251 (83.67)	49 (16.33)	300	231 (92.03)	20 (7.97)	251	97 (41.10)	139 (58.90)	236	7 (2.41)	283 (97.59)	290
Uchangidurga	107 (71.33)	43 (28.67)	150	90 (84.11)	17 (15.89)	107	55 (51.40)	52 (48.60)	107	1 (0.69)	144 (99.31)	145
Towdor	117 (78.00)	33 (22.00)	150	96 (82.05)	21 (17.95)	117	41 (37.27)	69 (62.73)	110	2 (1.33)	148 (98.67)	150
Davanagere	224 (74.67)	76 (25.33)	300	186 (83.04)	38 (16.96)	224	96 (44.24)	121 (55.76)	217	3 (1.02)	292 (98.98)	295
Muguru	114 (76.00)	36 (24.00)	150	113 (99.12)	1 (0.88)	114	50 (44.25)	63 (55.75)	113	2 (1.63)	121 (98.37)	123
Sosale	111 (74.00)	39 (26.00)	150	107 (96.40)	4 (3.60)	111	53 (47.75)	58 (52.25)	111	7 (5.74)	115 (94.26)	122
Mysuru	225 (75.00)	75 (25.00)	300	220 (97.78)	5 (2.22)	225	103 (45.98)	121 (54.02)	224	9 (3.67)	236 (96.33)	245
Kodigenahalli	111 (74.00)	39 (26.00)	150	88 (79.28)	23 (20.72)	111	49 (51.04)	47 (48.96)	96	8 (5.33)	142 (94.67)	150
Madalur	117 (78.00)	33 (22.00)	150	53 (45.30)	64 (54.70)	117	40 (64.52)	22 (35.48)	62	2 (1.46)	135 (98.54)	137
Tumakuru	228 (76.00)	72 (24.00)	300	141 (61.84)	87 (38.16)	228	89 (56.33)	69 (43.67)	158	10 (3.48)	277 (96.52)	287
Total	1425 (79.17)	375 (20.83)	1800	1193 (83.72)	232 (16.28)	1425	612 (47.59)	674 (52.41)	1286	105 (6.20)	1589 (93.80)	1694

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in Hotels

Our primary data reveals that almost all villages have hotels except Ravoor, Adivala, and Madalur. The majority (1450) of Dalits were able to sit with non-Dalit people in hotels, with Nayakanhatti showing the highest occurrences, followed by Muguru and Sosale (**Table 12**). In Chitradurga district, most of the Dalits were able to sit as equals with non-Dalits, followed by Mysuru, Tumakuru and Davanagere. But 13 per cent of the households reported that they were unable to sit on par with non-Dalits due to reasons of caste hierarchy and low economic status. Nearly 93 per cent (1544) of the respondents explained that there was no separate glass system in hotels (**Table 13**). However, seven per cent (120) of the respondents revealed that separate tea cups were provided, but this practice was not widely known due to local pressure and Dalits' reluctance to disclose the matter to outsiders. If it was disclosed, the local people would harass them, they feared. Most of them did not protest the practice but a few did, as a result of which hotel managements are changing for the better. The majority of Dalits said they do not protest, citing reasons such as lack of economic strength (568) and interest (111), poverty, fear, and lower caste status. The details are presented in **Table 13**.

Table 12: Particulars of Hotel in the Sample Villages

Village/District	Are there any hotels in your village?			Do you sit in the hotels along with other (OCs/BCs) caste people?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	96 (64.00)	54 (36.00)	150
Mugalkhoda	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	122 (81.33)	28 (18.67)	150
Belagavi	300 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	300	218 (72.67)	82 (27.33)	300
Ravoor	112 (74.67)	38 (25.33)	150	87 (77.68)	25 (22.32)	112
Srinivasa Saradagi	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	117 (78.00)	33 (22.00)	150
Kalaburgi	262 (87.33)	38 (12.67)	300	204 (77.86)	58 (22.14)	262
Adivala	139 (92.67)	11 (7.33)	150	137 (98.56)	2 (1.44)	139
Nayakanhatti	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150
Chitradurga	289 (96.33)	11 (3.67)	300	286 (98.96)	3 (1.04)	289
Uchangidurga	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	117 (78.00)	33 (22.00)	150
Towdor	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	145 (96.67)	5 (3.33)	150
Davanagere	300 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	300	262 (87.33)	38 (12.67)	300
Muguru	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150
Sosale	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	145 (96.67)	5 (3.33)	150
Mysuru	300 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	300	293 (97.67)	7 (2.33)	300
Kodigenahalli	150 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	150	124 (82.67)	26 (17.33)	150
Madalur	63 (42.00)	87 (58.00)	150	63 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	63
Tumakuru	213 (71.00)	87 (29.00)	300	187 (87.79)	26 (12.21)	213
Total	1664 (92.44)	136 (7.56)	1800	1450 (87.14)	214 (12.86)	1664

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Table 13: Particulars of Different Treatment in Sample Villages

Village/District	Are there any separate glasses for Dalits in hotels?			If yes, have you protested against separate glass system?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	15 (10.00)	135 (90.00)	150	4(26.67)	11(73.33)	15
Mugalkhoda	2 (1.33)	148 (98.67)	150	0 (0.00)	2 (100.00)	2
Belagavi	17 (5.67)	283 (94.33)	300	4(23.53)	13 (76.47)	17
Ravoor	20 (17.86)	92 (82.14)	112	5 (25.00)	15 (75.00)	20
Srinivasa Saradagi	19 (12.67)	131 (87.33)	150	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	16
Kalaburagi	39 (14.89)	223 (85.11)	262	12(33.33)	24 (66.67)	36
Adivala	2 (1.44)	137 (98.56)	139	1 (50.00)	1 (50.00)	2
Nayakanahatti	3 (2.00)	147 (98.00)	150	0 (0.00)	3 (100.00)	3
Chitradurga	5 (1.73)	284 (98.27)	289	1 (20.00)	4 (80.00)	5
Uchangidurga	1 (0.67)	149 (99.33)	150	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)	1
Towdor	11 (7.33)	139 (92.67)	150	2 (18.18)	9 (81.82)	11
Davanagere	12 (4.00)	288 (96.00)	300	2 (16.67)	10 (83.33)	12
Muguru	2 (1.33)	148 (98.67)	150	0 (0.00)	2 (100.00)	2
Sosale	3 (2.00)	147 (98.00)	150	2(66.67)	1(33.33)	3
Mysuru	5 (1.67)	295 (98.33)	300	2(40.00)	3(60.00)	5
Kodigenahalli	41 (27.33)	109 (72.67)	150	3(7.32)	38(92.68)	41
Madalur	1 (1.59)	62 (98.41)	63	0(0.00)	1(100.00)	1
Tumakuru	42 (19.72)	171 (80.28)	213	3(7.14)	39(92.86)	42
Total	120 (7.21)	1544 (92.79)	1664	24 (20.51)	93 (79.49)	117

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Table 14: Reasons for Not Protesting Against Discrimination in Sample Villages

Village/District	Lack of economic strength	Not interested	Lower caste	Poverty and fear	Total
Harugeri	59 (84.29)	11 (15.71)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	70
Mugalkhoda	43 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	43
Belagavi	102 (90.27)	11 (9.73)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	113
Ravoor	43 (47.25)	41 (45.05)	5 (5.49)	2 (2.20)	91
Srinivasa Saradagi	37 (75.51)	5 (10.20)	1 (2.04)	6 (12.24)	49
Kalaburagi	80 (57.14)	46 (32.86)	6 (4.29)	8 (5.71)	140
Nayakanahatti	94 (74.02)	33 (25.98)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	127
Chitradurga	94 (74.02)	33 (25.98)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	127
Uchangidurga	57 (85.07)	10 (14.93)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	67
Towdor	74 (86.05)	10 (11.63)	2 (2.33)	0 (0.00)	86
Davanagere	131 (85.62)	20 (13.07)	2 (1.31)	0 (0.00)	153
Muguru	53 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	53
Sosale	105 (99.06)	1 (0.94)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	106
Mysuru	158 (99.37)	1 (0.63)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	159
Madalur	3 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3
Tumakuru	3 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3
Total	568 (81.73)	111 (15.97)	8 (1.15)	8 (1.15)	695

Source: Primary data, 2014. Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Caste Discrimination in Dhobi Services

Almost all villages have had dhobis from olden days. However, at present, many dhobis are migrating from villages to urban areas in search of better livelihood. The primary study results show that dhobis were available in the villages of Harugeri, Mugalkhod, Adivala, Nayakanahatti, Uchangidurga, Muguru and Kodigenahalli. They were fully available in Belagavi, Chitradurga and Mysuru districts (**Table 15**). A majority (1266) of them reported that dhobis do not wash Dalits' clothes. A small number (65) of households reported that they do. The main reason was that these few Dalits had a cordial relationship with the dhobis. In contrast, many dhobis were willing to iron Dalit clothes in the villages, with Kodigenahalli reporting the highest percentage, followed by Madalur, Adivala, and Muguru. Tumakuru district had the highest number of dhobis willing to press the clothes of Dalits as compared to other districts (**Table 15**). The dhobis' unwillingness to wash the clothes of Dalits, a visible form of caste discrimination, has gone on without protest. The Dalits say they are not interested in protesting against the discrimination due to lack of strength and interest, poverty and low caste status (**Table 16**).

Table 15: Particulars of Dhobi Services in Sample Villages

Village/District	Are dhobis available in your village?			Would dhobis wash your clothes?			Would dhobis iron your clothes?		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	150 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	150	2 (1.33)	148 (98.67)	150	12 (8.0)	138 (92.0)	150
Mugalkhoda	150 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	150	2 (1.33)	148 (98.67)	150	17 (11.33)	133 (88.67)	150
Belagavi	300 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	300	4 (1.33)	296 (98.67)	300	29 (9.67)	271 (90.33)	300
Ravoor	83 (55.33)	67 (44.67)	150	1 (1.20)	82 (98.80)	83	5 (6.02)	78 (93.98)	83
Srinivasa Saradagi	0 (0.0)	150 (100.0)	150	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kalaburagi	83 (27.67)	217 (72.33)	300	1 (1.20)	82 (98.8)	83	5 (6.02)	78 (93.98)	83
Adivala	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	150	12 (8.00)	138 (92.0)	150	47 (31.33)	103 (68.67)	150
Nayakanahatti	150 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	150	7 (4.67)	143 (95.33)	150	14 (9.33)	136 (90.67)	150
Chitradurga	300 (100.0)	0 (0.00)	300	19 (6.33)	281 (93.67)	300	61 (20.33)	239 (79.67)	300
Uchangidurga	150 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	150	5 (3.33)	145 (96.67)	150	9 (6.00)	141 (94.0)	150
Towdor	69 (46.0)	81 (54.0)	150	0 (0.00)	69 (100.0)	69	1 (1.45)	68 (98.55)	69
Davanagere	219 (73.0)	81 (27.0)	300	5 (2.28)	214 (97.72)	219	10 (4.57)	209 (95.43)	219
Muguru	150 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	150	1 (0.67)	149 (99.33)	150	47 (31.33)	103 (68.67)	150
Sosale	0 (0.00)	150 (100.0)	150	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mysuru	150 (50.0)	150 (50.0)	300	1 (0.67)	149 (99.33)	150	47 (31.33)	103 (68.67)	150
Kodigenahalli	150 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	150	32 (21.33)	118 (78.67)	150	140 (93.33)	10 (6.67)	150
Madalur	129 (86.00)	21 (14.0)	150	3 (2.33)	126 (97.67)	129	59 (45.74)	70 (54.26)	129
Tumakuru	279 (93.0)	21 (7.0)	300	35 (12.54)	244 (87.46)	279	199 (71.33)	80 (28.67)	279
Total	1331 (73.9)	469 (26.1)	1800	65 (4.88)	1266 (95.2)	1331	351 (26.4)	980 (73.6)	1331

Note: NA means: Not Applicable.

Source: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Table 16: Particulars of Washing Information in Sample Villages

Village/District	If dhobis iron your clothes, why not wash your clothes?			Did you protest against dhobis not washing your clothes?		
	Low caste	Poor	Total	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	7 (58.33)	5 (41.67)	12	0 (0.0)	148 (100.0)	148
Mugalkhoda	17 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	17	0 (0.0)	148 (100.0)	148
Belagavi	24 (82.76)	5 (17.24)	29	0 (0.0)	296 (100.0)	296
Ravoor	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5	0 (0.0)	82 (100.0)	82
Srinivasa Saradagi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kalaburagi	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	5	0 (0.0)	82 (100.00)	82
Adivala	47 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	47	0 (0.0)	138 (100.0)	138
Nayakanahatti	11 (78.57)	3 (21.43)	14	1 (0.7)	142 (99.3)	143
Chitradurga	58 (95.08)	3 (4.92)	61	1 (0.4)	280 (99.6)	281
Uchangidurga	2 (22.22)	7 (77.78)	9	0 (0.0)	145 (100.0)	145
Towdor	1 (100.0)	0	1	0 (0.0)	69 (100.0)	69
Davanagere	3 (30.0)	7 (70.0)	10	0 (0.0)	214 (100.0)	214
Muguru	24 (51.06)	23 (48.94)	47	1 (0.7)	148 (99.3)	149
Sosale	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mysuru	24 (51.06)	23 (48.94)	47	1 (0.7)	148 (99.3)	149
Kodigenahalli	140 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	140	1 (0.8)	117 (99.2)	118
Madalur	35 (59.32)	24 (40.68)	59	0 (0.0)	126 (100.0)	126
Tumakuru	175 (87.94)	24 (12.06)	199	1 (0.4)	243 (99.6)	244
Total	288 (82.05)	63 (17.95)	351	3 (0.2)	1263 (99.8)	1266

Source: Primary data, 2014. Note: NA means: Not Applicable.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row total.

Summary

Our primary data results reveal that most of the Dalit households face strong caste bias in the villages. The discrimination was very high in Tumakuru district as compared to other districts. In Tumakuru district, caste discrimination was high due to poverty and illiteracy, and some households stated that there are separate plates and cups for SCs in working places. Nearly half the households described indignities at working places. After Tumakuru district, working place discrimination was high in Mysuru, Chitradurga and Belagavi districts. A majority of the general category households do not eat food in Dalit houses. Most of the households reported that only men members visit Dalit houses. Because of the low caste status of Dalits, the so-called general caste household members do not visit Dalit houses. Almost all Dalits eat in non-Dalit houses. Nearly one-tenth (242) of the households reported that non-Dalits do not shake hands with Dalit people due to caste discrimination. Even more unfortunate, half of the households reported that they cannot enter non-Dalit households. Though half of the households reported that non-Dalits were allowed into their houses, they said they could not sit as equals with non-Dalits.

Villagers perform marriages in traditional ways. According to our study, most of the households reported that general caste people invited them for the marriages and other celebrations. But some of

the households noted that Dalits had to sit separately in front of houses during marriages and ritual times, in a case of visible discrimination. One-tenth of the respondents highlighted the fact that there was no equality in services, with separate cups and tea glasses being maintained for Dalits in the selected villages, though this was not so obvious to outsiders. Some of the households reported that dhobis do not wash their clothes because of the Dalits' low caste identity. It is obvious from this study that caste practices and biases are strong in all villages. The study suggests that moral and ethical values are needed at the individual, group and community levels to end caste discrimination in rural areas.

References

- Acharya Meena and Puspa Ghimir (2005). Gender Indicators of Equality, Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Measuring Programme/Project Effectiveness. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40 (44-45): 4719-28.
- Busenna Pesala and I Maruthi (2015). Small, Marginal and Dalit Farmers in Rainfed Agriculture: A Case Study of Srinivasa Sardgi in Kalaburgi District, Karnataka. *International Journal Research in Social Science*, 5 (2): 1-14.
- Comber Stacey May, Marc-Andre Gauthier, Malini L Tantri, Zahabia Jivaji and Miral Kalyani (2015). Food Security in Karnataka: Paradoxes of Performance. *ISEC Working Paper No. 352*. Bengaluru: ISEC.
- FAO, IFAD and WFP (2013). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013*. The Multiple Dimensions of Food Security. Rome, FAO.
- FAO (2003). *Trade Reforms and Food Security: Conceptualizing the Linkages*. Rome: FAO.
- Grebmer, K Von, J Bernstein, D Nabarro, N Prasai, S Amin, Y Yohannes, A Sonntag, F Patterson, O Towe and J Thompson (2016). *2016 Global Hunger Index: Getting to Zero Hunger*. Bonn, Washington, DC, and Dublin: Welthungerhilfe, International Food Policy Research Institute, and Concern Worldwide.
- Maruthi I and Pesala Busenna (2015a). *Assessment of Socio-economic Capabilities of Dalit Households in Karnataka*. Report Submitted to ICSSR, New Delhi.
- (2015b). Drinking water, Sanitation, Hygiene Practices of Dalits in Karnataka. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 6 (2): 82-102.
- (2016). Own House and Dalit: Selected Villages in Karnataka State. *ISEC Working Paper No. 354*. Bengaluru: ISEC.
- (2017). Expenditure Inequalities Among School Children: A Study in Karnataka. Edited by Gyanmudra and M. Sarumathy, *The New Rural Paradigm: Policies and Governance*, published by NIRD, Hyderabad.
- Maruthi I and Pesala Peter (2016). Participation of SHG and Employment Capabilities of Dalits Households in Karnataka. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*, 4 (8): 1-10.
- (2017). Status of Small and Marginal Dalit Farmers in Karnataka. *Agriculture Situation in India*, 73 (12): 35-47.

- (2018). Rural Household Migration and Development of Dalits in Karnataka. *Agricultural Situation in India (Journal)*, LXXV (3): 28 to 36.
- Swaminathan, Madhura and Vikas Rawal (2011). Income Inequality in Village India: The Role of Caste. *ECINEQ WP- 207*, pp.1-33.
- Subramaniam, M (2009). Capability Building as Potential to Protest Gender and Caste Injustice: Poor Women in Rural India. *Theory in Action*, 2 (1): 1- 22.
- Thorat Sukhdeo and Amaresh Dubey (2013). How Inclusive Has Growth been in India during 1993/94-2009/10? Implications for XII Plan Strategy. United Nations Development Program (UNDP), pp: 1-46.

Recent Working Papers

- 355 **Alternative Medicine Approaches as Healthcare Intervention: A Case Study of AYUSH Programme in Peri Urban Locales**
Manasi S, K V Raju, B R Hemalatha,
S Poornima, K P Rashmi
- 356 **Analysis of Export Competitiveness of Indian Agricultural Products with ASEAN Countries**
Subhash Jagdambe
- 357 **Geographical Access and Quality of Primary Schools - A Case Study of South 24 Parganas District of West Bengal**
Jhuma Halder
- 358 **The Changing Rates of Return to Education in India: Evidence from NSS Data**
Smrutirekha Singhari and S Madheswaran
- 359 **Climate Change and Sea-Level Rise: A Review of Studies on Low-Lying and Island Countries**
Nidhi Rawat, M S Umesh Babu and
Sunil Nautiyal
- 360 **Educational Outcome: Identifying Social Factors in South 24 Parganas District of West Bengal**
Jhuma Halder
- 361 **Social Exclusion and Caste Discrimination in Public and Private Sectors in India: A Decomposition Analysis**
Smrutirekha Singhari and S Madheswaran
- 362 **Value of Statistical Life: A Meta-Analysis with Mixed Effects Regression Model**
Agamoni Majumder and S Madheswaran
- 363 **Informal Employment in India: An Analysis of Forms and Determinants**
Rosa Abraham
- 364 **Ecological History of An Ecosystem Under Pressure: A Case of Bhitarkanika in Odisha**
Subhashree Banerjee
- 365 **Work-Life Balance among Working Women – A Cross-cultural Review**
Gayatri Pradhan
- 366 **Sensitivity of India's Agri-Food Exports to the European Union: An Institutional Perspective**
C Nalin Kumar
- 367 **Relationship Between Fiscal Deficit Composition and Economic Growth in India: A Time Series Econometric Analysis**
Anantha Ramu M R and K Gayithri
- 368 **Conceptualising Work-life Balance**
Gayatri Pradhan
- 369 **Land Use under Homestead in Kerala: The Status of Homestead Cultivation from a Village Study**
Sr. Sheeba Andrews and Elumalai Kannan
- 370 **A Sociological Review of Marital Quality among Working Couples in Bangalore City**
Shiju Joseph and Anand Inbanathan
- 371 **Migration from North-Eastern Region to Bangalore: Level and Trend Analysis**
Marchang Reimeingam
- 372 **Analysis of Revealed Comparative Advantage in Export of India's Agricultural Products**
Subhash Jagdambe
- 373 **Marital Disharmony among Working Couples in Urban India – A Sociological Inquiry**
Shiju Joseph and Anand Inbanathan
- 374 **MGNREGA Job Sustainability and Poverty in Sikkim**
Marchang Reimeingam
- 375 **Quantifying the Effect of Non-Tariff Measures and Food Safety Standards on India's Fish and Fishery Products' Exports**
Veena Renjini K K
- 376 **PPP Infrastructure Finance: An Empirical Evidence from India**
Nagesha G and K Gayithri
- 377 **Contributory Pension Schemes for the Poor: Issues and Ways Forward**
D Rajasekhar, Santosh Kesavan and R Manjula
- 378 **Federalism and the Formation of States in India**
Susant Kumar Naik and V Anil Kumar
- 379 **III-Health Experience of Women: A Gender Perspective**
Annapuranam Karuppannan
- 380 **The Political Historiography of Modern Gujarat**
Tannen Neil Lincoln
- 381 **Growth Effects of Economic Globalization: A Cross-Country Analysis**
Sovna Mohanty
- 382 **Trade Potential of the Fishery Sector: Evidence from India**
Veena Renjini K K
- 383 **Toilet Access among the Urban Poor – Challenges and Concerns in Bengaluru City Slums**
S Manasi and N Latha
- 384 **Usage of Land and Labour under Shifting Cultivation in Manipur**
Marchang Reimeingam
- 385 **State Intervention: A Gift or Threat to India's Sugarcane Sector?**
Abnave Vikas B and M Devendra Babu
- 386 **Structural Change and Labour Productivity Growth in India: Role of Informal Workers**
Rosa Abraham
- 387 **Electricity Consumption and Economic Growth in Karnataka**
Laxmi Rajkumari and K Gayithri
- 388 **Augmenting Small Farmers' Income through Rural Non-farm Sector: Role of Information and Institutions**
Meenakshi Rajeev and Manojit Bhattacharjee
- 389 **Livelihoods, Conservation and Forest Rights Act in a National Park: An Oxymoron?**
Subhashree Banerjee and Syed Ajmal Pasha
- 390 **Womanhood Beyond Motherhood: Exploring Experiences of Voluntary Childless Women**
Chandni Bhambhani and Anand Inbanathan

- 391 **Economic Globalization and Income Inequality: Cross-country Empirical Evidence**
Sovna Mohanty
- 392 **Cultural Dimension of Women's Health across Social Groups in Chennai**
Annapuranam K and Anand Inbanathan
- 393 **Earnings and Investment Differentials between Migrants and Natives: A Study of Street Vendors in Bengaluru City**
Channamma Kambara and Indrajit Bairagya
- 394 **'Caste' Among Muslims: Ethnographic Account from a Karnataka Village**
Sobin George and Shrinidhi Adiga
- 395 **Is Decentralisation Promoting or Hindering the Effective Implementation of MGNREGS? The Evidence from Karnataka**
D Rajasekhar, Salim Lakha and R Manjula
- 396 **Efficiency of Indian Fertilizer Firms: A Stochastic Frontier Approach**
Soumita Khan
- 397 **Politics in the State of Telangana: Identity, Representation and Democracy**
Anil Kumar Vaddiraju
- 398 **India's Plantation Labour Act - A Critique**
Malini L Tantri
- 399 **Federalism and the Formation of States in India: Some Evidence from Hyderabad-Karnataka Region and Telangana State**
Susant Kumar Naik
- 400 **Locating Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 in the Federal Structure: An Analysis of Its Application in Manipur and Tripura**
Rajiv Tewari
- 401 **Performance of Power Sector in Karnataka in the Context of Power Sector Reforms**
Laxmi Rajkumari and K Gayithri
- 402 **Are Elections to Grama Panchayats Party-less? The Evidence from Karnataka**
D Rajasekhar, M Devendra Babu and R Manjula
- 403 **Hannah Arendt and Modernity: Revisiting the Work *The Human Condition***
Anil Kumar Vaddiraju
- 404 **From E-Governance to Digitisation: Some Reflections and Concerns**
Anil Kumar Vaddiraju and S Manasi
- 405 **Understanding the Disparity in Financial Inclusion across Indian States: A Comprehensive Index for the Period 1984 – 2016**
Shika Saravanabhavan
- 406 **Gender Relations in the Context of Women's Health in Chennai**
Annapuranam K and Anand Inbanathan
- 407 **Value of Statistical Life in India: A Hedonic Wage Approach**
Agamoni Majumder and S Madheswaran
- 408 **World Bank's Reformed Model of Development in Karnataka**
Amitabha Sarkar
- 409 **Environmental Fiscal Instruments: A Few International Experiences**
Rajat Verma and K Gayithri
- 410 **An Evaluation of Input-specific Technical Efficiency of Indian Fertilizer Firms**
Soumita Khan
- 411 **Mapping Institutions for Assessing Groundwater Scenario in West Bengal, India**
Madhavi Marwah
- 412 **Participation of Rural Households in Farm, Non-Farm and Pluri-Activity: Evidence from India**
S Subramanian
- 413 **Inequalities in Health Outcomes: Evidence from NSS Data**
Anushree K N and S Madheswaran
- 414 **Urban Household Enterprises and Lack of Access to Production Loans**
Shika Saravanabhavan and Meenakshi Rajeev
- 415 **Economic and Social Benefits of SHG-Bank Linkage Programme in Karnataka**
Meenakshi Rajeev, B P Vani and Veerashekharappa
- 416 **Two Decades of Fiscal Decentralization Reforms In Karnataka: Opportunities, Issues and Challenges**
M Devendra Babu, Farah Zahir, Rajesh Khanna and Prakash M Philip
- 417 **Karnataka State Budgets - How Far Have They Promoted Inclusiveness?**
K Gayithri and Vijeth Acharya

Price: ₹ 30.00

ISBN 978-81-7791-274-6



INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE

Dr V K R V Rao Road, Nagarabhavi P.O., Bangalore - 560 072, India
Phone: 0091-80-23215468, 23215519, 23215592; Fax: 0091-80-23217008
E-mail: reimeingam@isec.ac.in; Web: www.isec.ac.in