

GROWTH AND SIZE OF POPULATION AND SETTLEMENTS IN JIND DISTRICT

Sumitra Bairagi

Assistant Professor of Geography, Government College, Baund Kalan, Haryana, India
Email: bairagisumitra2@gmail.com

How to cite this paper:

Bairagi Sumitra (2025)
Growth and Size of
Population and Settlements
in Jind District, Journal of
Global Resources, Vol. 11
(02)


DOI:

10.46587/JGR.2025.v11i02.014

Received: 09 April 2025

Reviewed: 11 May 2025

Final Accepted: 18 June 2025


Freely available Online
www.isdesr.org

Abstract: *The Analysis of size is an important aspect of settlement geography. The size speaks about the nature of soil, topography, socio-economic background of the cultural group of a particular area. In the present research work an attempt has been made to study the distribution of rural population and their growth among the settlement of different population size groups during 1991-2011 in Jind district. For the present research work census data for the year 1991 and 2011 after a gap of 20 years has been used. For the size analysis of rural settlements, the data regarding total number of inhabited villages and their share of population and settlements in all the seven groups has been calculated. It is observed that the maximum bulk of population share correspond with moderately large to large size villages that are in between 2000-9999 persons per village and number of occurrence of villages correspond with moderate size to moderately large size village in 1991-2011. Further it is also noted that (200-4999 persons per village) shows a negative growth in percentage share of population while very small size villages to moderate size villages show a negative growth in number of villages while moderately large, large and very large size villages indicate remarkable growth in population and number of villages. These reflect a change in rural structure, mainly due to agricultural growth and development of infrastructural facilities after the formation of Jind as a district. The greatest dynamism has been experienced moderately large to very large size villages. Such villages are the scene of transformation and rapid development and improve the quality of life of the people of the region.*

Key words: Rural Population, Settlements, Demography, Size, Share.

Introduction

The analysis of size is an important aspect of settlement geography. The size speaks about the nature of *soil, topography, socio- economic background of the cultural group* of a particular area [Singh, 1994]. The variation in size of rural settlements from area to area is a physically established fact due to the variations in ecological conditions [Mandal, 2001]. Agricultural growth and development of transport and other infrastructure facilities also plays an important role in change the social structure of any society. In the present research work an attempt has been made to analyze the growth and size of population and settlements in Jind district.

Study Area

The Jind district is a part of eastern Haryana Plain. The district was formed at the time of reorganization of the composite state of Punjab and creation of Haryana in November, 1966. Earlier it has been part of Sangrur district. It lies between 29° 03' and 29° 50' North latitude and 75° 57' and 76° 47' East longitude. It is bounded by the districts of Kaithal, Karnal, and Panipat on its north-east and east; by Sonapat and Rohtak districts in the south-east and south, by Hisar and Fatehabad districts in the south- west and west. On its north- west it has a common state border with Punjab. It is entirely a plain land having a gentle slope towards south- west.

Demographic Characteristics

As per 2011 census, the total population of the district is 10.28 lakh persons in which male constitutes 5.50 lakh (53.52 percent) and females 4.78 lakh (46.48 percent) persons. The total area of the district is 2626.74sq/km. As per 2001 census, the total literacy rate in Jind District is 68.85 percent in which male literacy rate is 78.89 percent and female literacy rate is 57.34 percent, while in 1991 the total literacy rate was 40.77 percent, male literacy was 57.34 percent and female literacy rate was 24.35 percent. The sex ratio was 834 females/ 1000 males in 1991, which increased to 868 females/ 1000 males in 2011. By increased the sex ratio is 34 points in 2011. In 1991, the total working force was recorded 27.78 percent in which male working force was 49.14 percent and female working force was 6.56 percent. While in 2011, the total working force is 41.82 percent in which male working force is 52.56 percent and female working force is 29.46 percent. The district is dominated by Jat, which is a predominantly agriculturist caste. On the basis of 2011 census, the district has 306 villages including four un- inhabited villages, while in 1991 the total number of villages was 302 including two un-inhabited villages. In 1991, the village Siwana Mal was part of Rohtak district.

Source of Data Research Methodology

The present research work involves the census data for the year 1991 and 2011, after a gap of 20 years. For the size analysis of rural settlements, the data regarding total number of inhabited villages and their share of population have been compiled into seven population size groups. After that net growth of rural population and settlements has been calculated in percentage in all the respective population size groups.

Size of Rural Population and Settlements

The overall growth of villages with respect to *size, population, and number of villages* are shown in table [Table-1]. The general tendency of relationship between size of population, number of villages and percentage of population are as follows;

- (i) **Very small size and small size villages** (less than 500 persons per village) constitute insignificant percentage of population share and number of occurrences in 1991 and 2011.
- (ii) **Moderately small size villages** (500-999 persons per village) constitute in significant share in percentage of population and moderate share in percentage of number of villages in 1991 and 2011.
- (iii) **Moderate size villages (1000 – 1999 persons per village)** have moderate share in percentage of population and moderately large share in percentage of number of villages in 1991, but moderately large share in percentage of population and high share in number of villages in 2011.
- (iv) The maximum bulk of population share and number of occurrence of villages correspond with **moderately large size to large size villages** that is in between **2000 to 9999 persons** per village both in 1991 and 2011.

Table 01: Population Size and Rural Settlement, 1991-2011

Range of Population Size	POPULATION				SETTLEMENTS			
	Population In Each Range		Cumulative Population		Inhabited Settlements In Each Range		Cumulative Settlements	
	1991	2011	1991	2011	1991	2011	1991	2011
Very Small Size (Less than 200)	258 (00.03)	284 (00.03)	258 (00.03)	284 (00.03)	03 (00.67)	03 (00.99)	02 (00.67)	03 (00.99)
Net Growth	[00.00]		-		[00.32]		-	
Small Size (200-499)	1967 (00.24)	1400 (00.14)	2225 (00.28)	1684 (00.16)	06 (02.00)	04 (01.32)	08 (02.67)	07 (02.32)
Net Growth	[-00.10]		-		[-00.68]		-	
Moderately Small (500-999)	24119 (02.97)	13913 (01.35)	26344 (03.25)	15597 (01.52)	31 (10.33)	17 (05.63)	39 (13.00)	24 (07.95)
Net Growth	[-01.62]		-		[-04.70]		-	
Moderate Size (1000-1999)	139912 (17.25)	111172 (10.81)	166256 (20.50)	126769 (12.32)	93 (31.00)	71 (23.51)	132 (44.00)	95 (31.46)
Net Growth	[-06.44]		-		[-07.49]		-	
Moderately Large (2000-4999)	416974 (51.42)	501334 (48.74)	583230 (71.93)	628103 (61.06)	136 (45.33)	154 (50.99)	268 (89.33)	249 (82.45)
Net Growth	[-02.68]		-		[05.66]		-	
Large Size (5000-9999)	194072 (23.93)	301149 (29.28)	777302 (95.86)	929252 (90.34)	29 (09.67)	45 (14.90)	297 (99.00)	294 (97.35)
Net Growth	[05.35]		-		[05.23]		-	
Very Large Size (+ 10000)	33582 (04.14)	99317 (09.65)	810884 (100.0)	1028569 (100.0)	03 (01.00)	08 (02.65)	300 (100.0)	302 (100.0)
Net Growth	[05.51]		-		[01.65]		-	

Note: Figures in brackets are shown in percentage. Source: Compiled by Author.

(iv) **Large size villages (5000-9999 persons per village)** have moderately large share in percentage of population and small share in percentage of number of villages in 1991, but moderately large share in percentage of population and moderate share in percentage of number of villages in 2011.

(v) **Very large size villages (10,000 and above persons per village)** have very small share in percentage of population and number of villages in 1991. Since there are only three village under this category namely; Chhattar, Alewa and Muana in 1991, but small share in percentage of population and very small share in percentage of number of villages in 2011.

The comparative glance of percentage growth in population and number of villages from 1991 to 2011 is shown in the table. Table- 2 also highlights some more variations as under;

(1) **Very small size villages (less than 200 persons per village)** show insignificant growth in percentage share of population and number of villages.

(i) **Very small size villages (less than 200 persons per village)** show nil growth in percentage share of population and insignificant growth in percentage of number of villages (00.32 percent). There were two villages i.e. Teg Bahadurpur and Birbaraban in this category in 1991 which increased to three villages in 2011. The village Drond Khera was uninhabited in 1991 but it converted into inhabited village population of 12 persons 2011.

Table 02: Percentage Variation of Population and Number of Villages, 1991-2011

Range of Population Size	Population Growth [1991-2011]	Growth of Villages [1991-2011]	Remarks
Very Small Size (< 200)	00.00	00.32	Nil growth in percentage of Population and Insignificant decline in Number of villages.
Small Size (200-499)	-00.10	-00.68	Insignificant decline in percentage of Population and Vert low decline in Number of villages.
Moderately Small Size (500-999)	-01.62	-04.70	Low decline in percentage of Population and High decline in Number of villages.
Moderate Size (1000-1999)	-06.44	-07.49	Very high decline in percentage of Population and Number of villages.
Moderately Large Size (2000-4999)	-02.68	5.66	Moderately high decline in percentage of Population and Very high growth in Number of villages.
Large size (5000-9999)	05.35	05.23	Very high growth in percentage of Population and Number of villages.
Very Large Size (*10000)	05.51	01.65	Very high growth in percentage of Population and Low growth in Number of villages.

Note: Figure shows in percentage. Source: Compiled by Author

(2) **Small size to moderate size villages (200-1999 persons per village)** shows negative growth in percentage share of population and percentage of number of villages. Even in these categories there are variations;

(i) **Small size villages (200-499 persons per village)** have recorded insignificant decline in population percentage (-00.10 percent) and very low decline in number of villages (-00.68 percent). In 1991, this category had 6 villages which declined to 4 villages in 2011. Although, 2 villages of this category have shifted from their ranks to higher ranks i.e. Mando Kheri and Rohjh Khera. While three villages have kept the same status in 1991 to 2011. Only one village i.e. Safidon (rural) declined from moderately small size to small size category in 2011.

(ii) **Moderately small size villages (500-999 persons per village)** have recorded low decline in population share (-01.62 percent) and high decline in number of villages (-4.70 percent). This category covered 31 villages in 1991 but only 17 villages have been recorded under this category in 2011. About 16 villages of this category have upgraded their ranks from moderately small size to moderate size during 1991 to 2011. While 14 villages maintain the same status during this period. One village i.e. Kheri Naguran was uninhabited in 1991 but it converted in moderate small size village in 2011. Safidon (rural) was exist in moderately small size category in 1991 but it declined in small size category in 2011.

(iii) **Moderate size villages (1000-1999 persons per village)** have recorded high decline in percentage of population (-6.44 percent) but very high decline in number of villages (-7.49 percent). In 1991, there were 93 villages in the category of moderate size which have very high declined to 71 villages in 2011. Maximum number of villages that is 39 villages have shifted their ranks to the next category while 54 villages have maintained their same status during the period. One village i.e. Kheri Naguran is recorded under this category from small size category.

(3) Moderately large size villages (2000-4999 persons per village) show a negative growth in percentage of population and positive increase in percentage of number of villages.

(i) **Moderately large size villages (2000-4999 persons per village)** have recorded moderately high decline in population share but very high growth in number of villages that is -2.68 per cent and 5.66 per cent respectively during 1991 to 2011. There were 136 villages in 1991 which increased to 154 villages in 2011. It is noted that 115 villages remained in the same category, while 39 villages upgraded from the category of moderate size of villages to moderately large size village in 2011. Twenty-one villages have jumped from this category to large size category in 2011.

(4) Large to Very large size village (5000-above 10,000 persons per village) show a positive increase in percentage of population and number of villages. Inter variations among these categories are also significant.

(i) **Large size villages (5000-9999 persons per village)** show very high growth in population share (5.35 percent) and number of villages (5.23 percent). In 1991 there were 29 villages in this category which increased to 45 in 2011. Twenty-four villages have maintained the same status while 21 villages have been included by upgrading their ranks from this category to moderately large size. Five villages have jumped from this category to very large size category in 2011.

(ii) **Very large size villages (10,000 and above persons per village)** show very high growth in percentage of population (5.51 percent) and low growth in number of village (1.65 percent). Three villages (Chhattar, Alewa and Muana) have maintain the same status during this period, while five villages (Danoda Kalan, Naguran, Dhanari, Ujhana and Dhamitan Sahib) have been included by upgrading their rank from large size to very large size village.

Conclusion

It is concluded that small size villages show insignificant growth in population and number of settlements. Small to moderately large size village show a negative growth in population. While small to moderate size villages have negative growth in number of settlements. Large size to very large size villages indicate remarkable growth in population and moderately large size to very large size villages have positive growth in number of villages. These reflect a *change in rural structure*; mainly due to agricultural development, transport and other infrastructure facilities in Jind district.

Suggestions

It is suggested that better infrastructure facilities should be provided to *very large and large size villages* especially to Danoda Kalan, Naguran, Ujhana, Dhanauri, Chhattar, Dhamitan Sahib, Alewa and Muana for balanced development. *Multi storied housing board colonies* should also be developed in these villages by providing all basic infrastructural facilities. More attention should be given at *vertical expansion in place of horizontal*. Small scale industries should be established in these villages for provide the employment and increased the living standard of the people.

References

1. Census of India (1991) District Census Handbook, Jind Districts, Series-8, Haryana, Chandigarh.
2. Census of India (2011) Primary Census Abstract, Jind District, No.13, CD, Series- 6, Haryana, New Delhi.
3. Mandal, R.B. (2001) Introduction to Rural Settlements Geography, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
4. Singh, R. Y. (1994) Geography of Settlements, Rawat Publications, New Delhi.