

## Comparison of Social Problems of Urbanization Hyderabad Karnataka Region - Differential Statistics Study

<sup>a</sup>H.M. Mujawar, <sup>b</sup>N.V.Gudaganavar

<sup>a</sup>Associate Professor, Dept. of Statistics, A S Patil College of Commerce, Vijaypur, Karnataka, India

<sup>b</sup>Associate Professor, Dept. of Statistics, Anjuman Arts, Science , Commerce College& PG Centre, Dharwad, Karnataka, India

### Abstract

Urbanization and Social problems have been two major concerns of this century and they are likely to remain so far quite some time to come. The analysis of the research in relation to problem of social dimensions with regard to urbanization in Hyderabad Karnataka region.

The data collected on different variables i.e. they may relate to the kind of social problems, personal problems, urban environment, perceptions of urban residents about their needs, impact of employment on family life, suitability of urban jobs, expectations and aspirations of urban residents, etc.

Then the data were analyzed with reference to the objectives and hypotheses by using descriptive statistics, differential analysis including unpaired t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukeys multiple post hoc procedures and Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis by using SPSS 20.0 statistical software.

It concludes that social problems of urbanization are significantly different in all district headquarters of Hyderabad Karnataka region. Further, the pair wise comparisons of study area with social problems of urbanization were calculated by using Newman Keuls multiple post hoc procedures.

**KEYWORDS:** Urbanization, Social problems, Personal problems, Urban environment

### Introduction

The paces of urbanization and globalization have added new dimensions to issues of social problems. It has been projected that 21<sup>st</sup> century will be the urban century because the highest share of population ever lived in urban areas. Urban population is growing at a rapid pace from 17 percent (1951) to 31percent (2011) and approaching 41 percent by 2030(Kadi-IJSN-VOL3 (1)-17).

Urbanization is increasing in both the developed and developing countries. However, rapid urbanization, particularly the growth of large cities and associated problems of unemployment, poverty, inadequate health, poor sanitation, urban slums and environmental degradation pose a formidable challenge in many developing countries. Available statistics shows that more than half of the world's 6.6 billion people live in urban areas, crowded into 3 percent of the earth's land area (Angotti, 1993; UNFPA, 1993). The proportion of the world's population living in urban areas which has less than 5 percent in 1800 increased to 47 percent in 2000 and is expected to reach 65 percent in 2030 (United Nations, 1990; 1991).

Indian urban population is growing at an average rate of three percent per annum and has almost doubled from 165 million to 285 million between 1981 and 2001 and is expected to reach 575 million by 2030 (UN, 2002).

Urbanization simply defined, is the shift from a rural to an urban society, and involves an increase in the number of people in urban areas during a particular year. Urbanization is the outcome of social, economic and political developments that lead to urban concentration and growth of large cities, changes in land use and transformation from rural to metropolitan pattern of organization and governance. Employment is agreed between employer and employee on certain conditions that have greatly involved through time and still differ greatly in space. These specify the time spent at work, during the day, the week, the year, the place of work, the nature of the services, the duration of the arrangement, the remuneration and benefits received by the employee.

The purpose of the paper is to provide an social problems of urbanization and its components like reasons for being personal problems, urban environment, perceptions of urban residents about their needs, impact of employment on family life, suitability of urban jobs, expectations and aspirations of urban residents, etc. of north Karnataka state.

### **Methodology**

The present study has taken into six district of Hyderabad Karnataka namely, Bellary, Bidar, Gulbarga, Koppal, Raichur and Yadgiri. In order to obtain information, a representative sample of 200 from the each district, using simple random sampling method.

In this study, we have tried to analyzed with reference to the objectives and hypotheses by using descriptive statistics, differential analysis including unpaired t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukeys multiple post hoc procedures and Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis by using SPSS 20.0 statistical software and the results obtained thereby have been interpreted.

**Hypothesis:** There is no significant difference between six district headquarters (Bellary, Bidar, Gulbarga, Koppal, Raichur and Yadgir) with respect to social problems of urbanization and its components i.e.

1. Kind of social problems faced by urban residents
2. Personnel problems in urban environment
3. Perception of urban residents about needs
4. Impact of unemployment on family life
5. Suitability of urban jobs
6. Steps needed to enhance job chances in urban areas
7. Expectations from family in fulfillment of aspiration in urban life
8. Observation on expectations and aspirations urban residents

To verify this hypothesis, the one way ANOVA test was applied and the results are presented in the following table.

## Results and Discussion

Table: Comparison of six district headquarters with respect to social problems of urbanization and its components

Variables	Summary	Bellary	Bidar	Gulbarga	Koppal	Raichur	Yadgir	Total	F-value	P-value
Social problems of urbanization	Mean	49.94	38.31	33.41	54.85	41.14	30.48	41.36	144.5026	<0.0001
	SD	10.86	12.18	11.12	7.47	16.55	4.72	14.06		
Kind of social problems faced by urban residents	Mean	54.00	40.15	31.95	38.55	35.85	35.90	39.40	44.1911	<0.0001
	SD	21.12	15.93	13.99	16.45	17.97	10.57	17.75		
Personnel problems in urban environment	Mean	77.40	47.30	49.60	52.20	47.00	38.10	51.93	102.7979	<0.0001
	SD	23.49	20.56	16.77	12.16	23.62	10.91	22.23		
Perception of urban residents about needs	Mean	39.25	39.00	30.30	33.85	32.50	35.15	35.01	10.7184	<0.0001
	SD	16.77	14.63	13.37	12.67	22.68	8.85	15.73		
Impact of unemployment on family life	Mean	61.24	37.35	32.20	54.79	40.34	36.90	43.80	104.0120	<0.0001
	SD	21.04	14.49	19.43	11.31	16.58	9.58	19.06		
Suitability of urban jobs	Mean	20.37	30.98	12.89	18.98	20.32	19.15	20.45	61.8421	<0.0001
	SD	9.63	12.60	7.08	11.82	14.27	4.65	11.80		
Steps needed to enhance job chances in urban areas	Mean	55.35	41.20	40.00	88.93	54.55	33.00	52.17	228.4414	<0.0001
	SD	22.67	16.03	20.75	12.79	25.33	9.86	26.14		
Expectations from family in fulfillment of aspiration in urban life	Mean	48.53	38.65	34.87	51.15	41.68	29.96	40.81	35.2501	<0.0001
	SD	24.21	15.37	19.09	15.22	27.43	6.47	20.53		
Observation on expectations and aspirations urban residents	Mean	67.02	41.64	48.86	84.20	57.58	30.58	54.98	196.2788	<0.0001
	SD	20.64	15.08	21.82	18.54	25.92	8.70	25.91		

\*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, we have observed the followings:

- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to social problems of urbanization scores (F=144.5026, p<0.05) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is

accepted. It means that, the social problems of urbanization scores are different in different district headquarters.

- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. kind of social problems faced by urban residents scores ( $F=44.1911$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the social problems faced by urban residents scores are different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. personnel problems in urban environment scores ( $F=102.7979$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the personnel problems in urban environment scores are different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. perception of urban residents about needs scores ( $F=10.7184$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the perception of urban residents about needs scores is different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. impact of unemployment on family life scores ( $F=104.0120$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the impact of unemployment on family life scores is different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. suitability of urban jobs scores ( $F=61.8421$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the suitability of urban jobs scores is different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. steps needed to enhance job chances in urban areas scores ( $F=228.4414$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the steps needed to enhance job chances in urban areas scores are different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. expectations from family in fulfillment of aspiration in urban life scores ( $F=35.2501$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the expectations from family in fulfillment of aspiration in urban life scores are different in different district headquarters.
- A significant difference is observed between six district headquarters with respect to component of social problems of urbanization i.e. observation on expectations and aspirations urban residents scores ( $F=196.2788$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the observation on expectations and aspirations urban residents scores are different in different district headquarters.

If F is significant, to know the pair wise comparison of district headquarters with respect to employment problems of urbanization and its components by applying the Tukeys multiple post hoc procedures and the results are presented in the following tables.

Table: Pair wise comparison of district headquarters with social problems by Tukeys multiple post hoc procedures

District HQ	Bellary	Bidar	Gulbarga	Koppal	Raichur	Yadgir
Mean	49.94	38.31	33.41	54.85	41.14	30.48
SD	10.86	12.18	11.12	7.47	16.55	4.72
Bellary	1.0000					
Bidar	<0.0001	1.0000				
Gulbarga	<0.0001	0.0002*	1.0000			
Koppal	0.0002*	<0.0001	<0.0001	1.0000		
Raichur	<0.0001	0.1114	<0.0001	<0.0001	1.0000	
Yadgir	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0894	<0.0001	<0.0001	1.0000

\*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, we have found that, the social problems of urbanization scores are significantly higher in Koppal headquarter (54.85±7.47) as compared to Bellary (49.94±10.86), Bidar (38.31±12.18), Gulbarga (33.41±11.12), Raichur (41.14±16.55) and Yadgir headquarter (30.48±4.72). It means that, the respondents belonging to Koppal headquarter have higher social problems of urbanization scores and minimum in the respondents belonging to Yadgir headquarter.

#### Conclusions:

- The social problems of urbanization scores are different in different district headquarters.
- The social problems faced by urban residents scores are different in different district headquarters.
- The personnel problems in urban environment scores are different in different district headquarters.
- The perception of urban residents about needs scores is different in different district headquarters. the impact of unemployment on family life scores is different in different district headquarters.
- The suitability of urban jobs scores is different in different district headquarters.
- The steps needed to enhance job chances in urban areas scores are different in different district headquarters
- The expectations from family in fulfillment of aspiration in urban life scores are different in different district headquarters
- The observation on expectations and aspirations urban residents scores are different in different district headquarters.

#### Reference

1. Angotti, T (1993) Metropolis 2000: Planning, Poverty and Politics. London, Routledge
2. United Nations (UN) (2002) Press Release, POP/815, 21 March, p 1.
3. United Nations (1990) Human Development Report: Oxford University Press
4. United Nations (1991) World Urbanization Prospects, New York

5. “Problems of Urbanization in Developing Countries: A Case Study in India”. Kadi A.S., Halingali B.I. and Ravishankar P. (2012). International Journal of Science and Nature, ISSN 2229-6441, Vol. 3(1), pp. 93-104.