



P-ISSN: 2349-8528

E-ISSN: 2321-4902

IJCS 2018; 6(3): 2872-2875

© 2018 IJCS

Received: 16-03-2018

Accepted: 18-04-2018

Saurabh Arya

Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management, Chaudhary Charan
Singh, Haryana Agricultural
University Hisar, Haryana,
India

Asha Batra

Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management, Chaudhary Charan
Singh, Haryana Agricultural
University Hisar, Haryana,
India

Arpit Arya

Department of Foods and
Nutrition, Government Home
Science College, Chandigarh,
Punjab, India

Livelihood capabilities of farm families in Ambala division of Haryana state

Saurabh Arya, Asha Batra and Arpit Arya

Abstract

The present investigation “Livelihood securities of small and marginal farm families of Ambala division of Haryana state” was conducted in Ambala division of Haryana state. Two district from Ambala division i.e. Ambala and Yamunanagar were selected randomly. One block from each district viz. Sadhora block from Ambala and Nareingarh block from Yamunanagar district were selected randomly. From selected two blocks Sadhora and Nareingarh four villages (two from each block) Rajpur and Nashera from Sadhora, Sain Majra and Badi Ujjal from Nareingarh were selected randomly. Thus a total of 300 respondents were selected randomly. Statistical tools frequency percentages, weighted mean score and ranking were applied for data analysis. In the present study livelihood capabilities and security with problems and opportunities were assessed by developing media on identified aspect of livelihood security. The overall level of Human capital, social capital, physical capital and financial capital was found medium in both the districts (Ambala and Yamunanagar) with mean score range in 1.87-1.93 whereas human capital was found low in both districts with WMS 1.52 and 1.59 in Ambala and Yamunanagar districts respectively.

Keywords: livelihood, security, food security, small and marginal farmers, rural

Introduction

Indian agriculture is well-known for its multi-functionalities of providing employment, livelihood, food, nutrient and ecological securities. Agriculture and allied activities contribute about 14.2 per cent to the gross domestic product and the growth rate of agriculture is around 6.6 per cent (2015-16). Indian agriculture employs 58.0 per cent of the total work force and it is the major source of poverty mitigation, empowerment of the agrarian society and it is the back bone of development for India (Chand *et al.* 2011) [1]. India with a land territory spreading more than 329 million hectares is supplied with complex diversity of climate, soils, flora and fauna offering both a blessing and a challenge for agricultural development. The quality and richness of the nation asset endowments is constantly threatened by the huge population and increasing population density and corresponding demand for arable lands and ensuring food security. The green revolution in wheat and rice, white revolution in milk, yellow revolution in oilseed and the “blue revolution” in fisheries have augmented the food basket of the country. Be that as it may, numerous technological difficulties remain. In the first place, in spite of the shrinking share (23%) of the agricultural sector in the economy, most of the labour force (about 60%) keeps on relying upon agribusiness. Around 75% of India's needy individuals with low buying power live in rural area and about 60% of the cultivated area is under rainfed farming (Gautam *et al.* 2007) [2]. A major farming community of India comes under small and marginal farming community, where the size of land holding is very low to achieve the standards of livelihood. Agriculture is the mainstay of the Indian economy, as it constitutes the backbone of the rural livelihood security system. In India small farms have been the mainstay for food security and labour employment in India. Despite their significance in providing food security, family labour employment and economy in management and high productivity per acre, small farms face a few challenges particularly in the wake of globalization and WTO dispensation (Maxwell and Frankenberger, 1992) [4]. With rising population, declining land-man ratio and increasing automation in farm operations, agriculture unaided is not able to provide enough income and employment to households in India. Amalgamation of farm enterprises provides better source of revenue in terms of increased food production, higher net income, improved productivity, and reduced income imbalance between agricultural labourer and urban factory worker.

Correspondence

Saurabh Arya

Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management, Chaudhary Charan
Singh, Haryana Agricultural
University Hisar, Haryana,
India

Introduction of appropriate farming systems has been proposed as one of the approaches to achieve better growth in agriculture and livelihood (National Commission on Farmers, 2005) [2]. Rural people depend on more than one resource and more than one activity for earning their livelihoods. A poor household will raise food security enhancing crops on a small piece of land, rear livestock animals, and migrate to cities as unskilled labour. A landless family may work as farm labour and construction labour, and may also make bidis or agarbattis etc. Another family may lease in land for agriculture and seasonally migrate to Punjab to work as farm labour or to Gujarat to work on brick kilns and so on. Around three quarters of the world's farmers cultivate small plots of land; India is the land of marginal and small farmers constituting more than 80 per cent. According to agricultural census 2011, the small and marginal holdings taken together (below 2.00 ha.) constitute 84.97 per cent in 2010-11 against 83.29 per cent in 2005-06. Small and marginal farmers are the people for whom farming is a major livelihood activity, they feed the whole country but are still hungry. They face insecurity of tenure, threats of land alienation, growing forces of urbanization and industrialization and constraints in the process of cultivations in the growing agricultural value chain. They owned tiny parts of lands as mostly unirrigated, fragmented which can be termed as unviable economical land holdings as it is noticed that the zeal and enthusiasm among the farmers are reducing as they don't want to be a farmer if given an opportunity elsewhere but unfortunately there is no scope to flourish in other sectors because they lack all types of resources whether land, capital and skills which is highly demanded in other sectors of the economy. Agriculture plays a pivotal role in the Indian economy. Small holdings agriculture is important for raising agriculture growth, food security and livelihoods in India. Therefore, the future of sustainable agriculture growth and food security in India depends on the performance of small and marginal farmers. Agricultural Census data shows that there were about 121 million agricultural holdings in India in 2000-01. Of which 99 million were small and marginal farmers. Small and marginal farmers account for more than 80% of total farm hectares, but their share in operated area is around 44%. Despite the belief that employment leads to women's empowerment, there is very little research that empirically tests this relationship. It is against this background the present study has been undertaken with the objective to explore livelihood capabilities of farm families in the Ambala division of Haryana state.

Methodology

The study was conducted in Haryana state. Haryana state has been divided into four division- Ambala, Hisar, Rohtak and Gurgoun divisions. The present study was conducted in Ambala division which comprises of five district viz., Ambala, Kaithal, Kurukshetra, Panchkula and Yamunanagar out of five districts, two districts from Ambala division that is Ambala and Yamunanagar were selected randomly. One block from each district namely sadhora from Yamunanagar district and Nargard from Ambal district were selected randomly. Two villages' that is Rajpur and nashera from sadhora block and badi ujjal and sain majra were selected from nareingarh block randomly. From the selected villages a sample of 75 small and marginal farm families were drawn randomly. Thus a total of 300 respondents were selected randomly as a sample for the present study. Data were collected by the investigator with help of pre structure interview schedule. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean

score, overall mean score, co-relation coefficient were applied to draw the inferences from the collected data.

Results and Discussion

Human capital of farm families

Age of members in the Household

Table 1 Shows that in Ambala district more than half of the respondents (50.27%) were in the age group of 25-50 years followed by 34.69 per cent in less than 25 years and 15.03 per cent in more than 50 years categories respectively. In Yamuna Nagar district less than fifty per cent (46.79%) were in the age of 25-50 years followed by 35.51 per cent in less than 25 years and 17.69 per cent in more than 50 years category. In pooled sample less than fifty per cent of the respondents (48.40 %) were in the category of 25-50 years followed by less than 25 years (35.13%) and more than 50 years (16.47%) respectively. It was reported that the economically active members in family shows that in both the districts more than half of the respondents families (63.00%) had up to 2 economically active members, followed by 3 to 4 economically active members (36.00%) and only 1.00 per cent of the families were found to have more than 4 economically active members and 85.00 per cent of families were not having any kind of disease in terms of disability, only one disable member was found in 14.67 per cent families and very few 0.67 per cent had two disabled members in their families. It was also further reported that in both the districts 34.00 per cent of farm families had less than 2 members who were migrated to earn wages while 61.33 per cent families had no member migrated and 4.67 per cent farm families had more than 2 members migrated to earn wages. Most of the respondent's families, 88.67 per cent had no member died below 60 years of age. Ten per cent of the families reported more than two members and 1.33 per cent families had less than 2 members who died below 60 years of age. In Ambala district 54.00 per cent of the respondents were having low family education status followed by medium (36.00%) and high (10.00%) education status. In Yamunanagar district, 56.00 per cent of the respondents were having low family education status followed by medium and high education status (30.00% and 14.00% respectively), respectively. From pooled sample in both district 55.00 per cent of the respondents were having low family education status followed by medium and high education status (33.00% and 12.00%), respectively. Further it was reported that families in Ambala district indicated that in 72.00 per cent families, no members had received any kind of vocational training, followed by 19.33 per cent families in which less than 2 members and in (8.67%) families more than 2 members had received training. In Yamunanagar district (65.33%) respondent's families were not receiving any kind of vocational training followed by more than 2 members receiving training (27.33%) and less than 2 members (7.33%) respectively. In pooled sample (68.67%) of the respondents were not receiving any kind of vocational training followed by more than 2 members receiving training (23.33%) and less than 2 members (8.00%) receive training respectively. 67.67 per cent respondents were less skilled in terms of traditional skill possession (related to health, medicine and indigenous knowledge) followed by somewhat skilled (32.33%) respondents respectively and more than half of the respondents (54.00%) had good occupational knowledge followed by excellent and poor knowledge by 27.33 per cent and 18.67 per cent respectively. Human capitals of farm families include age of household member, economically

active member, disabled members, migrated members, family education, vocational trainings received and duration of training etc. More than fifty percent farms families in both the districts had low family education status and majority of the respondent families had not received any vocational training and traditional skills but more than half of the respondents had good occupational knowledge. The findings of present

study are in confirmation with the findings of Hunter *et al.* (2012) [3] and Jodha (2018). Findings of present study is in line with the findings of Ramachandani and Karmakar (2014) observed that due to the lack of irrigation amenities and practice of utilization traditional methods in agriculture led to low yield causing a forced migration to the nearby urban area.

Table 1: Human Capital of farm families

Sr. No.	Variables	Ambala (n=150)		Yamunanagar (n=150)		Total (N=300)	
		f	%	F	%	f	%
1.	Age of members in the household 732 859 1591						
	Less than 25 years	254	34.69	305	35.51	559	35.14
	25-50 years	368	50.27	402	46.79	770	48.40
	More than 50 years	110	15.03	152	17.69	262	16.47
2.	Economically active members						
	Uptp 2 members	106	70.66	83	55.33	189	63.00
	3-4 members	44	29.33	64	42.66	108	36.00
	> 4	-	-	3	3.00	3	1.00
3.	Disabled members in the family						
	Nil	115	76.67	140	93.33	255	85.00
	One	34	22.67	10	6.67	44	14.67
	Two	1	.66	-	-	1	.33
4.	Family members migrate to earn wages						
	>2 members	14	9.33	-	-	14	4.67
	< 2 members	49	32.67	53	35.33	102	34.00
	No members	87	58.00	97	64.67	184	61.33
5.	Members died below 60 years						
	>2 members	-	-	4	2.67	4	1.33
	<2 members	28	18.67	2	1.33	30	10
	No member	122	74.66	144	96.00	266	88.67
6.	Family education status						
	Low (up to 3)	81	54.00	84	56.00	165	55.00
	Medium (3-5)	54	36.00	45	30.00	99	33.00
	High (above 5)	15	10.00	21	14.00	36	12.00
7.	Vocational training received by family members						
	>2 members	13	8.67	11	7.33	24	8.00
	<2 members	29	19.33	41	27.33	70	23.33
	Nil	108	72.00	98	65.33	206	68.67
8.	Duration of training (N=42) (N=52) (N=94)						
	0-3 months	26	61.90	39	75.00	65	69.14
	4- 6 months	11	26.19	13	25.00	24	25.53
	Above 6months	5	11.90	-	-	5	5.31
9.	Traditional skills possessed						
	Highly skilled	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Somewhat skilled	55	36.67	42	28.00	97	32.33
	Less skilled	95	63.33	108	72.00	203	67.67
10.	Occupational knowledge						
	Excellent	33	22.00	49	32.67	82	27.33
	Good	88	58.67	74	49.33	162	54.00
	Poor	29	19.33	27	18.00	56	18.67

Access and utilization of government services

The findings in Table 2 depicts that in pooled sample a considerable percentage of the respondents had access to *anganwadi* (91.66) followed by *panchayat* (88.00 per cent, bank 82.66 per cent, CHC/PHC (69.33%), private hospitals/

clinics (57.00%) respectively. It was also reported that more than half of the respondents (56.67%) had easy accessibility to government/ social organization followed by (43.33%) respondents who had accessibility with some difficulty to the organizations.

Table 2: Access and utilization of government services by farm families

Sr. No.	Variables	Ambala (n=150)		Yamunanagar (n=150)		Total (N=300)	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Access to government/ social organization*						
	<i>Anganwadi</i>	134	89.33	141	94.00	275	91.66
	<i>Panchayat</i>	127	84.67	137	91.33	264	88.00
	CHC/PHC	89	59.33	119	79.33	208	69.33
	Banks	112	74.66	136	90.66	248	82.66
	Private hospital/Clinics	73	48.66	98	65.66	171	57.00

2.	Level of Access						
	Easily accessible	55	36.67	115	76.67	170	56.67
	Accessible with some difficulty	95	63.33	35	23.33	130	43.33
	Not accessible	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.	Awareness about government schemes						
	High	18	12.00	15	10.00	33	11.00
	Medium	79	52.67	87	58.00	166	55.33
	Low	53	35.33	48	32.00	101	33.67
4.	Utilization of government services*						
	MNREGA	84	56.00	102	68.00	186	62.00
	<i>Atal Pension Yojana</i>	91	60.66	111	74.00	202	67.33
	<i>PM Fasal Bima Yojana</i>	112	74.66	104	69.33	216	72.00
	<i>Kisan Credit Card</i>	89	59.33	86	57.33	175	58.33
	<i>Agri. Extension Services</i>	21	14.00	13	8.66	34	11.33
	<i>Mid Day Meal</i>	79	51.97	114	76.00	193	64.33
	<i>Skill India</i>	43	28.66	37	24.66	80	26.33
5.	Level of Utilization						
	Most often	23	15.33	29	19.33	52	17.33
	Often	88	58.67	73	48.67	161	53.67
	Never	39	26.00	48	32.00	87	29.00

The results also indicate that in both districts, 72.00 per cent of the respondents had utilization of *PM Fasal Yojana* followed by *Atal Pension Yojana* (67.33%), *Mid Day Meal* (64.33%), *MNREGA* (62.00%), *Kisan Credit Card* (58.33%), *Skill India* (26.33%) and *Agricultural Extension Services* (11.33%) respectively, and in both the districts, 53.67 per cent respondents often utilized the services of government organizations followed by never (29.00%) and most often (17.33%) respectively. It was also reported that considerable percentage of the respondents had access to *anganwadi*, accessibility to government/ social organization and medium awareness about government schemes. It was also reported that most of the respondents utilizes *PM Fasal Yojana*, *Atal Pension Yojana*, *Mid day meal*, *MNREGA*, *KCC* and *Skill India* respectively. The findings of present study did not coincide with the findings of Sharma (2011) ^[7] to reported that many farmers did not know about *KCC*, crop insurance schemes. Jodha (2014) reported that most of the rural respondents had awareness about government schemes but utilization was low or medium about different schemes in Bikaner district.

Conclusion

It was concluded from the study that majority of the families had not received any kind of vocational training was possessed less traditional skill and good occupational knowledge. Regarding human capital of farm family's mass of the household had at least two economically active members in their family and no family members migrated to other place to earn livelihood. The respondents were having medium awareness about government schemes. So, its need to make the awareness among the rural farmer regarding the trainings, imparting skills and the benefits of the government schemes.

References

1. Chand R, Lakshmi Prasanna, Aruna Singh. Farm size and productivity: Understanding the strengths of smallholders and improving their livelihoods, *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2011; 46:26-27.
2. Gautam US, Paliwal DK, Naberia S. Improvement in Livelihood Security for Small and Marginal Farmers through Front Line Demonstrations on Oilseed and Pulse Crops in Central India, *Indian Research. Journal of Extension Education*. 2007; 7(1):1-5

3. Hunter M, Dickinson T, Nawrotzki R. Rural livelihoods and access to natural capital: Differences between migrants and non-migrants in Madagascar. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 2012; 201:15-18,
4. Maxwell S, Frankenberger T. *Household Food Security: Concepts, Indicators and Measurements: A Technical Review*. New York and Rome: UNICEF and IFAD, 1992.
5. Raman Jodha, Manju Dahiya. Livelihood Problems of Small and Marginal Farm Families in Rural Areas of Haryana State. *International. Journal of Current. Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2018; 7(01):1624-1629.
6. Ramchandani R, Karmarkar P. Sustainable Rural Livelihood Security in the Backward Districts of Maharashtra. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014; 133:265-278.
7. Sharma L. Kissan credit card scheme: An Analysis since inception, *Southern Economist*. 2011; 49(20):5-7.