

STUDY ON GROWTH OF RURAL NON-FARM EMPLOYMENT FOR SELECTED DISTRICT OF HARYANA

FINAL REPORT

PLANNING COMMISSION

GOVT. OF INDIA, NEW DELHI

CENTRE FOR RESEARCH, PLANNING AND ACTION

16, DAKSHINESHWAR, 10-HAILEY ROAD, NEW DELHI – 110 001

Tel.: 3326955, 3355170 Fax: (91) (11) 3329216

e-Mail : spahuja@nde.vsnl.net.in

: vermamc@bol.net.in

MARCH, 2002

CONTENTS

S.No.	Description	Page No.
	Executive Summary	I - III
1.	Introduction	1 - 6
2.	Scope, Coverage & Methodology	7 - 11
3.	Literature Survey and some findings of the recent Studies of Rural Non-farm Employment	12 - 16
4.	Primary Survey Results and Data Sheet of District <u>Bhiwani (Table 4.1 to 4.18)</u>	17 - 45
5.	Primary Survey Results and Data Sheet of District <u>Kurukshetra (Table 5.1 to 5.18)</u>	46 - 74
6.	Major Findings	75 - 80
7.	Recommendations	81 - 83

REFERENCES

ANNEXURES

A to I-D

I-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- ❖ The two selected districts, one in the western and the other in eastern region of Haryana, show rather different picture of Non-farm employment and its growth between 1997-98 and 2001-2002. The agriculturally advanced Kurukshetra district showed much higher rate of growth of Non-farm employment than Bhiwani - higher than 3-4 percent growth of labour force over the period as per latest NSSO Round.
- ❖ The village level data expected of village functionaries in terms of population, labour force, employment and Non-farming employment did not materialize in terms of precise figures for the 2 periods. Whatever information could be gathered from them indicates rise of Non-farm employment between the two periods. However, the utilization of Special employment schemes by families/individuals fell from the year 1997-98 to the most recent period. Though loss of memory over the last 3-4 years could be a factor, the differences are so significant that reduction in employment through the Special employment schemes has to be accepted. The local explanations generally were that more and more outside labour is getting benefit of the Special employment schemes, operated more and more through contractors. It also appears that since these outside workers were more needy/poor, the village officials utilized their presence to benefit themselves personally as well..
- ❖ The employment data or man-days collected from individuals was similar to the data collected from the households and clearly showed the following most important Non-farm activities, namely; Animal Husbandry, Construction and Trade. Manufacturing was hardly important. Mining/quarrying was a significant activity only in Bhiwani district. The physical infrastructure including roads etc. are not significantly different and there was evidence of decline of Farm-based employment in both districts – more in Kurukshetra than Bhiwani district.
- ❖ The public sector roadways network has not expanded in either district in recent years and so also the quality of roads to the villages under study. Only a few villages did not have enough electricity but drinking water and water in general was a problem in many of them. Though the overall quality/availability of different components of infrastructure in the two districts was not very different, the Kurukshetra district appear to have a slight edge overall. However, there were no signs of any distress or serious poverty anywhere. This tallies with the fact of induction of more and more outside labour for a number of special employment programmes through the local Surpanches.
- ❖ There were other differences noticed between the two districts in terms of employment potential of different sectors. Kurukshetra shows much higher prosperity, paddy cultivation, processing and greater mechanization, especially in the recent period. However, utilization of agri.equipment on the one side and similar transport vehicles on the other has picked up in both districts with consequential increase in employment relating to use of such equipment/vehicles. As regards operation of pull and push factors at village level affecting different components of Non-farm employment, there was hardly any evidence of clean shifting of individuals from Non-farm to farm activity over the three-year period of study. However, there was better evidence of shifting of persons from farm to Non-farm activities which tallies with evidence of decline in farm-based employment mentioned earlier. There was also

clear evidence of the desire of a lot of people to make the shift even if in reality they have not made it so far.

- ❖ The related issue was expectations from authorities about support for Non-farm activities/ employment. There was clear evidence of peoples' demand from their Government for providing monetary as well as technical support for industries - village, small or medium. Some support is available from the scheme SGSY which provides mix of credit and subsidy for self-employment ventures. Apparently, the individual respondents were not satisfied with the nominal increases in the allocations under this scheme in recent years and in any case, the visual evidence and discussions of the survey team supports the view that manufacturing has not picked up anywhere. A related piece of evidence comes from the suggestions made by individuals on vocational education/training since only around 5% respondents demand improvements in this HRD sector. One can infer that in the absence of manufacturing/ modern industries, HRD in rural areas could hardly be in demand.
- ❖ Kurukshetra district showed evidence of employment of many more people in restaurants and trade. However, there was clear evidence growth in the non-Government services in both districts but much more in the agriculturally advanced Kurukshetra. There was also more evidence of opening of schools, clinics, nursing homes and even private training facilities as well as English medium schools.
- ❖ There was clearly greater growth of such Non-Govt. services in Kurukshetra over the three years span than in not so prosperous Bhiwani. There was also clearer evidence of higher growth of animal husbandry in Kurukshetra than in Bhiwani which is relateable to higher level of farm production in that district. This is despite the lack of any formal dairying establishments in villages in the either of the districts surveyed. But, rural towns indicated existence of dairying establishments more in Kurukshetra than Bhiwani.
- ❖ While the overall literacy rate for the two districts is between 68 and 69 per cent, there was greater differentiation in the literacy rates of respondents between the six villages of Bhiwani and that of Kurukshetra. The Kurukshetra villages, in fact, showed the literacy rates higher by almost 10% compared to the Bhiwani villages. This tallies with other evidence of larger number of individuals found pursuing higher education in Kurukshetra as well as lower number of persons taking advantage of special employment schemes though over the most recent period, both districts showed much less utilization of these schemes. Thus, there was clearer evidence of higher agricultural productivity, higher utilization of Non-Government services, more providers of education, training and health services in Kurukshetra. There was, however, no evidence of urban industrial development in Kurukshetra encouraging higher growth of rural industries in the six sample villages. The recently conducted Economics Census (1998) for all districts tends to give the impression that in the rural areas of both districts the number of non-agricultural establishments is rather small.
- ❖ One of the major points which could not be settled by the primary survey supplemented by secondary data, was whether there was sufficient evidence to infer that the greater interest of rural respondents of Haryana in the Non-farm sector was due to excess population pressure on strictly limited land resources and, therefore, by force or whether the higher interest was due to other factors, i.e., autonomous. While there is some evidence that people are interested in the Non-farm sector due to its

higher income potential and higher ranking of modern industry, whether small or medium, it is insufficient to come to a definite conclusion. The rural respondents of course, have demanded Government assistance for encouraging setting up of industries – some thing already discussed earlier – but have made no detailed suggestions even at the level of village, block or district officials. On the other hand, they have admittedly shown ignorance of the market forces and the limited role of the Government in a liberalized economy. Also, lack of interest shown in financial services including Insurance does not augur well for the development of an autonomous Non-farm sector/employment. It has, therefore, been recommended that fresh incentives for modern small industries as well as agro-processing should be worked out and the Government of Haryana/India should definitely intervene. Small industries around Gurgaon and Sonapat do not seem to be pushing similar initiatives from entrepreneurs elsewhere in Haryana, including the two sample districts. On the other hand, the Textile industry/spinning mills seem to be in difficulties and are not adding to employment. All this experience justifies fresh incentives for rural industrialization.

- ❖ The construction sector though important for rural respondents, is also not proving sufficiently attractive for transfer of farm labour to the Non-form side. With a rush of incentives for house construction at the level of Government of India, the rural labour of Haryana could have taken advantage of the huge Delhi market for the purpose. Since it has not happened, a least based on the experience of the two sample districts, it has been recommended that the rural labour interested in construction should be upgraded in skills not merely through the Government sector, ITIs and vocational schools but also through privately run training institutions with flexible skills development courses. Since the semi-skilled and unskilled labour market of Delhi has already been flooded with such labour from other poorer parts of the country, the Haryana labour can take advantage of the new openings only through up-graded skills which alone can justify higher wages than what the outside labour is asking for. In fact, the greater entry of outside labour into Haryana construction sector through special employment schemes and otherwise, leaves no other way for rural labour of Haryana aspiring for higher wages except through this route of skill upgradation/higher productivity

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Employment and unemployment situation continues to be a great source of worry in the country despite 10 years of liberalisation and more than 6 years of WTO agreements touching practically all sectors of economic activity, including Agriculture. By now it is well-known that there has not been commensurate growth of employment with reference to the relatively rapid economic growth in the 1990s. In the early 1990s there was a lot of discussion on a ten-year plan for eradication of unemployment and severe under-employment. The National Development Council meeting of September, 1992 discussed the issue at some length and it was pointed out that diversification of rural economy and growth of non-farm employment was the single most important means of solving the problem of rural areas and rural poverty. Some studies were also conducted on the subject and the topic remains as important now as it was in the early 1990s especially in view of the fact that all the recent evidence from the NSSO surveys indicate rapid decline in the rate of growth of the Organized sector, mainly non-farm and even relatively low growth of agricultural employment in the economy. At the 1-digit level, recent evidence in fact, points to a decline in employment under Agriculture and Mining/Quarrying. On the other hand, there has been relatively rapid growth in services employment, both in the urban and rural areas. The growth of employment in informal manufacturing has also been generally good, both in the urban and rural areas.

1.2 Context of Study : As mentioned above, the National Development Council in 1992 debated the issue of growth of non-farm employment as relevant to the development of rural areas. The basic report of the Committee on Employment presented to the National Development Council in Sept. 1992 stated that “it must be recognized that in the long run, agriculture and other land-based activities would not be able to provide employment to all the rural workers at adequate levels of incomes. Further, technological and organisational changes accompanying agricultural growth are likely to lead to (i) a declining employment potential of crop production and (ii) conversion of a substantial number of those underemployed in agriculture into openly unemployed, seeking work elsewhere”.

1.3 It was also noted in the above mentioned document that “non-farm employment has already occupied more than 1/5th of the rural workers and that it has been growing rapidly. Over one-fifth of the rural workers are engaged in non-agricultural activities. This proportion has shown a rapid increase in recent years. Available evidence suggests that this shift is attributable to the growth of productive employment opportunities in the non-farm sector in rural areas, and is not a result merely of the overcrowding in agriculture”..... “An increasingly larger component of rural industrial activities now consist of non-traditional activities with forward and backward linkages with agriculture as well as those with little relation with agriculture. Unlike many traditional village industries which constituted only secondary or supplementary occupations, these activities are pursued as main occupations.”

1.4 The 8th Five Year Plan had mentioned clearly that eradication of unemployment and substantial under-employment should be achieved within a period of 10 years. This Plan was prepared in the context of the liberalisation and opening of the Indian economy by Dr. Manmohan Singh through the budgets of July 1991 and Feb./March 1992. Integration of Indian economy with the rest of the world was expected to be one of the main objectives of the programme of opening up/liberalisation/globalisation of economy. However, it was also noted that the Govt.’s resources for further expenditures directly were limited in the context of IMF conditionalities in the wake of the 1990-91 Gulf Crisis, external debt servicing problems

etc. The problems of funding food procurement at higher and higher levels, especially from the states of Punjab, Haryana and Western UP have been aggravated over the last 8/9 years i.e. all through the Eighth and Ninth Plans. Governments of various hues have remained worried about the continuing levels of unemployment and under-employment, specially in the rural areas even though recent evidence indicates that there has been a decline in poverty ratios both in the urban and rural areas. Since the growth of labour force in the rural areas has been much higher than the growth of employment under Agriculture, it is obvious that more and more persons have moved out to non-agricultural employment even in the rural areas. Whether this employment has been voluntary or involuntary due to excessive pressure on the existing land resources by the already agriculturally dependent population is important but is not a subject of this study. What is being attempted through this study is to understand the utilization of rural labour force under various economic activities which could even include movement out of rural areas into urban areas.

1.5 According to the Ninth Plan document rural non-farm sector, which accounted for a steadily rising share of the rural workforce (from about 15 percent in 1978 to 22 percent in 1987-88 and 23 percent in 1993-94), has registered a rate of employment growth of around 5 percent between 1987-88 and 1993-94. There is certainly a discernible shift in the growth structure of productive employment opportunity in the non-farm sector in the rural areas. This phenomenon cannot be treated as over-crowding in agriculture. Practically all non-farm activities have shown a steady increase in employment. Manufacturing and services respectively accounted for 31 and 27 percent of rural non-agricultural employment; trade accounted for 20 percent and construction 12 percent in 1993-94. Manufacturing has shown about 1 percent growth in employment during 1988-94. But Services and Transport & Trade have shown an annual growth in employment of about 4.3 and 3 percent per annum respectively, during this period. According to the Ninth Plan, diversification and expansion of the rural economy particularly non-farm sector is possible through promotional policies and efforts particularly in respect of infrastructure, improved access to credit, technological upgradation and training in entrepreneurial development and marketing support.

1.6 The Ninth Plan also saw quite a bit of activity on the rural development side. A number of new schemes have been started and revamping of the earlier schemes has taken place. Currently, the following schemes are in existence, funded either fully or more than 50% by the Central Govt. These are shown below in the form of tables made out of data available from various plan documents, for the years 1997-98 and 2000-01. The first table gives the national level situation while the one placed immediately below that gives Haryana picture (in somewhat greater details). It would be seen that the schemes under implementation either at the national level or at the state level/Haryana are more or less, the same with some changes/adjustments. On the other hand, it is also clear that some schemes have been merged while others have been discontinued e.g. TRYSEM while others have been merged or re-named. Even this is not a story of all the rural development schemes as there could be local area development schemes specific to a region or district. These schemes are not reflected in the first table. Further some development schemes like PMRY & KVIC and the latest scheme of Pradhan Mantri Gram Sarak Yojana are rather recent and were not in existence in the year 1997-98 for which also this study has collected comparative data to try to understand the growth in employment between now and 3 years back. Details of the methodology to be used for this study are, however, covered in subsequent chapters.

1.7 The study assigned to CERPA also looks at detailed configuration of the employment situation in the two selected districts, two blocks in each district, three villages under each block i.e. a total of 12

villages distributed equally over Bhiwani and Kurukshetra for the last 12 months (reference date 15th Sept 2001) and similarly, 12 months in 1997-98 (reference date 15th Sept. 1998) 1998, same season.

1.8 Several employment-generating schemes are being implemented in Haryana including districts of Bhiwani and Kurukshetra, to provide employment opportunities to men and women in the age group of 18-60 years. These programmes/schemes are as under:

- (a) Swaran Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) - This is a poverty alleviation programme covering all aspects of self-employment such as organization of the poor into self-help groups, training, credit, technology, infrastructure and marketing. The objective of this scheme is to bring every assisted family above the poverty line within three years. The target group under this scheme consists of small and marginal farmers, rural artisans, agricultural and non-agricultural labourers living below the poverty line. In both the districts, this scheme is making an impact on providing employment to the target groups.
- (b) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY/JGSY) - This is ment for providing wage/self-employment to rural unemployed persons through implementation of identified rural works besides generation of supplementary employment for the unemployed poor in the rural areas. This programme is being implemented at the village level through Gram Panchayats. This has been revised and renamed as JGSY.
- (c) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS/RGY) - This primary objective of this scheme is creation of additional wage employment opportunities during the period of acute shortage of wage employment through manual work for the rural poor. The secondary objective is the creation of durable community social and economic areas for sustained employment and development. Under this scheme conservation of soil moisture, minor irrigation, augmentation of ground water, link roads, other labour oriented works as per felt need of the areas are taken up in this scheme, specially in the district of Bhiwani which has water problem in the area. Under this scheme, there is a provision to provide minimum 100 days of employment per year for casual/manual labour during the lean agricultural season. This scheme was reported upon in our Hindi Questionnaire by its Hindi synonym - Rozgar Guarantee Yojana (RGY).
- (d) Pradhan Mantri Gram Sarak Yojana (PMGSY) - This programme has been launched by the Government of India, during the year 2000-2001. The primary focus of the program is the construction of the new roads besides upgradation of existing roads for achieving connectivity through good all weather roads. The programme covers all district roads and village roads. This scheme while providing employment opportunities to the rural poor at the village, block and district level, if improving infrastructure in the area of transport and mobility.

**Year wise of Allocation/Expenditure of National Poverty Alleviation
Programmes from 1997-98 to 2000-2001 (Rs. in crore)**

Name of the scheme	Year of Initiation	Allocation in 1997-98	Expenditure in 1997-98	Allocation in 1999-2000
1. Integrated Rural Development Prog.	2-10-1980	1133.51	1109.54	1260
2. TRYSEM	15-8-179	90.00 lakh	80.74 lakh	-
3. DWRCA	1982-83	4145.43 lakh	-	-
4. MWS		559.09	462.83	
4. Jawahar Rojgaar Yojana	4-1989	2872.03 cr,	2451.65 cr.	-
5. Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	1-4-1999	-	-	1000.00
6. Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana	1-4-1999	-	-	2205
7. Employment Assurance Scheme	2-10-1993	2460.48	2904.97	2432
8. Indira Awas Yojana	1-4-1999	-	-	2132
9. Development Programmes				
PMRY				465.00
KVIC				20.93
a. DADP*	1973-74	10.00	183.50 lakh	190
b. DDP	1977-78	70.00	-	135.00
c. IWDP	1989-90	74.50	53.00	480.00

Source: Annual Plan 2000-2001, Govt. of India; Mid term appraisal of Ninth Plan (1997-2002) and other Sources

* DADP - Drought Prone Area Programme DDP- Desert Development Programme
IWDP - Integrated Wasteland Development Programme

HARYANA

Centrally Sponsored Schemes on Sharing Basis from 1997-98 to 2000-2001, Outlay & Expenditure and Achievement during 9th & Annual Plan (Rs.in Lakh)										
		Ninth Plan 1997-2002			Annual Plan 1997- 98	Achie ve- ment	Annual Plan 1999- 00	Achiev e-ment	Annual Plan 2000-01	Achiev e-ment
		CS	SS	Target/ Achievem ent (Lakh/ Mandays)						
1	IRDP & Allied (Now SGSY)									
(i)	IRDP	4270	4270		812					
(ii)	TRYSEM Training	500	500		71					
(iii)	TRYSEM Infrastructure	65	65		15					
(iv)	DWCRA	640	640		189					
	Total (SGSY)	5475	5475	1.50/ 0.42 (upto 2000)	1087	10853	1963	14618 manday s	1540	13392 manday s
2	DPAP(Now DDP)	1470	490	-	161	-	223	-	500	-
3	JRY (Now JGSY)	-	-	80/ 57	-	16 Lakh manday s	2667	17 lakh manday s	2760	13 lakh mandays
4	Employment Assurance Scheme/RGY	3700	9250	275/96	2871	55 lakh manday s	4335	23 lakh manday s	3100	11 lakh mandays
	Total	10645	15215	-	4119	-	9188	-	7900	-

CS-Central Share SS - State Share

Source: Approved Annual Plan 2000-2001, Govt. of Haryana

1.9 The Govt. of India has placed a lot of confidence in the ability of the economy in general to generate a lot of employment both in the urban and rural areas autonomously by the sheer forces of rapid economic growth distributed over various sectors of economy. The Prime Minister had asked for a Programme for generating 10 million jobs a year in 1999 and under his instructions a Task Force Mr. M.S.

Ahluwalia, Member Planning Commission had been set up to examine the entire issue and make recommendations. The Ahluwalia Task Force has already submitted its report to the Govt. in mid-2001. The Task Force has expressed its faith in favour of autonomous growth of employment in both urban and rural areas based on the economic growth scenario of the 9th Plan and the up-coming 10th Plan. No data on the likely growth of rural non-farm employment are, however, available from this Task Force or the Planning Commission. No such projections are either available from the Govt. of Haryana or any Govt. supported institutions. Therefore, the current study is expected to throw new light on the ground situation, as will be revealed in the subsequent chapters.

1.10 Some of the official key results of the NSSO 55th Round for the year 1999-2000 have recently become available, but at the aggregated level of the states and comparison between results of this Round and the Round for 1993-94 would in any case, take considerable time. The analysis of state level samples takes much longer and data at the district level is hardly available with sufficient assurance of accuracy. It was in this context that the Planning Commission has commissioned this study at the disaggregated levels in Haryana, in the nature of case studies. Haryana is one of the most agriculturally and industrially progressive states accounting for 2% of the total population of India and ranking 16th according to size of its population among 28 States and 7 Union Territories as per census 2001. Its population of 2.10 crores has 1.13 crores males and 0.97 crores females, distributed in 19 districts and 111 blocks. The state has an area of 44212 sq. km with a density of 477 persons per sq.km. Faridabad is the most densely populated district in the state having an average of 1020 persons per sqm while Sirsa has the lowest density of population as 260 persons per sq km. There are 861 females per 1000 males in Haryana much less than 933 females per 1000 males for All-India. The age group of 0-6 yrs constitute 15.46% of the total population, lower than in the 1991 census. The literacy rate is 68.59% in 2001 showing a strong improvement over 1991 census when it was 55.85%. The literacy rate both for males and females is comparatively higher than the national average of literacy rates.

1.11 With the mechanization of the agriculture there is a release of labour force through push factor which needs employment and these are the people who are looking for avenues in non-farm sector. Therefore, it becomes necessary to study the growth in non-farm sector through push and pull factors linkages between agricultural development and activities in non-farm sector as well as explore the avenues available in other areas. The impact of Govt. sponsored schemes by generating employment in non-farm sector opportunities coming up due to technological explosion in the area of information, communication and education as well as the expanding services sector by virtue of mechanization in agriculture transportation and media explosion.

1.12 To undertake this exercise in depth two districts, one agriculturally advanced i.e. Kurukshetra and other industrially advanced i.e. Bhiwani have been selected. To undertake primary survey in the district, block, village, household and individual worker level to study the impact and find out the potential of growth in non-farm sector. As there is a lot of secondary information available this also requires to be scanned, screened, compared and correlated with the information collected through primary survey extrapolated and interpolated to arrive at conclusions and recommendations for the study as a whole.

2. SCOPE, COVERAGE & METHODOLOGY

2.1 Scope

The scope of study is limited to the growth of rural non-farm employment in selected districts of Haryana i.e. Bhiwani and Kurukshetra.

2.1.1 Non-farm employment by definition pertains to sector where rural folks earn extra income by activities other than Agriculture. By and large most farmers have non-farm activities in the field of Animal husbandry, Poultry, Fisheries and related areas to some extent. But unless any activity other than agriculture involves member of family substantially by way of time spent or income derived such persons are considered engaged in the field of Non-farm activity. Further, there are considerable number of workers outside Agriculture or allied activities, in non-agricultural enterprises in rural areas. The study aims at understanding growth in Non-farm Employment over three years.

2.1.2 Impact of various welfare schemes sponsored by the Govt./ National and International agencies to increase employment in the non-farm activities have to be studied. Moreover, availability of natural resources, infrastructure facilities available in the districts, their strengths and weaknesses on the backward and forward linkages as well as push & pull factors (including growth of agricultural activities) also come under the purview and their impact on the growth of rural non-farm employment over 2 periods of time, 1997-98 and 2000-2001.

2.1.3 Constraints faced by the non-farm sector and the perception of target group involved in the area in tackling these problems their ideas and initiatives will also be considered so as to recommend appropriate policies for growth of rural non-farm employment.

Liberalization and technological interventions in the area of agriculture and other sectors of economy are affecting the life of people including rural areas. These have to be kept in mind as they have their impact on the shift from traditional to the new areas opened up by the concepts of information, communication and education in the areas of technology and growth of farm and industrial sector including non-farm sector.

Forward and backward linkages between the growth of agriculture and non-farm sector, conditions of workers engaged in rural non-farm activities vis-à-vis those engaged in agriculture and their impact on income and productivity also form a part of this study.

2.2 Objectives

The principal objectives of the Study are the following :

2.2.1 To test the hypothesis that the Govt. developmental assistance to rural areas has contributed to increase the employment opportunities outside the farming operations over the last 3 years.

2.2.2 To determine whether the increased non-farm employment is of stable nature or there are large fluctuations.

2.2.3 To study whether rural infrastructure and availability of natural resources and other facilities have strengthened/weakened the backward and forward linkages in non-farm employment vs Farm-employment as well as condition of workers, their income and productivity.

2.2.4 To study the constraints being faced by this sector and suggestions/recommendations in tackling the problems coming in the way of growth of rural non-farm employment.

2.2.5 Linkages between growth of agriculture and non-farm sector in rural areas.

2.2.6 Recommend appropriate policies for strengthening non-farm sector, especially with a view to alleviate rural unemployment or severe under-employment.

The age group covered is between 18-62 years and all non-farm activities over the last 12 months and similar 12 months 3 years back are covered under the study.

2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 To undertake the study, the two districts selected in Haryana are Bhiwani and Kurukshetra. In each district three blocks and in each block two villages have been selected. For this purpose it is proposed

(a) To list all the households in the villages and their current main economic/activities. This is to enable an understanding of the primary character of the villages in terms of their economic profile.

(b) To collect full information on current infrastructure available, including road, irrigation, power, education/skill development institutions, Mandis etc.

(c) To develop age, sex and social status profile of each of the selected household members potentially in the labour force i.e. those who are above 18 years in age but below 62 years, in the sample households selected on a random basis.

(d) To also work out education/training status of each of the household members as above.

(e) To find out the exact employment details on the basis of the Principal + subsidiary status definition on the basis of recall of activities of last 12 months. Similar details would be gathered for each member for a similar period, 3 years back. This would necessarily imply that such questions could be asked only from those who are over age 18 in the current year.

(f) On the basis of these two observations over the 2 periods, to assess extent of change of employment status with reference to non-farm economic activities in each village of the sample, and to what extent such changes therein could be attributed to any special natural phenomena or various schemes of rural development initiated/funded by the Govt.

2.3.2 Secondary information available from various sources on this subject will be scanned, analyzed and made use while studying the data collected from the field through primary survey. While primary data will be compiled, analyzed and results derived will be correlated with the secondary data available from various sources in relation to scope and objectives of this study as till date hardly any study has taken place in the state of Haryana to cover the above mentioned objectives. Thus, secondary data pertaining to the relevant objectives of the study will be made use of and their correlation will be worked out with the findings coming out of the primary data.

2.3.3 As would be noticed, the individual members of labour force as well as the head of the family are being asked to report on the nature of economic activities undertaken by them in the 12 months of 2000/2001 and the corresponding activities in the years 1997/1998. These have been classified into 11 categories as against 9 or 10 normally utilized for economic analysis. In addition, each worker when he answers questions about the economic activity, is also expected to tell the nature of work undertaken i.e. Regular, Casual (labour), Self-employed or Unpaid family work. In fact, this last category is a division of the category of self-employed but has been separated for the benefit of the women in Haryana who play an important role both in Agriculture as well as allied activities (classified by us under Non-farm Employment) and other activities. However, it is also expected that a number of males also perform unpaid labour if they are young or have a subsidiary status.

2.4 Sample Design

2.4.1 For the purpose of primary survey, three blocks in each district have been selected by random sampling. Similarly, two villages in each block were selected by random sampling. In every village, households were selected by stratified random sampling. The total sample size will be as under :

Districts	=	2
Block(Three blocks in each district)	=	3 x 2 = 6
Village(Two villages per block)	=	2 x 6 = 12
Household(100 households per village)=		100 x 12 = 1200
Three non-farm workers per household, on an average	=	3 x 1200 = 3600

2.4.2 Districts are already identified i.e. Bhiwani and Kurukshetra. The blocks selected in these districts were :

Districts	:	Bhiwani	Kurukshetra
Total No. of Blocks	:	9	5
Blocks selected are	:	Badhra, Dadri – II, Tosham	Babain, Pehowa, Thanesar

The villages selected in each block were the following

Bhiwani		Kurukshetra	
Block	Village	Block	Village
Dadri -	Charkhi & Kalyana	Thanesar -	Umri & Ameen
Badra -	Berla & Nandha	Pehowa -	Talehri & Bhateri
Tosham	Khanak & Sagwan	Babain -	Sanghor & Bidkalwa

2.5 Survey Instruments

2.5.1 For the purpose of primary study 4 questionnaires were developed to cover (1) district and block level data (2) village level data (3) household level data (4) non-farm worker data. These questionnaires by and large, cover details of their respective area, provide information on the level of education of the people involved, non-farm activities they are engaged in, infrastructure facilities available in the area, impact of Govt. schemes etc. The questionnaires are provided at Annexure-1-A to 1-D.

2.5.2 Since the main focus of the study is to understand the growth of Non-farm Employment, the questionnaire for the individuals takes off from the previous elaboration of various activities performed by an individual and by a series of probing questions tries to discover the number of days which the individual might have utilized under each activity, indicated earlier, over previous 12 months in the years 2000 & 2001 and similarly in the 12 months in the years 1997 and 1998. Memory loss is a factor in the village setting and in the pilot testing of the questionnaires it became quite clear that one can not depend on memory of the typical day for the same month 3-4 years back or even a typical week or month three years back. As a result, the sample questions had to fall back upon the concept of usual status employment spread over the previous 12 months either now or three years back. The general reference date for the two case studies, covering Bhiwani & Kurukshetra has been kept the same namely, September-end. It is expected that this being relatively lean period there would be much more males available for direct questioning and personal examination to improve the quality of responses. Even then, it is difficult to completely trust the memory of individuals, specially women of the household to such a large extent in the context of rather low rates of literacy of women in Haryana despite much better levels of income attained by the respective households.

2.5.3 The family as well as the individual questionnaires also include questions on activities performed by persons who may have been part of the family but go out for work less than 20 kms or more than that. Similarly, an attempt has been made to discover persons now in the family and performing economic activities but who had come back from the urban area. A similar question about persons who might have been member of the family earlier in the years 1997/1998, who have left the family and gone out to work in the urban areas. However, if they are not a member of the family in the sense of living together and eating from the same kitchen, they are not considered eligible for closer examination under our individual questionnaire. To this extent, our definition of Rural Non-farm Employment is quite wide but it still does

not include persons who have technically not been members of the family in the normal sense of the word.

2.5.4 As an added precaution, it was also decided after the pilot test survey, to engage more or less the same investigators in both the districts and avoid engaging new investigators. The supervisors for the study were also retained for both the districts. This was to ensure that the same quality of data is maintained alongwith the same understanding of the counting of days under each activity in both the districts. The Project Director visited himself both the districts at the start of each survey, provided the names of the villages selected randomly as well as the blocks to the investigators and the supervisors and even found time to visit a couple of villages in each District. It was hoped that all these precautions would ensure that the questionnaires received back would all be in order and any doubts about how to count days or hours etc. can be resolved right in the field. As it happened, the number of rejections of questionnaires on account of inconsistent or totally irrational responses was found to be the minimum.

2.5.5 The survey was conducted in end-September under well-trained supervisors drawn from CERPA. The survey in Bhiwani and Kurukshetra district work at the ground level concentrated on the household questionnaires on the one side and the individual members of the household falling under the target age group and also participating in non-farm activities. To begin with, each village was examined between the investigators and the supervisor and a list of households prepared from which to draw 100-120 households at random. After this the field investigators fanned out in the village to cover their respective zones under the broad supervision of the trained supervisors keeping in mind the fact that not only each sample household has to be examined in some details but also the basic information about economic activities performed by the household gets collected. The target individuals, within the specified age group and with participation in non-farm activities, were probed through a separate questionnaire for understanding their employment status. It was found that the average size of household varied between 3 and 10 while the members of the household within the target age group/economic activities varied from 1 to 5.

2.5.6. The training of Investigators was conducted both at CERPA and in the field, firstly in the very first village covered by the Survey Team in Bhiwani district in September 2001. After they return with the questionnaires, some important points came up during the scrutiny of the questionnaires. The Survey Team was, therefore, trained again since on it some new investigators as well, based on both the reading of the questionnaires and on the experience built up from the Bhiwani district survey. The Project Director himself participated in the training programme along-side the field supervisors who were expected to remain in the field along with the investigators. On several stages the Adviser, CERPA, also guided the Survey Team as well as the Project Director, especially in questions relating to the next use of team by individuals in the rural areas, e.g., opening both animal husbandry activity and household industry or some kinds of services. There were involved questions more in respect of female labour force and in the case of male labour force. Therefore, the investigators had to be cautioned in examining the female respondents and giving them more chance to point out other economic activities, which they were performing. Some of these questions continued in the field even after the first village was taken up for actual surveys.

3. LITERATURE SURVEY AND SOME FINDINGS OF THE RECENT STUDIES OF RURAL NON-FARM EMPLOYMENT

3.1 Sarvekshana. Vol.XX, No.1, 68th Issue, July – September 1996, National Sample Survey Organization, Department of Statistics, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation, Government of India

3.1.1 This important document explains the methodology used in the employment/ unemployment Surveys of the NSSO every five years at the national level. This particular document shows in the section on Conceptual framework the various definitions used in defining economic activities, classification of labour force by principal/subsidiary status and how employment data is collected through those surveys. The procedures and the methodology utilized by the NSSO are very important for any small-scale surveys like the current Surveys/study of two Haryana districts. The methodology used for the Current Survey/study is modeled on the corresponding methodology given in this document. At the time of designing of the questionnaires this was the best available document since the corresponding NSSO publication for the 55 Round was not yet released.

3.2 Annual Report of Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India , (2000 – 01)

3.2.1 This document gives, in considerable details the progress made under various rural developments schemes, including the employment oriented schemes for the year 2000-02. The data under different tables is for the period up to September or December 2000, not for the entire financial year. However, there is no specific discussion on the role of these schemes in generation of rural Non-farm employment though the employment generated under the employment oriented schemes is almost entirely of a Non-farm type.

3.3 Informal sector activities in rural areas – A methodological study, by Gujarat Institute of Development Research – September 1999

3.3.1 This study is basically a methodological study though towards the end it gives estimates of informal sector employment consisting of own account workers, employers of micro-enterprises and employees in the unregistered enterprises. It uses the classification of workers only in two categories, agri-workers or non-agri-workers. The category of non-agri-workers is pretty close to the category of Non-farm employment utilized in the current Survey/study. Though the study has indicated possible breakup of manufacturing under sub-categories like food, textiles, wood, clay products and other products, this kind of fine classification within manufacturing was not found feasible in the current Survey/study. Further, the study was confined to a particular period of 1999 and did not depend on recall of activities and employment in different sectors of a previous period say, three years back. The study gives the impression that if a limited time span is selected for study, in-depth investigations on various types of employment can be made in considerable details and separation of activities by different sub-sectors of the broad economic sectors would be possible.

3.4 Mid-term Appraisal of the Ninth Plan by Planning Commission, Govt. of India Released in 2001

3.4.1 This document was based on internal studies made by the Planning Commission which found a lot of weaknesses in various rural development/poverty alleviation programme. However, it does not discuss rural Non-farm employment as such in any significant manner. It has recommended a number of initiatives to plug the lacunae noticed in implementation of some employment oriented schemes and has suggested steps to prioritize use of EAS, JRY and other programmes. It has also pointed out & the need to strengthen the administrative mechanisms and improved transparency in implementation of such programmes.

3.5 Annual Plan (2000 – 01), Planning Commission, Govt. of India

3.5.1 This document indicates high priority for generation of productive employment in the country with focus on accelerated growth and accepting the important role played by agriculture in poverty reduction and employment generation effects. It lists the important poverty alleviation Programmes in rural areas as Swaran Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SJGSY), Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY), Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP), Rural Housing and other area development programmes like DPAP & DDP. A new initiative in the form of Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) was introduced in this year 2000–01. The focus of this Yojana was on creation of social and economic infrastructure specially in rural areas.

3.6 Workshop on Rural Transformation in India: The Role of Non-farm Sector– Planning Commission, Institute for Human Development, DFID & World Bank, Sept. 19-21, 2001

3.6.1 According to many studies presented in this Workshop, the employment situation has deteriorated most in the rural areas. Within the rural areas, the growth rate in employment in agriculture and allied activities has been extremely dismal it came down to 0.20 percent during 1993-94 to 1999-2000, from 2.16 percent during 1987-88 to 1993-94. The growth rates in constructions and transport, storage and communications have been 6.95 percent and 7.35 percent, respectively.

3.6.2 Although there was significant deceleration in the growth in employment in rural areas, the non-farm sector employment grew @ 2.34 percent during 1993-94 to 1999-2000 as against 2.04 percent during 1987-88 and 1993-94. This growth is less than half compared to the growth in rural non-farm employment achieved during 1983 and 1987-88 (5.23 percent). In terms of the proportion of total workers employed by Usual Principal Status (UPS) among total workers in the rural areas, the long-term trend shows that this ratio has been rising, from about 20 percent in 1983 to nearly 25 percent in 1999-2000.

3.6.3 The percentage of rural non-farm employment increased from 16.6 percent in 1977-78 to 23.88 percent in 1999-2000 - an increase of 7.2 percentage points over 22 years. During this period, there was 9.4 percentage points increase (from 19.3 to 28.7) in case of males, while females got an increase of 2.8

percentage points only (from 11.8 to 14.6), indicating less diversification in female employment. This is reflected in the larger percentage of female workers employed in agricultural activities as compared to male workers - more than 85 percent of females are employed as agricultural workers as against only about 71 percent for males.

3.6.4 It is noticed that construction, trade and transport are expanding at a faster rate in rural areas, whereas manufacturing activities are rather stagnating. In fact, the small increase in manufacturing activities has been exclusively due to female participation. At two-digit level, important sub-sectors which have large share in employment were: retail trade in food; beverages and tobacco; construction: personal services, public administration; textile products; educational services; land transport: and wood, wood products and furniture.

3.6.5 The expansion in the RNFS may create linkages of various types such as (i) backward linkages in the form of activities that service agriculture; (ii) forward production linkage (in terms of supply of raw material etc.); (iii) forward consumption linkages; (iv) forward investment linkages etc. When the linkages mentioned at (ii) and (iv) are found together, some sort of an agri-business could be a possible form of expansion in the RNFS.

3.7 Rural Industrialisation in India: ILO, Some Policy Perspectives, 2000

3.7.1 In terms of employment, there is evidence of an atrophying of rural manufacturing activities within RNFE, and a relative increase in the share of the trade, commerce and services sectors. These tend to show that rural survival and livelihood strategies have come to depend increasingly on non-farm labour performed increasingly beyond the village boundaries, generally in the local townships.

3.7.2 As regards a more market-friendly policy configuration, there has been increasing attention devoted to the promotion of the organisational form of the industrial clusters, whether in rural or urban locations. Such clusters enjoy high profile and visibility in theoretical and policy discourse at present. Thus the announcements concerning the launching of a National Programme of Rural Industrialisation treats the creation of new rural industrial clusters as the key policy instrument.

3.8 The Rural Non-Farm Sector : A Ray of Hope, Development Alternative (News letter), Vol.III No.2, Feb.2001

3.8.1 Owing to the uncertain nature of Indian agriculture, highly fragmented land holdings, rapidly growing labour force, and the low capital to labour ratio, it becomes imperative to open up more opportunities in rural non-farm sector to avoid the rising rural poverty. The rapid acceleration in the rural non-farm activities will generate additional employment opportunities for the rural poor. Consequently, the income level and capital to labour ration will improve.

3.8.2 The rural non-farm sector has created approximately 60 million jobs in the rural sector out of which 23 percent were women employees. The sector provides an export contribution of 68967.08 crores, more than 35 percent of the total exports of the country. A considerable portion of rural household income (25-35 percent) is contributed by the non-farm sector. The rural non-farm sector is primarily composed of

mining, construction, manufacturing and service sector. Although, the government is trying its best to promote the entrepreneurship in rural areas, the results are far from the desired.

3.9 Impact of Economic Liberalization on Rural Workers in India, ILO, T.Haque & D.P.A.Naidu, 1999

3.9.1 In 1991, non-farm rural workers constituted nearly 20 percent of the total rural workforce. The share of rural females in non-agricultural employment was 17.2 percent, while in the rural household-industry sector it was as high as 40 percent. The household industry workers comprised mainly handloom workers, beedi workers, carpet weavers, handicraft workers, potters, metalware workers and blacksmiths and other related categories. The non-farm rural workers seem to be as unorganized as the agricultural workers, with low bargaining power and low wage rates. Due to lack of access to institutional credit and marketing arrangements, rural artisans are exploited by intermediaries. Handicrafts alone provide employment to about 2.5 million rural artisans. As the National Commission on Rural Labour (Government of India, 1991) rightly put it, as the Green revolution bypassed agricultural labourers, so industrialization bypassed non-farm workers.

3.9.2 Certain categories of non-farm workers like beedi workers, leather workers, handloom workers and toddy tappers are relatively better organized than other categories of rural workers.

3.10 Report of the NDC Committee on Employment, (Sept.,1992)

3.10.1 Employment has grown at a relatively faster rate in urban areas than in rural areas. Within the rural areas, however, non-agricultural sector has registered a significantly high employment growth.

3.10.2 Animal Husbandry is an important activity with large potential for rural employment and income generation. Fisheries constitute another area whose potential for growth and employment has not been fully tapped so far. It is assessed that output from this sector can grow at 7 percent per annum as about two-thirds of the existing marine and inland potential is unexploited. Different items of agriculture-related activities have relevance for different States and regions, but a major thrust in the development of agri-business would particularly suit the States and regions with higher levels of agricultural productivity.

3.10.3 Steps to enhance economic efficiency of production and marketing support are important to make the agricultural sector contribute to more food production as well as higher incomes and productive employment in rural areas. There are a number of areas like food crops, oilseeds, cotton, sugarcane, horticulture, sericulture, dairy development, poultry, aqua-culture and agro-forestry, where India has comparative advantage and which need to be efficiently exploited for ensuring food security, food exports and higher levels of rural incomes and employment.

3.10.4 It must be recognised that in the long run, agriculture and other land-based activities would not be able to provide employment to all the rural workers at adequate levels of incomes. Diversification of the rural economy into non-agricultural activities is necessary in those States to provide productive employment to the growing rural labour force as well as to reduce the wide economic differences between rural and urban areas.

3.11 Rural Non-Farm Employment : An Assessment of Recent Trends - Dr. TS Papola (1991/92)

3.11.1 Certain occupational shift and changes in employment status have occurred as indicated e.g. (i) self-employment in agriculture has declined; (ii) self-employment in non-agricultural sector has increased; (iii) regular wage/salaried employment in the agricultural sector has declined; (iv) casual employment in agriculture has hardly changed; and (v) casual employment in the non-agricultural activities has significantly increased.

3.11.2 The earnings in the non-farm activities should be high enough as compared to agriculture if the non-farm employment is to produce a positive impact on casual workers' wages in agriculture.

3.12 Approved Annual Plan, Haryana 2000-2001

3.12.1 According to this document, Special Programmes for Rural Development will continue to be implemented during 2000-2001. Provision of Rs.385.00 Lakh has been made for Swarnjayanti Gram Swarajgar Yojana. A matching contribution of Rs.1155.00 lakh will become available from Government of India.

3.12.2 Employment Assurance Scheme for providing assured manual labour employment for 100 days during the lean agricultural season is being implemented in the State. A maximum of two adult persons per family between 18-60 years of age in the rural areas who need and seek employment will be provided assured employment on development works.

3.12.3 A sum of Rs.1400.00 lakh was allocated for the expansion/extension of the activities of the Animal Husbandry Department. The main thrust would continue to be on the promotion of livestock production especially by the weaker sections of the population in rural areas. Adequate funds have been provided to meet the requirement for cattle development, development of feed and fodder and development of sheep-wool, poultry and piggery.

3.12.4 Provided loan of Rs.50 crore to 7685 unemployed youth under Prime Minister's PMRY. For the Self Employment scheme, in the District as well as in Tehsil level, the total amount of loan distributed were Rs.21.04 crore to the 3629 beneficiaries.

3.12.5 To improve the self employment programme, the Govt launched 3 different schemes in the Animal Husbandry & Dairy Development Sector. The schemes provide loans for 5 years tenure with 50 percent subsidy and one year insurance premium free on Animal providing milk. The Govt also provides free medical treatment upto one year to the animals under this scheme.

4. PRIMARY SURVEY RESULTS : DISTRICT BHIWANI

4.1 District Bhiwani - A Profile :

Out of 19 districts in Haryana, Bhiwani commands number one position by area which is 4778 square Kilometers and number four in order of population which is 14,24,554 out of which males constitute 7,57,824 while females constitute of 6,66,730. Growth rate of population during the period 1981-91 was 22.8 percent and it remained almost the same during the census period 1991-2001, which has been 22.45 percent. The number of females per thousand males has been almost static during the period 1991-2001. During the census 1991, 878 females were recorded against thousand males while during 2001, they were 880. The population density has increased in the year 2001 to 298 persons per square Kms. against 243 persons recorded during the census 1991.

Literacy rate during the year 2001 has been recorded at 68.17 percent, out of which males' rate is 81.19 percent while females' rate is 53.5 percent.

Bhiwani is an important industrial town and is famous for its textiles by virtue of production units as well as educational institutes in the area. However, Agriculture still constitutes the major activity in this district where cotton besides wheat is the principal crop while several non-agricultural activities based on this crop are spinning, weaving, dyeing and trading. This provides opportunity for employment in non-agriculture areas for the workers displaced from agricultural activities due to its mechanization.

The number of different type of enterprises in the district as per Economic Census, 1998 are as under:

	Rural		Total	Urban		Total	Combined		G.Total
	Agri.	Non-Agri.		Agri	Non-Agri		Agri	Non-Agri	
Own account enterprises	323	8197	8520	133	9066	9199	456	17263	17719
Establishment	161	2950	3111	35	3390	3425	196	6340	6536
Total	484	11147	11631	168	12456	12624	652	23603	24255

OAE (own account enterprises) are those which are operated with the help of members of household only . Establishments are the enterprises run by employing atleast one hired worker on a fairly regular basis.

Non agricultural enterprises are those whose activities relate to the processing of primary produce of agricultural and allied activities such as milling of paddy, preparation of gur , bailing and processing of wool from sheep etc. Non-agricultural enterprises account for 96% of the total enterprises and about 97% of total employment in these enterprises.

Number of enterprises per thousand population is 21 as per 1991 census. In rural areas they are 12 while

in urban areas they are 64.

Several employment programmes/schemes are being implemented for generation of employment opportunities in the district. The programmes/schemes include poverty alleviation, employment programs such as Swaran Jyanti Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP, Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, Nehru Rozgar Yojana, and employment Assurance Scheme, (Rozgar Guarantee Yojana). Loans to educated unemployed persons including technically qualified urban poor and weaker sections of the society are being provided. Training-cum-production-cum-employment Schemes relating to development of Handlooms, Handicrafts, Carpets Weaving, Leather foot-wears, Electronics. Computer, Petty Industrial and Rural trades are also being offered to increased employment.

With the implementation of various employment schemes, there is a marked difference in level of poverty, which has come down substantially in the past ten years. On an average, annual per capita income in the district of Bhiwani is around Rs.18,000 on current prices and Rs.12,000 on constant prices based on 1993-94.

As per the 1992 Animal census report there were 6,79,000 animals in different categories out of which 53 percent were Buffalo or Cows. They have played a positive role in recent years in providing employment in the non-farm sector of the economy.

The district has its own identity on certain stones called 'HILNA PATHAR'. The stone is only available from the district. Certain stones are also available which are used for preparation of Calcium & Cement. One important stone that is used as raw material for certain industries (i.e Aluminium, Cement), called 'Granite', is also available.

In December 2000, as per the Employment Exchange record, the number of job seekers was about 67515. Out of the total number, the percentage share of SC candidates was 15 percent. The candidates having matriculation & higher numbered 36646 i.e. almost 54 percent.

4.2 Village Profile

Kalyana: This village is in the Block Dadri. The population of the village is around 3565 as per the provisional population census 2001. The distribution of Male/Female is about 1000/880. About 10 percent population of village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of the population is engaged as landless agriculture labour, non-farm sector like Quarrying, construction and other activities. The village has a primary school but for higher education the students mostly depend on the institutions in Dadri i.e. 15kms from the village.

The common cause of concern is the shortage of natural water resources. This has adverse implications for agriculture growth, i.e. the low productivity. It is unable to provide employment to all the population, especially those who have acquired some education. Overall, the socio-economic conditions of village are not good. The village looks poor in every respect and majority of population is poor, living in small Katcha houses. Different centrally sponsored employment schemes implemented by the govt. were (a) SGSY (b) JGSY (c) IAY (d) EAS/RGY and (e) Self Help Group Programme through MP & MLAs Funds. Near

about 80 percent enjoy the benefits of these programmes.

Charkhi: This Village is in the Block Dadri. The population of the village is around 6835 as per the Provisional Population Census 2001. The distribution of Male/Female is about 1000/889. Around 50 percent of the population holds the village land and rest of the population is engaged as landless agriculture labourer, construction activities, small shops, quarrying & other activities. School and other facilities such as Primary Health Centre is available in the village because the village is close to Block Dadri (Hq.).

The shortage of water resources is also an important concern with for adverse implications for agriculture growth. The village resources are not enough to provide employment opportunities to all the educated youth. The village otherwise looks good because of its close to the block Dadri hq. The major important Centrally Sponsored schemes on employment were implemented. More than 60 percent of its population enjoyed the benefits of these programmes.

Nandha: This village is in the Block Badhra. The population of the village is 2724 and distribution of Male/Female is 1000 / 855 as per the provisional population census 2001. This is a small village and most of its population is involved in other than agriculture activities. The main vocation of the population are Goatery, Dairy, Construction activities etc.

The common cause of concern is the sandiness of soil. Which has adverse effects on for agriculture. Most of the population migrates from villages during the agriculturally lean period. The village looks poor and most people are living in a small Katcha houses.

Centrally sponsored schemes on employment e.g. SGSY, JGSY & IAY are under operation to improve the employment status of the rural poor. More than 20 percent of its population enjoys the benefits of these schemes.

Berla: This village is in the Block Badhra. The population of the village is 5325 as per the provisional population census 2001. The distribution of Male/Female is about 1000/890. More than 50 percent of village population is involved in agriculture activities. The rest of the population is involved in quarrying, Dairy & other Govt. sponsored infrastructure activities i.e. construction of roads, canal etc.

The soil quality is poor and sufficient water is not available. The sandy soil needs more water to make productive. So, agriculture activity is not able to create enough employment for all the village population. The village looks poor & living standards are not upto the mark. To improve the rural employment, centrally sponsored schemes are being implemented which have provided employment to more than 30 percent population of this village.

Khanak: This village is in the Block Tosham. The population of the village is 5545 and distribution of Male/Female is about 1000/910 as per the provisional census of 2001. Only 10-15 percent of the village population is involved in agricultural activities. Others are involved in different type of non-agricultural activities such as Quarrying, Construction, Goatery & Dairy etc. The village has a primary school but

literacy rate is below average.

The common cause of concern in the village/surrounding entire region is shortage of water. This has an adverse impact on agriculture & results in low productivity. The village resources are unable to provide employment to all the villagers. The village looks poor and living standards are not satisfactory. To improve their employment conditions, several centrally sponsored schemes i.e. JGSY & EAS/RGY were in operation. They have created employment for about 50 percent of the rural population during the last few years.

Sagwan: This village is in the Block Tosham. The population is about 4675 and Male/Female ratio is about 1000/900 as per the provisional population census of 2001. About 20 – 25 percent of the villagers have land and are involved in agriculture. The rest of the villagers depend on non-farm agriculture activities such as Goatery, Dairy, Quarrying & other construction activities.

Agricultural production of the village is not good and is not able to provide employment to local population. Most of the villagers migrate to nearby towns as a day-labour & for construction activities. The economic condition of the village is poor & status of the population is not satisfactory. Just like other villages, a few centrally sponsored schemes are in operation in this village to improve their employment conditions. Near about 50 percent of the population enjoyed benefits of these schemes during the last 3 years.

4.3 Some results from the Primary Survey

4.3.1 In this chapter it is proposed to focus on the major findings of the sample survey conducted in the district Bhiwani, in 3 blocks, six villages, as already explained. The table below gives in summary form the number of households for which worthwhile data was collected, the number of individuals from whom the main questionnaire on employment status was canvassed (classified by blocks). It would be noticed that out of the 6 villages, responses from 694 households were found worth tabulating and analyzing. From within these households, a total of 1396 individual responses were similarly found worthwhile for tabulating and analyzing. The table also gives the sex profile of the individuals from whom responses were collected. This shows that the number of responses from females were relatively low. However, village level/block level data was also collected through separate questionnaires by CERPA supervisors at various stages of the field work and the relatively low number of female responses was checked for its veracity.

**Distribution of individual respondents by sex and activity profile
(Within the age group 18-62 years)**

Village	Number of Household	Total No. of Individuals			No of individuals engaged in farm and non-farm activities		
		Male	Female	Total	Farm Activities	Non-farm activities	Total
Charkhi	94	96	23	119	2 (1.7)	117 (98.3)	119
Kalyana	122	200	60	260	2 (1.1)	257 (98.8)	260
Total	216	296	83	379	5 (1.3)	374 (98.7)	379
Berala	120	196	50	246	-	246 (100)	246
Nandha	117	179	66	245	-	245 (100)	245
Total	237	375	116	491	-	491	491
Khanak	120	183	87	270	5 (1.8)	264 (97.8)	270
Sagwan	121	168	88	256	2 (0.8)	254 (99.2)	256
Total	241	351	175	526	7 (1.3)	518 (98.5)	526
G. Total	694	1022	374	1396			1396

4.3.2 The basic data from the 6 villages (and 3 blocks), as mentioned above, was collected to understand the size of the village, the number of households in the village currently, the general infrastructure situation of the village in terms of facilities like roads, schools, hospitals, markets, power etc. and the population distribution. Some of the basic data collected through the village and block level questionnaires has been tabulated and can be seen in the following tables. The first table only gives the very broad picture of the population and its social break-up and the second table the quality of infrastructure. The second table is based on marks given (0 or 1) to each component of the infrastructure found in the village. It would be immediately noticed from the table that all the villages falling in the random sample had almost similar level of infrastructure which squares up with the impressions given by the district officers and others about the nature of the blocks and the general connectivity in this district of Haryana. Through other questions it was also checked if there was any particular over powering factor to indicate if the year gone by and the year 1997-98 were rather different from normal. The study team was not told of any major disasters, floods or droughts in either of the two years (12 months each) for which comparative data on employment has been collected from individual members. This gives confidence that the employment data collected for two different periods could be compared with fair degree of confidence.

**Distribution of households in the entire village by activity profile –
6 villages in 3 blocks**

Household Activities Over the last 12 months for each village (as a whole)

H/hold activities	Dadri			Badra			Tosham		
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Berla	Nandha	Total	Khanak	Sagwan	Total
Farm Activities	439	60	499	467	194	661	140	171	311
Mixed Farm/ Non-Farm Activities	221	35	256	15	76	91	148	44	192
Non-Farm	316	407	723	247	103	350	451	417	868
Total	976	502	1478	729	373	1102	739	632	1371
	Total population (2001)								
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Berla	Nandha	Total	Khanak	Sagwan	Total
Population	6835	3565	10400	5325	2724	8049	5545	4675	10220

Source : Provisional Population : 2001, as reported by various village Sarpanches

Basic Data of Village Level Infrastructure – Bhiwani						
Infrastructure	Village					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Rail Station	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telecom Facilities	0	1	1	0	1	0
Drinking Water	1	1	1	1	0	1
Bus Stop	1	0	1	1	1	1
Money lender	0	0	1	0	1	0
NBFC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Education	0	0	1	0	0	0
School/College	1	1	1	1	1	1
Banks	0	0	1	1	1	1
Coop. Samiti	1	0	1	1	0	1
Post Office	1	1	1	1	1	0
Market	1	0	1	0	0	0
Electricity	1	1	1	1	1	1
Factory	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	5	11	7	7	6
Note: If a facility was found within the village or within 3 km range, it was given one mark – other wise it was given zero mark.						
1. Charkhi, 2. Kalyana, 3. Berla, 4. Nandha, 5. Khanak, 6.Sagwan						

4.4 Results from the respondents survey : for the Six Villages

4.4.1 There are in total 13 tables placed at the end of this chapter, numbered 4.1 to 4.13, based on data culled from the questionnaires filled in by individual respondents. In addition, there are another 5 tables numbered 4.14 to 4.18 which are based on data collected from the families from whom individual respondents were picked up, participating in the non-farm activities. Those 5 tables are analyzed in the next section. Some basic data from the respondents has already been summarized in the first table in the previous section, giving the number of households, families' size and participation in farm or non-farm activities. In the subsequent paragraphs of this section it is proposed to analyze the results from each of the 13 tables in some details and compare the same, wherever possible, with data available from other sources.

4.4.2 The Table 4.1 gives the percentages of the number of households as well as the number of individual respondents for each of the six villages covered under the survey. This table shows clearly that in terms of responses from different villages spread over 3 blocks, the number of households covered as well as the number of individuals surveyed is roughly the same, except for the village Charkhi. Being the first village for the survey team, it was found that a large number of responses had to be rejected, having been found inconsistent and irrational. The training of the investigators was simultaneously going on in the field conditions also, which explains much less of rejections in the subsequent villages covered by the team. Thus the individual investigators were trained not only at CERPA but also in the field. They were also

supervised by the CERPA supervisors in each of the villages and to make sure that at least 100 households with non-farm workers are surveyed, they were asked to cover larger number of households on a random basis. The number was increased from 100 to 122 as the average since it appeared that the number of respondents per household i.e. those with non-farm employment was turning out to be well below two. On the whole, however, the average number of persons under non-farm employment per household selected on the basis of its non-farm sector turned out to be just above two (2.01) after all the results were collated. This ratio is lower than the original estimate of between 2 & 3 prepared at the time of drafting of the Proposal. It was noted during the field survey that two of the villages in Tosham block and Kalyana in Dadri block have very large proportion of workers in the Stone/Mining activity. In addition, the village Nandha has a strong presence of wood workers, making chairs and other small pieces of furniture. It was also noted by the field team that the village Berla in block Badra had the maximum dominance of agricultural activities out of the six villages surveyed.

4.4.3 The next Table 4.2 gives the age & sex wise break-up of the individual respondents which were all confined to the age group 18-62 years i.e. none less than 18 years or more than 62 years was interviewed or included in the survey team's list. The table shows clearly that total number of males for the six villages surveyed came to 1022 out of 1396, accounting for over 73% of respondents. This ratio, however, varied widely from village to village, the lowest being in Sagwan and the highest being in Charkhi. Even then the ratio of female workers to the total at below 27% is lower than the national norm derived from the NSSO as in 1993-94 round. The Haryana wide picture from the same round shows that females in the Labour Force on Principal status + subsidiary status basis worked out to roughly the same (37 percent). Further, the most productive age group was always expected to be the age group 26-45 which accounted for over 51% of male workers and 58% of female workers i.e. an average of about 53% as a whole. This break-up also varied widely from village to village with Nandha showing the lowest percentage and Charkhi showing the highest, both for males and females. As for the differences between blocks, the Tosham block shows the lowest ratio of male workers while Dadri shows the highest.

4.4.4 The next Table 4.3 shows the break-up by educational levels of individual respondents for the selected villages. It shows that literacy rates varied widely among the villages with Khanak in Tosham block indicating illiteracy rate of over 55%. The lowest illiteracy was in Nandha: Badra block, below 32%. As regards higher education, the village Charkhi indicated the highest percentage of individual respondents with at least a high school certificate and also showed the highest ratio of graduates and above. The village Nandha was immediately behind with a very high percentage of respondents with at least a high school certificate. The study team found no special factors to explain such major differences in attainment of educational levels. On the other hand, the villages with pre-ponderance of stone/mining namely, Kalyana and Kanko indicated rather low percentages of individual respondents with at least high school certificate, Kanko showing the lowest ratio for all the villages together.

As against the above village / block-wise data on literacy etc. comparable data from the Provisional results of Census 2001 for Haryana show an overall literacy rate of 68.6 percent. The figure for the Bhiwani district as a whole from the same source works out to roughly 68.2 percent, without separate rates for Urban & Rural Areas. It is possible that once the detailed tables of urban/rural became available the literacy rate for rural Bhiwani might turn out to be closer to what has been found for our sample respondents.

4.4.5 The subsequent tables 4.4 & 4.5 indicate a very low transfer of activity pattern between farm and non-farm employment even over a 3 year period. Of course, the number of persons shifting from Farm to non-farm employment was much higher at 10 compared to only 4 in the reverse shift, from the year 1997/1998 to the year 2000/2001. However, the figure 10 represents not even 1% of the total number of respondents and in any case, the reasons given for shifting from farm to non-farm employment were basically “small land holding”. Not much can be read in these two tables but the fact of non-farm employment being associated with small or nil land holding is obvious.

4.4.6 The next Table 4.6 investigates the responses by income increases from Farm to non-farm activity on the basis of the question on income increase in the last 12 months (2000-2001). Around 31% stated that this was true, but this is not necessarily based on their own personal experience since we have seen that very few persons had actually moved out from one to the other activity. Similarly, sizeable percentage of respondents over, 36%, stated the same thing about the experience of 3 years back. Again, the number of actual respondents who shifted from one to the other activity is rather minuscule as we have seen in the previous tables. Therefore, these responses should be considered on the basis of a general perception of income of the two types of activities.

4.4.7 The next Table 4.7 gives the break-up of individuals' involvement in different economic activities over the last 12 months as well as similar 12 months of 1997/1998. This is based on multiple responses from individual respondents since many of them do perform more than one activity. This is perhaps more true of females than males. The table shows a total of 1594 responses for the last 12 months and 1537 responses for the situation 3 years back i.e. there were 198 extra responses in the last 12 months but only 141 extra responses in 1997/1998. Therefore, the multiple-activity-individuals are not too many either in the last 12 months or 3 years back. It is perhaps natural to expect less multiple activities, being based on memory, for a similar period in 1997/1998. Interestingly, the responses about involvement in agriculture/agri-labour for the households picked up for detailed investigation are rather few, just about 7-8 persons of the total responses. This gives the impression that households with non-agricultural employment tend to be more or less, uniformly in non-farm employment. Analyzing first for the last 12 months, it comes out clearly that villages like Kalyana and Khanak are heavily dependent on mining/stones while the village with the highest responses in agriculture/agri-labour turns out to be Sangwan. In terms of the activity of construction, the villages with the highest responses are Nandha, Berla and Sagwan. Trading appears to be a small activity in the Dadri and Tosham blocks but is more significant in Badra block. Finally, Badra block has the highest number of responses for involvement in community/social services, govt. or non-govt.

The response pattern, based much more on memory, for similar period in 1997/1998 is not terribly different. In terms of grand total percentages for all the six villages together, there is hardly any difference between the distribution of activities between last 12 months and similar period 3 years back. There are small differences in terms of individual villages, however. The significant difference only in respect of Non-govt. community/social services which seem to have expanded over the last three years. A more definitive picture might come up from table on actual employment in mandays subsequently.

4.4.8 The Table 4.8 gives the break-up of involvement of individual respondents in the different schemes for rural development which have been listed in some details. This table gives the picture of the last 12

months as well as that of similar period 3 years back. The responses from this table give very different picture of respondents' involvement in govt. supported schemes for employment generation. For example, the total number of responses, in the multiple response format, for the period 1997/1998 is so much higher that the row "none" contains only 62 responses. That means that out of 1358 responses, only 62 i.e. 4.5% were those indicating lack of benefits from one or the other schemes. In contrast, 69% of the respondents indicated lack of benefit from any of the schemes over the last 12 months. Some schemes have, of course, been replaced during this period by new schemes like RGY(EAS)/PMGY & PMGSY but since new schemes have also been included in the response sheet, it is surprising to find that much less positive responses have come through for the most recent period, i.e. only around 22 percent. Some another schemes like IAY & JGSY appear to have winded down in Haryana. On the other hand, the new scheme of Haryana Gram Vikas found seems to have been started only recently & has got 6.2% positive responses.

4.4.9 The respondents were also asked to list the problems faced by them in non-farm activities and their open ended responses have been classified into six plus 1 categories in Table 4.9. This is also in the multiple response format since respondents could mention more than one problem. From this table it is very clear that the most significant problems are in the categories 1-4 namely, bank loans, inability to initiate right activity or employment opportunity but most importantly, the statement that there was little scope in non-farm activities. These responses do not tally very well with the earlier responses of the same individuals where they mentioned that there were advantages in the non-farm activities. But may be, they expect much more support from the govt., from the holders of capital or banks than what is visible. Another significant point which is quite natural refers to inability to get work for the entire year. However, it is well-known that work under the farming sector is also not for the entire year even in Haryana with 2 crops or more.

4.4.10 The next Table 4.10 again indicates the attitudinal responses about non-farm sector from the same respondents in the current situation. Under this question they were also requested to indicate the reasons for their interest in non-farm activities/employment. The first part of the table, based on 1359 responses out of total 1396 individuals, shows that the dominant majority of individuals are interested in non-farm activity. May be this is not a significant finding since the respondents are already in the non-farm employment predominantly. Only 21.4% respondents indicated interest in farming activity. In the second part of the table the reasons shown indicate clearly that the majority of the respondents are interested in non-farm sector mainly because there is either more income or they had small/nil land with them on which to perform farm activity. The first response should be considered positive while the second type of responses amounting to over 50% of total responses indicate compulsion from factors outside their control like being born into a non land-holding family. Since Haryana is so well-known for its agricultural progress, the second type of response should not be considered unnatural.

4.4.11 The Table No. 4.11 tabulates the suggestions made by respondents on how to increase non-farm employment. The rate of response is almost universal, with only 10 individuals not responding. The suggestion to set up industries has been given the largest number of respondents namely, about 50%. This is followed by the suggestion that govt. should provide loans for setting up small industries or cottage/village industries. Other suggestions have been given by a rather small percentage of people. The table is in the nature of expectations from the govt. basically. While Haryana has generally higher proportion of non-farm

employment, higher agricultural mechanization and greater use of various gadgets, insecticides and fertilizers etc., it was expected that technical/vocational training would be suggested by large number of respondents. However, only 4% made this suggestion. May be, the facilities for technical/vocational training are already sizeable/adequate in Haryana or the respondents do not understand the positive role which vocational/technical training can play in this regard.

4.4.12 The respondents were also asked a question about their present employment and the distance traveled for the purpose of their work. Table 4.12 gives the distribution of respondents by distance travelled for work. The total number of responses for different villages varied widely from 100 in Charkhi to 310 in the village Khanak. If the responses for farm activities are excluded, the number varies from 94 in Charkhi village to 291 in the Khanak village. In terms of various types of non-farm activities, the activity which attracted the highest response within 20 km distance was animal husbandry in case of Charkhi, mining/quarrying in case of Dadri, construction/repair in case of Nandha as well as Berla and mining/quarrying in case of Khanak while Tosham showed the highest for animal husbandry etc. as in the case of Charkhi.

4.4.13 Finally, we come to the table giving the number of days worked on various activities in the last 12 months or similar period in 1997/1998 which should throw light on the quantitative picture of growth of non-farm sector employment. Table 4.13 has been prepared village-wise while for the block as a whole the number of days worked were totalled up. Percentages of days worked under each activity to the total of the non-farm and farm activity have also been indicated. A grand total of total employment in the 100 or so households in each selected village has also been worked out. Since the main focus is on non-farm sector, the table also shows number of responses under that as well as the average number of days worked by individual respondents. This had to be done since the total number of households in practice varied from village to village though not very widely and so also the number of individual respondents examined in details in each of the six villages.

The table shows clearly that there has been a small temporal increase in employment in the non-farm sector in the same households from which data was collected both for the last 12 months and for a similar period 3 years back. The growth is not very significant but it varies from just under 3% to 6% in the six villages studied. The percentage growth, however, varied widely from activity to activity, maximum growth being shown in the case of electricity, gas, water and the minimum shown under finance/insurance etc. However, interestingly, there has been sizeable growth also under the category community, social and personal services, both under the Govt. as well as outside the govt. in several of the villages. The important point which comes up from looking at all the data together is that there is no set pattern of growth of non-farm employment. It is difficult to say why we cannot see any pattern but one reason could be that the six villages were selected randomly and represented the district in its whole variety, through the medium of random selection of blocks as well. Finally, it appears that the farm employment has shown too much of variation from village to village, with 3 villages showing decline in agricultural employment in the last 12 months over 1997/1998 while the rest of them showed some increase. Overall again, there is no pattern but this is not surprising since the process of selection of households was itself done in such a way that we were selecting (randomly) basically those households which had somebody working in the non-farm sector.

4.5 Additional data collected through the family based questionnaire

4.5.1 There was also a detailed question in the family questionnaire in the nature of a control question namely, Question No.3 where details of the family members including their age, sex composition, education and activity status was collected from the head of the household/ spokesperson. This question was very helpful in locating the real individual respondents engaged in non-farm activity but it also gave extra information on the total number of persons in the age group 18-62 years, whether engaged in farm or non-farm activities. This has been tabulated as table No. 4.14 which gives a grand total of 2610 individuals within the age group 18-62 years, out of which 54.7% were males. The number of persons engaged in farm activities was only 697 out of 2152 responses amounting to 32.4 %, over the last 12 months. The corresponding number of persons and proportion of the then total number of persons was 684 out of 2085 responses amounting to 32.8% for the similar period in 1997/1998. Though too much cannot be read on that bare data it is clear that the total number of individuals engaged in non-farm activity as per the spokespersons of the households went up only a little below 4%. The table also makes it clear that the educational status of the family members varied widely across the six villages and the percentage of illiteracy was the highest in village Khanak in Tosham Block.

4.5.2 The Table 4.15 gives the distribution of respondent households by the number of family members who answered the question about whether any family member in the labour force had joined the family in the last 12 months as compared to 3 years back, from the urban area. Obviously, the responses to this question are very few since all the villages showed some stability in their populations. Only 13 persons indicated this kind of re-migration from the urban to the rural area in the last 12 months. The adjoining table 4.16 is based on the reverse question about whether any persons from the family in labour force left the village to go to the urban areas. The number of positive responses here was only slightly higher at 16. The respondents (households) were also asked the reasons for this kind of migration-out or re-migration into their villages. However, not many responses were received to this specific question which was open ended in nature. The tables 4.15 & 4.16, therefore, do not add much to our knowledge about the reasons why some people leave the village for the urban areas while others join the village from the urban area.

4.5.3 Table 4.17 gives the distribution of respondents by interest shown in non-farm activity/ employment and those who indicated their interest in non-farm. They were additionally asked to give the reasons for this interest. The first part of the table 4.17 shows that the number of households showing interest in non-farm employment was very much higher than those showing interest in farm i.e. almost 73% as a whole. The percentage of households showing this interest, however, varied widely across the six villages with Berla showing the lowest percentage of households interest in non-farm at 60% and Khanak showing the maximum interest at 94.8%. It has already been pointed out earlier that Berla was known to be very rich agriculturally whereas Khanak was primarily a village making money out of stones/mining etc.

As for the reasons indicated by the respondents/households for showing interest in the non-farm sector, the maximum response was in regard to lack of land and other was "others". Here also the responses varied widely across the villages with only 3 respondents/ households from Berla indicating lack of land while 57 indicated this reason in the village Khanak. The number of responses were not high in most of the villages with only Khanak showing rather high response

4.5.4 Table 4.18 similarly distributes the respondents by suggestions given by them on how to increase non-farm employment. The suggestions were classified under six categories while code 7 was given to miscellaneous. Here the number of responses was pretty high in practically all the villages and the non-responses were a total of 30 out of 685. A careful reading of this table indicates that people were still very hopeful that the govt. can set-up industries for their benefit to provide non-farm employment or they could at least set up small cottage or village industries with govt. assistance. Either way, the faith in the efficacy of govt. intervention comes out very clearly whereas faith in the efficacy of technical/ vocational training was almost negligible. Interestingly, the respondents did not show much interest in the possibility of animal husbandry growth and only slightly above 3% respondents thought loans and support for animal husbandry would increase non-farm employment. Since Haryana has already a lot of animal husbandry, it is possible that the respondents felt that not much additionality can be expected out of this sub-sector..

4.6 Certain aspects related to construction sector

4.6.1 While every village is well connected within both selected districts of Haryana, the construction sector activities cover a wide range of actions with house making, on the one hand to widening/strengthening of existing tarred roads, on the other. Every village is not endowed with good construction sector raw materials, like stones or bricks or other items. In the district and village profiles given earlier, some references have been made to stone cutting, mining quarrying of stones in some of the sample villages. Such villages are located in the Bhiwani district and not in Kurukshetra. Even within the Bhiwani district, the position of mining quarrying varies from village to village and only two out of six sample villages have such endowments. The other side of the coin is that these villages are relatively weak in terms of agricultural operations and production.

4.6.2 None of the villages surveyed was so poor that there were no on-going house building activities during the period of the survey. The levels of income, however, vary significantly across the sample villages and the survey team noticed that much more construction activities were going on in villages. Kalyana & Khanak. In these villages the team noticed that work was also going on in making new roads, new schools and health facilities. The survey team, however, did not notice any on-going construction of modern medium or even small industry. Whatever construction-related activities in industries were noticed, was outside the sample villages.

4.6.3 While the detailed survey report on Kurukshetra will be given in the next section, it is worthwhile to mention that the sample villages of Kurukshetra did not differ amongst themselves as much as villages of Bhiwani. In all this sample villages of Kurukshetra agricultural production and operations were at relatively high level and house building activities were also relatively well distributed over the sample villages. Now new high way or major road was under construction in any of the six villages and no medium or even small industry-related construction activity was going on. Further, there was no particular village involved with production of raw materials for the construction sector as in the case of Bhiwani villages. As regards building of education or health institutions, the survey team noticed a lot of construction in the villages, more so in villages Taltheri & Beedkalwa.

5. PRIMARY SURVEY RESULTS : DISTRICT KURUKSHETRA

5.1 District Kurukshetra - A Profile

Kurukshetra is one of the most important districts from agriculture production point of view in the state of Haryana . Out of 19 districts of Haryana, Kurukshetra is 15th by size of population, which as per 2001 Census of India is 8,28,120 consisting of 4,43,841 males and 3,84,279 as females. Kurukshetra is having a population density of 541 persons per square kilometer. The growth rate of population has increased to 27.72% for the period 1991 – 2001 compared to 23.4% during the ten year period up to 1981–1991. Sex ratio for one thousand males has come down to 866 during 2001 census against 879 during 1990–1991 census. Literacy rates have also gone up during the Census of 2001 as can be seen from the figures given below: -

Year	Literates	Male	Female
1990	321764	68.92%	28.78%
2000	500397	78.23%	47.06%

Kurukshetra is a well known historical place where the famous battle ‘Mahabharata’ between Pandavas and Kauravas was fought in pre-historical days which resulted in advent of Gita. It commands a lot of religious importance and is a centre of pilgrimage - hence being of tourists’ value. Kurukshetra is well-known for its agriculture production, specially wheat and rice. This and the adjoining Karnal district are the main center of Basmati rice production.

With the mechanization of agriculture, there is pressure on work force engaged in agriculture activities to look out for other areas of employment in non-agriculture sector. As per 1991 census, the number of workers engaged were as under: -

Cultivators			
	Population	Male	Female
Total	58684	58254	430
Rural	56688	56311	377
Industrial Workers			
Rural	137707	132709	4998
Urban	41988	38739	3249
Non Workers			
Rural	345450	126035	219415
Urban	112062	43784	68278

In the Kurukshetra district the status of enterprises as per 1998 Economic census was as under:

	Rural		Total	Urban		Total	Combined		G.Total
	Agri.	Non-Agri.		Agri	Non-Agri		Agri	Non-Agri	
Own account enterprises	218	11503	11721	200	11851	12051	418	23354	23772
Establishment	105	2683	2788	54	4597	4651	159	7280	7439
Total	323	14186	14509	254	16448	16702	577	30634	31211

OAE (own account enterprises) are those which are operated with the help of members of household only . Establishments are the enterprises run by employing atleast one hired worker on a fairly regular basis.

Non agricultural enterprises are those whose activities are relating to the processing of primary produce of agricultural and allied activities such as milling of paddy, preparation of gur , bailing and processing of wool from sheep etc. Non-agricultural enterprises account for 96% of the total enterprises and about 97% of total employment in these enterprises.

The major activities in the Kurushetra district in Non-agriculture employment are in Animal husbandry/Dairying, wholesale/ retail trade, storage and warehousing, dehusking of paddy besides in the area of services, transport and tourism

Employment, poverty and distribution of income are inter-related phenomena. Any success achieved in one field will reflect improvement in the other. The number of educated job seekers has however, increased in the year 1999 to more than 60% as per the live Register of Employment Exchanges, while non-educated job seekers have declined in the same year to less than 30%.

Several employment programs/schemes are being implemented for generation of employment opportunities in the district. These programs/schemes include poverty alleviation, employment programmes such a Swaran Jyanti Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Jawahar Rojgar Yojana, Nehru Rozgar Yojana, and Employment Assurance Scheme (Rozgar Guarantee Yojana). Loans to educated unemployed persons including technically qualified urban poor and weaker sections of the society are being provided. Training - cum- poduction- cum -employment schemes relating to development of Handlooms, Handicrafts, Carpet weaving, Leather footwears, Electronics, Computer, Petty Industrial and Rural trades are also being operated to increase employment.

With the implementation of these schemes, the level of poverty has come down. On an average, the annual per capita income in Kurukshetra district is around around Rs.20,000/- on current prices and Rs.14,000/- on constant prices based on 1993-94. Productivity levels in Kurukshetra district are comparatively high compared to other districts in agriculture sector, so are the incomes and condition of workers.

5.2 Village Profile – District Kurukshetra

Sanghor: This village is in the Block Babbain. The population of the village is around 4347 as per the provisional population census 2001. The ratio of Male/Female is about 1000/860. About 30 percent population of the village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of the population is engaged as landless agricultural labour, for paddy processing & loading and other activities.

A number of centrally sponsored employment schemes e.g. SGSY, PMGY & EAS are in operation in the village. Most people are living in Katcha houses. Economic condition of the village is not so good.

Beedkalwa: This village is in the block Babbain. The population of the village is around 4025 as per the provisional population census 2001. The ratio of Male/Female is 1000 / 875. About 40 percent population of the village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of the population is engaged as landless agriculture labour, Paddy loading & processing, small shop owner, construction and other activities.

Umari: This village is in the block Thanesar. The population of the village is 6525 as per the provisional census 2001. The ratio of the Male/Female is 1000/875. About 25 percent population of the village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of population is engage as landless agriculture labour, paddy processing & loading, construction and other activities.

Most of the landless people are involved in Goatery & Dairy activities. Another section is involved in centrally sponsored employment schemes such as SGSY, JGSY & EAS. In all respects the economic condition are satisfactory with a variety of occupations/work available..

Amin: This largest village is in the block Thanesar. The population of the village is 7182 as per the provisional census 2001. The ratio of Male/Female is 1000/890. About 35 percent population of the village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of the population is engaged as landless agricultural labour, Road & Building, construction, shop owners, pvt. Drivers, Paddy Processing and other activities.

A section of the society is involved in footwear manufacturing which creates non-farm employment within the village. The economic condition are thus satisfactory. In addition, centrally sponsored schemes to increase employment are in action for the last few years and most landless agriculture labour have enjoyed the benefits of these programmes. Even otherwise, working conditions of local labour are good.

Bhateri: This village is in the block Pehowa. The population of the village is around 1862 as per the provisional population census 2001. The ratio of male / female is about 1000/880. About 50 percent population of the village holds the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of population is engage as landless agriculture labour, construction works, Paddy processing & loading, shop owners, drivers and other activities.

Centrally sponsored employment schemes are in action of the village. Nearly 25 percent of the landless labourers enjoy the benefits of the scheme. The village in general is economically sound & living conditions of its population are satisfactory.

Talheri: This village is in the Block Pehowa. The population of the village is around 1594 as per the provisional census 2001. The ratio of Male/Female is 1000/890. About 40 percent population of the village hold the entire agricultural land in the village. The rest of population is engage as landless agriculture labour, construction activities, Drivers, Shops, and other activities in non-farm sector.

A number of employment promotional schemes are in action in the village. They create significant amount of non-farm employment in the village. The economic conditions of the village are quite good with relatively high income level and low unemployment.

5.3 Some results from the Primary Survey

5.3.1 Similar to earlier chapter the major findings of the sample survey conducted in the District Kurukshetra in three blocks and six villages presented in this Chapter. The table below gives in summary from the number of household for which worthwhile data was collected, the number of individuals from whom the main questionnaire on employment status was canvassed (classified by blocks and villages). It would be noticed that out of the six villages, responses from 599 households were found worth tabulating and analyzing. From within the household, a total of 1259 individual responses was similarly found worthwhile for tabulating and analyzing. The table also gives the sex profile of the individual from whom responses were collected. This shows that the number of responses from females were relatively low. However, village levels/block levels data was also collected through separate questionnaire at various stages of the field work and the relatively low number of female responses was checked for its veracity.

Distribution of individual respondents by sex and activity profile (Within the age group 18-62 years)

Village	Number of Household	Total No. of Individuals			No. of individuals engaged in farm and non-farm activities		
		Male	Female	Total	Farm Activities	Non-farm activities	Total
Umri	100	152	55	207	-	207 (100)	207
Amin	99	147	58	205	-	205 (100)	205
Total	199	299	113	412	-	412 (100)	412
Batheri	101	147	56	203	-	203 (100)	203
Talheri	100	161	54	215	-	215 (100)	215
Total	201	308	110	418	-	418(100)	418
Sanghor	98	158	56	214	-	214 (100)	214
Beedkalwa	101	160	55	215	-	215 (100)	215
Total	199	318	111	429	-	429(100)	429
G. Total	599	925	334	1259	-	1259	1259

5.3.2 The basic data from the 6 villages & 3 Blocks as mentioned earlier, was collected understand the size of the villages, number of households in the village, the general infrastructure situation of the village in

term of facilities like roads, schools, hospitals, markets, power etc. and the population distribution. Some of the basic data collected through the village and Block level Questionnaires has been tabulated and can be seen in the following tables. The first table only gives the very broad picture of the population and the second table the Quality of infrastructure. The second table is based on marks given (0 or 1) to each component of the infrastructure in the village. It is noticed from the table that all the villages following in the random sample has almost similar level of infrastructure which gives the impression gives by the District Officer & others about the nature of the Block and the general connectivity in Kurukshetra districts. Similar to Bhiwani District, the study team in Kurukshetra was not told any major disasters, floods or droughts in either of two years (12 months each) for which comparative data on employment has been collected from individual members. This gives confidence that the employment data collected for two different periods could be compared with fair degree of confidence.

**Distribution of households in the entire village
By activity profile – 6 villages & 3 blocks**

Household Activities Over the last 12 months for each village (as a whole)

Thaneswar				Pehowa			Babain		
H/hold activities	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beedkalwa	Total
Farm Activities	424	136	560	144	105	249	131	128	259
Mixed Farm/Non-Farm Activities	208	107	315	94	35	129	103	72	175
Non-Farm	280	790	1070	130	81	211	325	245	570
Total	912	1033	1945	368	221	589	559	445	1004
Total population (2001)									
	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beedkalwa	Total
Population	6525	7182	13707	1862	1594	3456	4347	4025	8372
Source : Provisional Population : 2001, as reported by various Village Sarpanch									

Basic Data of Village Level Infrastructure – Bhiwani						
Infrastructure	Village					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Rail Station	0	1	0	0	0	0
Telecom Facilities	1	1	1	1	1	0
Drinking Water	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bus Stop	1	1	1	1	1	1
Money lender	0	1	0	0	0	0
NBFC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Education	1	0	0	0	0	0
School/College	1	1	1	1	1	1
Banks	1	1	0	0	1	0
Coop. Samiti	1	1	0	0	1	0
Post Office	1	1	1	1	1	0
Market	1	1	0	0	1	0
Electricity	1	1	1	1	0	1
Factory	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Marks	11	11	5	6	8	4
<u>Note:</u> If a facility was found within the village or within 3 km range, it was given one mark – other wise it was given zero mark.						
1. Umri, 2. Amin, 3. Batheri, 4. Talheri, 5. Sanghor, 6. Beedkalwa						

5.4 Results from the Respondents Survey : for the six villages in Kurukshetra

5.4.1 There are in total 13 tables placed at the end of this chapter, numbered 5.1 to 5.13, based on data culled from the questionnaires filled in by individual respondents. In addition, there are another 5 tables numbered 5.14 to 5.18 which are based on data collected from the families from whom individual respondents were picked up, participating in the non-farm activities. Those 5 tables are analyzed in the next section 5.3. Some basic data from the respondents has already been summarized in the first table in the previous section, giving the number of households, families' size and participation in farm or non-farm activities. In the subsequent paragraphs of this section it is proposed to analyze the results from each of the 13 tables in some details and compare the same, wherever possible, with data available from other sources or from the earlier Bhiwani district.

5.4.2 Table 5.1 gives the percentages of the number of households as well as individual respondents for each of the six villages covered under the survey. This table shows clearly that in terms of responses from different villages, the number of households covered as well as the number of individuals surveyed is

roughly the same. The field team of investigators deployed, for this district Kurukshetra was roughly the same as deployed in Bhiwani but obviously they had acquired experience in the earlier district. Even then, the individual investigators were trained again and supervised by CERPA supervisors in each village. To make sure that a target of 100 households with non-farm workers is achieved, the investigators were asked to cover larger number of households on a random basis. The results of this detailed exercise are shown in table 5.1 which show greater consistency in than in the previous district. However, the average number of persons under Non-farm employment per household did not turn out to be very different i.e. 2.1, which is lower than the original estimate of between 2 & 3 per household in the first draft of the Proposal. During the field survey, the study teams noted that 2 villages in Thanesar block and one village in Babain had a much higher proportion of Non-farm workers because they developed paddy cultivation and processing etc. and earned higher incomes. In fact, paddy cultivation is now found in all the villages, more or less.

5.4.3 The next Table 5.2 gives the age and sex wise break-up of individual respondents, all confined to the age group 18-62 years. The table shows that the total number of males for the six villages surveyed was 925 out of 1259, accounting for 73.5% respondents. This figure is only nominally higher than a similar figure in Bhiwani. Moreover, the ratio of male Vs female did not vary significantly from village to village ; the lowest was in the village Talheri while the highest was in Amin. The ratio of female workers to the total at around 26.5% is, however, much lower than the national norms derived from the NSSO as in 1993-94 Round. The Haryana wide picture from the same Round shows that female rates in the labour force on principal status plus subsidiary status basis was roughly the same as the national ratio namely, around 37%. As for the age group wise distribution of workers, the most productive age group turned out to be 26-45 which accounted for about 63% of total male workers and almost 72% female workers. On the average, 65% workers in the six villages were in this age group. This gender gap between proportions of male workers and proportions of female workers did not vary significantly from village to village but at least in one village namely, Batheri the proportion of female workers of this age group was lower than that of male workers in the same age group. Correspondingly, the block Pehowa containing village Batheri showed a much smaller difference between the two sexes in terms of workers belonging to this age group than the other two blocks.

5.4.4 The next Table 5.3 shows break-up of individual respondents by educational levels for the six villages. It shows that literacy rates varied widely amongst the six villages with the village Sanghor indicating the highest literacy and the village Batheri showing the lowest. On the whole, the literacy rate was close to 70% for the six villages, which is slightly better than the literacy rate for the state of Haryana as a whole. As regards higher education, the highest participation was shown by the village Amin and the lowest by the village Batheri, giving the impression that Batheri is perhaps, the most backward of the six villages. The village Amin had also the distinction of having almost half of the respondents reaching high school or beyond, which may be better than the entire district average. The study team, however, found no special factors to explain such major differences in attainment of educational levels. It appears that the backwardness of village Batheri can be explained by other factors as well as, namely its sandy soils and shortage of water.

As against the above village/backwardness data on literacy etc., the state of Haryana showed an overall literacy rate of 68.6% as from the provisional results of Census 2001. The comparable figure for Kurukshetra as a whole was estimated at roughly 70.1% though separate ratio for urban and rural areas

cannot be estimated so far, in the absence of further data from the Census.

5.4.5 The subsequent Tables 5.4 & 5.5 indicate low transfer of activity pattern between Farm and Non-farm employment even over the 3 years period between now and 1997/1998. The data shows that though the reasons for shifting from one type of activity to the other were not clearly pointed out, the number of persons shifting from Farm to Non-farm employment was a sizeable figure of 37. As against it the corresponding figure for the reverse movement from Non-farm to Farm employment elicited only two responses. Since the reasons for shifting could not be separated/identified by the investigators, not much should be read in these two tables but the fact of Non-farm employment getting slightly more popular should be noted and accepted.

5.4.6 The next Table 5.6 investigates the responses by income increase from Farm to Non-farm activity on the basis of the question on income increase in the last 12 months (2000-2001). Around 44.1% stated that this was true, but this is not necessarily based on their own personal experience since we have seen that very few persons had actually moved out from one to the other activity. Similarly, sizeable percentage of respondents over, 72%, stated the same thing about the experience of 3 years back. Again, the number of actual respondents who shifted from one to the other activity is rather small as we have seen in the previous tables. Therefore, these responses should be considered on the basis of a general perception of income of the two types of activities.

5.4.7 The Table 5.7 gives the break-up of individuals' engagement in different economic activities over the last 12 months as well as similar 12 months of 1997/1998, based on multiple responses. Perhaps, the multiplicity of responses was more in the case of females than males. The table shows break-up of total 1643 responses for the last 12 months and a smaller 1512 responses for the period 3 years back i.e. there were 384 extra responses in the 12 months but only 253 extra responses for the period 1997/1998. Obviously, the multiple activities in this are not too many either in the last 12 months or 3 years back and in any case due to memory loss, less multiple activities could be expected for the 3 year back period of 1997/1998. The table includes the Farm activities namely, agriculture or agriculture labour and responses under this activity show a significant variation from village to village both over the last 12 months and over a similar period 3 years back. The percentage varies from 16 to 28 over the last 12 months and 19 to 33 for the period of 3 years back. However, if the overall situation of six villages is looked at, the engagement in Farming activity is much lower at around 23% over the last 12 months than the 27% 3 years back. The impression, therefore, continues that households in Farming activity more or less remain the same and those in the Non-farm activity also remain in the same category even over the course of 3-4 years.

Coming to individual activities under the Non-farm group, it appears that the responses were highest for two types of activities namely, animal husbandry etc. and construction, over the last 12 months. In terms of individual villages, it has already been analyzed above that the highest ratio of 84% responses from Non-farm activities was from village Aamin while the lowest was from the village Talheri. While the animal husbandry activity/responses are well spread out over the six villages, those on construction show large variations, with the village Talheri showing the lowest response and the village Umri exhibiting the highest response. Trading appears to be the next most important activity but the community/social/personal services also have a significant response, slightly higher than that of trading. Unfortunately, manufacturing does not get any significant response in any of the villages, as also electricity/gas or storage & warehouse.

Though transport/communication was expected to be important in the well-developed Kurukshetra district, the figures from this table do not confirm that impression.

A similar response pattern, based more on memory, in the similar period in 1997/1998 can be seen from the same table. There are hardly any differences in the distribution of activities/responses for this period of 3 years back and the current period, though there are small differences in individual villages. The only significant difference between two villages is in respect of a very significant rise in community/social/personal services between the two villages giving the impression that employment in these activities might have also expanded significantly. A more definitive picture would obviously arise from the table on actual employment in mandays.

5.4.8 The next Table 5.8 gives the break-up of involvement of individual respondents in different employment schemes under the broad heading rural development, which have been listed in details both in the questionnaire and the table. The table covers both the periods of the last 12 months as well as of 1997/1998 and is in the multiple response format. Interestingly, the total positive responses to the involvement in such special employment segments are just about 1/4th of the responses for the similar period 3 years back. Apparently, the Govt. of Haryana had spent a lot more money on such schemes in the year 1997/1998. For the last 12 months the response of 313 out of a grand total of 1466 shows that only a few persons were really beneficiaries of some of these schemes. Over the last 12 months the most significant scheme was the PMGSY whereas over the previous period of 1997/1998 the best responses were from the schemes, SGSY & JGSY as well as RGY/EAS. The differences in the responses do indicate that the agricultural situation over the 2 periods was not the same or else the Govt. response was different because there were found different political parties. It is true that some schemes have been discontinued while others have been merged but since new schemes have also been included in the response sheet it is surprising to find very few positive responses over the recent period i.e. last 12 months. In fact, the response rate is less than 25% whereas in the case of similar period 3 years back the response rate was almost 94%. Obviously, some schemes like JGSY & RGY/EAS have winded down in Haryana with only HGVF as the new scheme with some positive responses. The overall pattern for the two period seems to be confusing and perhaps needs more in-depth investigations. However, when the higher level members of CERPA study team tried to obtain the reasons for such differences at the level of district officers they did not receive any real clues to explain such differences.

5.4.9 The respondents were also asked to list the problems faced by them in non-farm activities and their open ended responses have been classified into six plus 1 categories in Table 5.9. This is also in the multiple response format since respondents could mention more than one problem. From this table it is clear that the most significant problems are in the categories 1-4 namely, bank loans, inability to initiate right activity or employment opportunity but most importantly, the statement that there was little scope in non-farm activities. These responses do not tally well with the earlier responses of the same individuals where they mentioned that there was income advantage in the non-farm activities. But may be, they expect much more support from the govt., from the holders of capital or banks than what is visible. Another significant point made by them, which is quite natural, is in regard to inability to get work for the entire year. However, it is well known that work under the farming sector is also not for the entire year even in Haryana with 2 crops or more, even though Kurukshetra is known to be rather rich in farming.

5.4.10 The next Table 5.10 shows attitudinal response about Non-farm sector from the same respondents in the current situation/last 12 months. The respondents were asked to indicate the reasons for interest shown in Non-farm activities/employment. The first part of the table, based on 1226 responses out of total 1259 individuals, shows that the dominant majority of individuals were interested in Non-farm activities. May be, this is not a significant finding since the respondents were selected for their engagement in Non-farm activity and are predominantly in Non-farm employment already. Only around 26% respondents indicated interest in farming activities.

In the second part of the table the reasons given by individual respondents for preference to one or the other major activity groups indicate that the majority of respondents were interested in Non-farm either because there was more income or they had no land/small holdings, on which to perform their activities. Compared to the picture in Bhiwani district, the reasons indicated here are clearer with over 50% individuals indicating more income as the reason for their preference. However, the other two reasons about nil/small holdings can indicate a kind of compulsion from factors outside their control like being born into a non-land holding family. Since agriculture is the dominant and preferred occupation in Haryana practically all over, the second type of response should not be considered unnatural.

5.4.11 The Table 5.11 shows in details the suggestions made by individual respondents on how to increase Non-farm employment. The rate of response is almost universal with only 14 individuals not responding. The suggestion to set up industries through the govt. has been given the largest number of responses namely, around 39%. This is followed by the suggestion that govt. should provide loans etc. for small industries, cottage/village industries etc. The only other significant suggestion made by the respondents was about provision of loans even for Animal husbandry. Even this suggestion is part of the general expectation from the govt. for support to all types of activities under Non-farm. As regards the suggestion about technical/vocational training, it was surprising to find that less than 6% respondents made this suggestion even though Haryana has generally higher proportion of Non-farm employment, higher agricultural mechanization and use of gadgets, intensive application of insecticides, pesticides and fertilizers etc. Perhaps, the best explanation for this lack of faith in technical/vocational training is that despite considerable number of Vocational Educational/Training institutions, including those under the centrally sponsored scheme of Vocationalisation of Secondary Education, few industries of consequence have come to villages in this district. Alternatively, one can say that the respondents just do not understand the positive role which such vocational education/training could play in this regard.

5.4.12 The respondents were also asked a question about their present employment and the distance travelled for the purpose of work from their residences. Table 5.12 gives the distribution of respondents by distance travelled for work. The total number of responses, given in the multiple response format, exceed the total number of individuals i.e. 1450 and the same is true for each individual village. If the response for farm activities are excluded, the number of responses varies from 186 to 207 in the six villages but the differences are marginal. In terms of various types of Non-farm activities, the activity attracting the highest response for travel within 20 km was naturally Animal husbandry for the six villages as a whole. However, this did not get the highest response in three villages namely, Umri, Amin and Beedkalwar. In the rest of the 3 villages the next highest responses were received by the activity, construction/repair. In any case, between these two activities a large majority of responses are accounted for. The next highest number of

responses was received by the activity, trade. Compared to the district Bhiwani, the basic difference is in regard to the activity Mining/Quarrying which is not a major activity in Kurukshetra but was in Bhiwani.

5.4.13 Finally, we come to the table giving the number of days worked on various activities in the last 12 months or similar period in 1997/1998 which should throw light on the quantitative picture of growth of non-farm sector employment. Table 5.13 has been prepared village-wise while for the block as a whole the number of days worked were totalled up. Percentages of days worked under each activity to the total of the non-farm and farm activity have also been indicated. A grand total of total employment in mandays in the 100 or so households in each selected village has also been worked out. Since the main focus is on Non-farm sector, the table also shows number of responses under that as well as the average number of days worked by individual respondents. This had to be done since the total number of households in practice varied from village to village though not very widely and so also the number of individual respondents examined in details in each of the six villages.

The table clearly shows there has been a sizeable increase in employment in the Non-farm sector in the same households from which data was collected both for the last 12 months and for the similar period of three years back. On the other hand, there has been overall sizeable decline in the employment under farming i.e. agri-labour or cultivator. The growth of employment in terms of mandays over the three years period varies widely from activity to activity, the highest increase being noticed in a rather small activity namely, Storage & Warehouse, while the smallest increase which is almost insignificant in terms of actual volume of employment was in Mining/Quarrying. There have been sizeable growth of employment in activities like Animal husbandry, Construction/ repair, Transport/ communication and even Community/social and personal services, both under govt. as well as non-govt. In terms of volume of employment, the most significant Non-farm activity continues to be Animal husbandry etc. followed by construction/repairs and in this respect there are differences with the district Bhiwani only because of very large number of persons, next only to Animal husbandry, being involved in Mining/Quarrying there.

If the six villages are examined individually, the only visible pattern emerging is that Animal husbandry is uniformly the largest employment generating activity followed by construction/ repairs. Other activities fall in-between. However, in terms of growth rates over the last three years there are considerable differences from village to village and block to block. It is also noticeable that two of the activities namely Mining/Quarrying and storage/warehousing were not found in several villages. The village Bhatari, which is apparently the most backward village, did not get any respondents for these two activities at all. They did not have even sizeable number of persons in community/social/personal services. Overall, it appears that the data from the Kurukshetra villages was much more consistent as between the villages, against the other district Bhiwani where some villages showed increase in farm activity while others showed considerable growth in Non-farm activity.

5.5 Additional Data Collected through the Family Based Questionnaire

5.5.1 Similar to the Bhiwani District, in Kurukshetra, there was also a detailed question in the family Questionnaire in the nature of control Question namely, Question No.3 where details of the family members including their age, sex composition, education and actively status was collected from the head of the

household/spokesperson. It helps in locating the real individual respondents engaged in non-farm activity but it also same extra information on the total number of persons in the age group 18-62 years, whether engaged in farm or Non-farm activities. This has been tabulated as table No.4.14 which gives a grand total of 2201 individual within the age group 18 – 62 years, out of which 54.6% were males. The number of persons engaged in farm activities was only 399 out of 1664 responses amounting to 24% over the last 12 months. The corresponding number of persons and proportion of the then total number of persons was 453 out of 1556 responses amounting to 29.1% for the similar period in 1997-98. Though too much cannot be read on that bare data but the number of individuals engaged in non-farm activity as per the spokes persons of the households went down only a 5%. The table also makes it clear that the educational status of the family members varied widely across the six villages and the percentage of illiteracy was the highest in village Batheri in Pehowa Block.

5.5..2 The table 5.15 gives the distribution of respondent households by the number of family members who answered the Question about whether any family member in the labour force had Joint the family in the last 12 months as compared to 3 years Back, from the Urban area. The responses to this Questionnaires only 3 persons indicated this kind of re-migration from the Urban to the rural areas in the last 12 months. The adjoining table 5.16 is based on the reverse Question about whether any persons from the family in labour force left the village to go to the urban areas. The number of positive responses here was higher at 21. The respondents (households) were also asked the reasons for this kind of migration-out or re-migration into their villages. Not many responses were received to this specific Question which was open ended in nature. Therefore both the above tables, do not add much to our knowledge about the reasons why very few people leave the village for the Urban areas while others join the village from the urban areas.

5.5.3 Table 5.17 gives the distribution of respondents by interest shown in Non-farm activity/employment and those who indicated the interest in non-farm. They were additionally asked to give the reasons for this interest. The first part of the table 4.17 shows that the number of households showing interest in non-farm employment was very much higher than those showing interest in farm i.e. almost 73% as a whole. The percentage of households showing this interest, however, varied widely across the six villages with Talheri showing the lowest percentage of households interest in non-farm at 64% and Umri showing the maximum interest at 80.8%.

As for the reasons indicated by the respondents/households for showing interest in the non-farm sector, the maximum response was in regard to less agricultural land with less irrigation facilities and other was “others”. Here also the responses varied widely across the villages with only 2 respondents/ households from indicating lack of land while 61 indicated this reason in the village Batheri. The number of responses were not high in most of the villages with only Talheri showing rather high response

5.5.4 Table 5.18 similarly distributes the respondents by suggestions given by them on how to increase non-farm employment. The suggestions were classified under six categories while code 7 was given to miscellaneous. Here the number of responses was pretty high in practically all the villages and the non-responses were a total of 15 out of 595. A careful reading of this table indicates that people were still very hopeful that the govt. can set-up industries for their benefit to provide non-farm employment or they could at least set up small cottage or village industries with govt. assistance. Either way, the faith in the efficacy of govt. intervention comes out very clearly whereas faith in the efficacy of technical/ vocational training was

almost negligible. Interestingly, the respondents did not show much interest in the possibility of animal husbandry growth and only slightly above 13.8% respondents thought loans and support for animal husbandry would increase non-farm employment. Since Haryana has already a lot of animal husbandry, it is possible that the respondents felt that not much additionality can be expected out of this sub-sector.

6. MAJOR FINDINGS

6.1 Comparison of the results from the two selected districts.

6.1.1 The two selected districts namely, Bhiwani in western region and Kurukshetra in eastern region were always expected to provide different picture of Non-farm employment and its growth over the last three years. This expectation has been fulfilled if one focuses entirely on growth of mandays utilized in Non-farm activities between the two periods; it was relatively small at around 5% in Bhiwani but shot up to over 25% in the Kurukshetra district. Such growth of employment in one sector of activity from the same households could always have two contributing factors : one, the increase in population and labour force and two, increase in the Non-farm employment opportunities as such, irrespective of population/labour force growth. Recent evidence from the 55th Round of NSSO for the year 1999-2000 is towards rather small increases in the labour force more or less, over the period under review. This figure at the national level is just about 1% per annum and therefore over the 3 years period the growth over the same households could be around 3% or slightly. Even in the case of Bhiwani the growth of Non-farm employment in exactly the same households is more but this does not and cannot give a complete story for even the selected period for the villages, blocks or district as a whole. This is because labour force has grown in each of the villages under study and there have been no unnatural disasters or other factors to break that trend of steady growth of labour force. But the total labour force of the period in each village could have also grown if we accept the possibility that the number of households in themselves increased in number over the 3 year time-span. This type of detailed counting of the village population/labour force for either of the two districts under study was neither feasible nor visualized. Therefore, at the very macro level we could only say that in the district Bhiwani there was a marginal growth of about 5% in terms of Non-farm employment in the households falling in the random sample, in addition to whatever increase might have taken place in the number of households in villages during the same time-span of 3 years.

6.1.2 The CERPA study teams visited the block headquarters, the district headquarters and even the village offices both at the beginning of the field survey as well as after the close of the field survey. This was to make sure that whatever information on the overall demographic/employment situation of the villages, blocks or districts could be gathered, was not missed out. As it happened, the information supplied by the village functionaries on population, number of households, number of persons in Farm or Non-farm activities or other characteristics was not precise enough to be used for working out different rates of growth between the two periods i.e. last 12 months on the one side and similar period in the years 1997/1998, on the other. It appears that when the questionnaires were supplied to these various functionaries at the beginning of the field survey they did not indicate their inability to furnish precise information on these demographic/labour force characteristics but their failure to provide precise figures cannot be considered unnatural specially because CERPA study teams expected of them to authenticate the figures to be conveyed by them. The detailed data from the 2001 Census was almost not available village-wise or even block-wise due to various factors, including the privacy requirements of the Census operations themselves. The villages of Haryana are in themselves not very small in population terms and this in itself would not allow precise counting of households or population from year to year. Therefore, after examining all the data drawn up by different functionaries one gets the feeling that the best data and understanding had to be from district headquarters itself. Thanks to the letters written by the Planning

Commission to the State governments and the instructions to the Haryana Department of Rural Development and Planning, the District Officers were quite cooperative with whatever assessments they could give, short of precise figures for various labour force/demographic characteristics or enumeration of persons involved in Farm/Non-farm activity or even in various special employment/welfare programmes going on in their respective districts.

6.1.3 CERPA questionnaires had included questions about engagements in various special employment/welfare programmes as a supplement to the individual level employment data being collected by the field investigators. These have been discussed in details in the previous two chapters but it comes out clearly that very much larger number of persons interviewed were beneficiaries of the special schemes including for employment or welfare in the years 1997/1998 than over the last 12 months. Though the ratio of non-beneficiaries in the two districts differs for the period of last 12 months, the evidence is overwhelming. However, in cross checking with the district/block officers, no special factors were brought to the notice of the study teams as to why many more beneficiaries were found in 1997/1998 than in the recent period. It is possible that memory of last 3-4 years cannot be precise but the differences are so significant that we can discount the loss of memory factor. The study teams had also asked at various levels of enquiry where there were any significant natural phenomena to explain these differences but they failed to elicit any such facts. In pure statistical terms, this would be interpreted to mean that the mandays utilized over the last 12 months in Non-farm activities could have been higher if the utilization of special employment/welfare schemes were the same in the two period, other components being equal. The implication is that the growth of Non-farm employment in both the districts over the period of 3 years should be assumed to be even higher than what has been noted and discussed in the previous paragraphs.

6.1.4 The individuals as well as the family questionnaires had materials to cross-check the level of employment with engagement in different activities. Looking at both types of data, one in cardinal numbers and the other in ordinal numbers, the conclusion is clear that the most significant Non-farm activities to provide employment to the individuals of the two districts were Animal husbandry, Construction and Trade rather than Manufacturing with the exception of Mining/Quarrying which was found a rather significant employment provider in Bhiwani. Inquiries were subsequently made at other levels from officials to understand the reasons behind this behaviour pattern, especially failure of manufacturing to be employment generator. It appears that the district Kurukshetra has picked up on paddy cultivation and paddy processing as against Bhiwani which for obvious geographical reasons could not move significantly towards paddy cultivation. It also appears that Kurukshetra villages have a patent feel of prosperity which is reflected, as per the local officials, in the much greater use of Tractors, Tillers and other machinery now, compared to 3 years back. The same level of progress has not been made in the case of Bhiwani district but agricultural mechanization has proceeded ahead there as well, alongside more personal vehicles and use of taxis.

6.1.5 Comparing the two districts again in respect of community/social/personal services and construction/repair, it appears that both districts have made a lot of progress over the last few years though the progress in Kurukshetra might be higher. The villages show new construction of houses as well as renovation of houses in both districts. In any case, the differences in infrastructure availability is not very significant between the two districts and may be, Bhiwani is slightly better off in terms of transportation facilities. The interesting figures are from the growth of employment in the community/social/personal

services which was broken up in two parts in CERPA questionnaires namely, govt. services or non-govt. services. The data already analyzed shows growth in both the segments over the 3 years in both the districts though it is a little difficult to visualize that between 1997/1998 and the last 12 months there could have been significant increase in the govt./local bodies employee strength. A more significant observation from the comparison of the data from the two districts is with reference to irregular pattern of growth of Farming employment in the selected households in the Bhiwani district i.e. some villages show decrease in volume of Farm employment while others showed decline. On the other hand, the more agriculturally advanced district of Kurukshetra showed consistent decline of Farm employment in the selected households in each of the six villages. This could only mean that the impact of increased agricultural prosperity in Kurukshetra has spread across all the blocks and may be, all the villages though it was not so in Bhiwani district.

6.1.6 It is necessary to pause here to understand repeated observations by govt. functionaries everywhere to the effect that the increase of mechanization in agriculture has perhaps led to shifting of outside labour, say from UP, Bihar from Farming operations to Non-farming operations like road making and other activities included under the special employment/welfare schemes quoted above. The govt. functionaries at block and district levels but not at the village level, admitted that there has been significant utilization of such labour in their employment/welfare schemes currently. Their assessment was that over the last 3-4 years this process has picked up speed so much so that the village functionaries, specially Sarpanch now routinely use outside labour in the special schemes rather than local labour since they can afford to pay less to such labour from UP/Bihar but can still report payment of the same minimum wages to the individuals fixed by the Haryana govt. In fact, this implies leakage of govt. money allocated for special employment/welfare schemes not only into the pockets of village functionaries but also to the contractors who are now being used routinely in undertaking works under each of these special schemes. Obviously, conclusive data on this would require detailed investigation but the evidence mentioned earlier about our households not getting the benefits of the special schemes over the last 12 months is consistent with this hypothesis of leakage of money.

The study also had an objective to collect information on pull and push factors operating at the local level affecting growth of rural employment. Accordingly, two questions were included both in the family questionnaire as well as the individuals questionnaire. Unfortunately, not much data/responses could be elicited from the respondents to either of the questionnaires. It is more or less clear that there were very few individuals related to the selected households who shifted from Farm to Non-farm activity over the last 3 years. And even smaller number of persons admitted shifting from Non-farm to Farm activity during the same period. Furthermore, the reasons given for shifting from Farm to Non-farm activity was basically small/nil land holding which does not provide new evidence on the situation and was implicitly known. However, the 4 tables, two from each district do indicate the direction in which there is a greater movement i.e. from Farm activity to Non-farm activity. This kind of evidence is supported by further questions about income increase from Farm to non-farm activity over the 3 year period. While very few persons shifted from one to the other activity, a large number of them did say clearly that there was income increase from the shift to Non-farm. A lot of it can be attributed to their perceptions rather than reality or what they might have heard from their friends and relatives but it does indicate their desire to try their luck in Non-farm activities, if they get a chance.

6.1.7 The evidence from the suggestions given by individual respondents as well as households in various tables about how to increase Non-farm employment have been analyzed in details but the clear impression is that the govt. ought to provide support in terms of industries, medium, small or village. Interestingly, a lot of them also expect the govt. to provide support even in Animal husbandry. Haryana being a progressive state, it needs to be examined carefully as to why our respondents from the Non-farm households are so hopeful of getting support from govt. and why they cannot expect support from the private sector/private capital/banking etc. Further evidence of the same nature comes from the finding that in terms of suggestions hardly 4-6% persons expected anything significant from vocational education/training and did not demand it. If the villages selected happened to have no experience of industries which require vocational education/ training, this could be considered natural but it is necessary that this be investigated in-depth to arrive at the final picture.

6.2 Linkages between Agricultural growth and Non-farm sector, role of infrastructure etc.

6.2.1 Questions were included about the infrastructure facilities in each of the villages through the village level questionnaire. Marks were awarded on the basis of a facility being available or not available for about 15 items. It was found that the marks earned by villages in Bhiwani ranged from 5 to 11 while they ranged between 4 & 11 in district Kurukshetra. Comments have already been made in the body of the report on relative backwardness of a couple of villages in each of the district but the study teams did not find any real distress anywhere and did not receive any complaints about poverty or very poor facilities. It was, however, noted that the Haryana Roadways of the govt. did not expand its coverage of the villages in either of the districts in recent years but this was supplemented by individual entrepreneurs, either through taxi type of services or personal transportation. In any case, roads connecting the villages included in the survey were fairly good everywhere and therefore, there was no real problem of transportation of agriculture produce out of the villages, to whatever extent required. However, it was also true that some odd villages did not have enough electricity or drinking water and in any case, one or two villages did not have even sufficient irrigation facilities. On the whole, it was also noted that the district Kurukshetra certainly had much higher level of agricultural development and higher surplus of agricultural produce etc. compared to district Bhiwani. Even this is not an unknown fact but what is interesting is to sift the evidence from the responses to their engagement in different economic activities and possible relationship with the higher agricultural development in Kurukshetra.

6.2.2 It has already been commented upon earlier that Kurukshetra showed higher responses to engagement in trade/restaurants compared to Bhiwani, both in terms of just engagement and in terms of total mandays utilized in that particular activity. It was also noted that though manufacturing activity noted in Kurukshetra was rather small, the growth between 1997/1998 and the last 12 months was very significant at 22%. With the limited data available, it is obviously impossible to desegregate the growth of manufacturing at the two digit level but secondary data and discussions with various types of officials and experts indicated its linkages to paddy processing. As for the growth of non-govt. as well as govt. services, the evidences are quite clear that both of them grew over the last 3 years period of study but the growth of employment in the non-govt. services was much more in Kurukshetra than in Bhiwani. Discussions with officials and village elders indicated that this was on account of opening of new schools, clinics, nursing homes and even facilities for turners/mechanics etc. This again squares up with the evidence

about much higher levels of mechanization of agriculture and higher prosperity in Kurukshetra as compared to Bhiwani. The study teams noted existence of English medium schools even within the villages and advertisements of these new kinds of services for facilities located both within and outside the villages. This clearly shows that since the residents of Kurukshetra villages have more money in their pockets they were willing to spend it on all types of new services, mainly available from Non-govt. sources.

6.2.3 Interestingly however, the evidence on diversification of the rural economy as mentioned above also indicated much higher growth of Animal husbandry, both in terms of engagement and in terms of total mandays utilized in Kurukshetra, compared to Bhiwani. The growth of mandays utilized in Animal husbandry etc. over the 3 years period in Kurukshetra was as high as 17% as compared to only around 6% in Bhiwani. Discussions with officials and others pointed to much more processing of milk than before. However, the study teams did not notice any formal Dairying establishments in any of the villages but there were Dairying establishments in rural towns etc. which squares up with the evidence on much more growth in Animal husbandry in some districts of Haryana, including Kurukshetra more than in other districts like Bhiwani.

6.2.4 The impact of higher agricultural produce and thereby higher incomes in the Kurukshetra villages is reflected also in terms of lower number of illiterates in Kurukshetra as well as higher number of persons beyond high school & degree level etc. While detailed data on private educational institutions was not readily available, the study team did notice slightly higher impact of private providers of education, training and health in Kurukshetra compared to Bhiwani. This has already been commented upon in earlier chapters by way of comparing the illiteracy rate of the six villages in the two districts where it was found that Bhiwani villages indicated over 40% illiteracy compared to Kurukshetra showing over 30% only. Additional evidence of the impact of higher prosperity in Kurukshetra comes from the fact that over the last 12 months, its six sample village showed a much smaller number of individuals getting advantage of special employment schemes as compared to Bhiwani, though we have already noted that the picture of the last 12 months is very different from that of similar period 3 years back.

6.2.5 The analysis both from the primary data collected from the six sample village each in two differently located districts of Haryana as well as secondary data, both from documents and discussions with officials/non-govt. officials indicates that persons interested in Non-farm employment have certainly grown. There is also clear evidence that residents of Haryana expect to improve their incomes by shifting to Non-farm activities of various kinds. It is not clear, however, that this process of higher interest in Non-farm activity for various reasons can go on 'autonomously' or whether the govt. must intervene in promoting Non-farm sector, specially village & smaller industry and even medium industries through the process of either location or financial assistance in that regard. Suggestions made by individual respondents as well as officials/non-officials during discussions include demands for extra interventions from the govt. side.

6.2.6 There is hardly any evidence of people understanding the rationale of liberalization of economy at the village level and benefits which could be coming to them by way of liberalization of agricultural produce movements and even less, by way of exports of agricultural or related commodities. The politicians of Punjab and Haryana have continuously provided Ministers of Agriculture and Rural Development at the central level but in their individual responses at various levels their constituents still expect the govt. to do a lot more. Very recently ITC in association with ICICI has tried experiments in Karnataka/Maharashtra to

provide Insurance services in the rural areas but even the prosperous districts of Haryana are rather under-served by such services. The evidence from field survey and discussions with officials does not indicate any uptake of financial sector services so far which is a sad commentary on the monopoly providers of financial services as also of other services to move into rural areas where such services may be lacking just now but not for want of demand for them.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary data has indicated increasing interest in Non-farm employment at the level of individuals and even families. Since the motivation for moving towards Non-farm activities/ employment could have very many causes including continuing growth of population/labour force without increase in farm area, it is very difficult to focus on only one or two activities/ initiatives of Government for promoting this shift. However, some recommendations could certainly be made for this purpose.

7.1. The most natural action/initiative appears to be in the sector of small-scale industries/ enterprises and following it, construction related to infrastructure or housing or both. While Haryana as a whole has good level of small industries, they are concentrated more around Delhi. Neither of the two district headquarters studied in detail, had any direct influence of Delhi on actions leading to small-scale industries/enterprises. The existing level of industrialization in the two districts is apparently not sufficient to encourage any major movement of personnel from the rural agriculture to small industries. Since none of the district-towns is large in population terms, it appears that the rural labour force, already interested in Non-farm activities/employment, would be more than willing to serve in small industries in or adjoining the villages. Further, since transportation of raw-materials or finished goods is not a real problem with Haryana, it should have been possible for small industries to set themselves up in the villages or adjoining them. The clear implication is that existing incentives for setting them up are not sufficient for bringing capital and entrepreneurs inside the rural areas and therefore, Government must either provide better incentives or improve the enabling framework for small industries to not only survive but also prosper in the rural areas.

7.2. The existing levels of incentives for small industries/enterprises in Haryana is no different from other parts of the country. The tax benefits including the excise exemptions are generally of the same order. On the other hand, the Government of NCT of Delhi, has actively encouraged moving out small industries willingly or under instructions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The very fact that those who have shifted industries out of Delhi have not gone to these two districts shows that they are not really attractive enough for existing entrepreneurs. This reinforces the point that existing incentives including the remaining reservations for various items for production in small industries are not good enough. On the other hand, the experience of China's rural industrialization shows enormous possibilities for town and country enterprises in association with the local bodies including the PRIs and Municipalities/Notified areas. Therefore, the Government of Haryana should provide fresh incentives for setting up such types of industries with which China has experimented either as joint ventures with local bodies/district Governments/State Government or somehow ease the path of older entrepreneurs of Delhi or new entrepreneurs from around to set up shops there.

7.3. The list of items reserved for production through small industries is being continuously pruned and the entire list might go in the next couple of years. Therefore, the Government of Haryana/local bodies has to think not in terms of artificial propping up for mere survival of small-scale industries/enterprises but prosperity of such enterprises as well as their growth. This would involve better infrastructure in terms of industry needs like sufficient power of decent quality, even better roads to take in and take out goods from the villages and better training of local labour-force so that they get attuned to working in the modern small sale industries/enterprises requiring discipline, punctuality, higher knowledge, English language and so on. While the Vocational Education schools of Haryana have been found to be rather good as part of the 10+2

scheme of Vocationalization of Secondary Education of the Government of India, they apparently do not encourage or motivate young persons to work in blue colour type of jobs or what is becoming more and more semi-blue colour jobs. The pattern of vocational schools followed in Haryana is different from the National pattern in several respects and there is no reason why greater experimentation cannot be done to improve upon the expertise of individual persons interested in modern industry/enterprises. In fact, there is need for developing culture for working in modern industry/enterprises as significantly different from work in the farms/ handicrafts/pottery/stone-making etc. This would include raising the levels of productivity of individual workmen as well as understanding of modern factory equipment but this is surely possible as demonstrated by the positive experience of workmen from Haryana in the auto components and auto factory initiated by Maruti Suzuki in Gurgaon district. The availability of the huge market of Delhi where the growth of population is still of the order of about four lakhs or more per year should be a spur for the growth of such skills and enterprises based on those skills.

7.4. Since the questionnaires could not have gone into two or three digit classification of industry and since the data collected so far indicates very little of modern industry in these two districts, no light was thrown on such rural related industries as dairying, making of various home – based products/pickles and other processed items. What the Pepsi food has demonstrated in Punjab has not happened in Haryana but is certainly possible with significant surpluses of both dairy and other farm products from these districts. The Government of Haryana owes it to the farmers in the wake of changing philosophy of the Central Government about food procurement to encourage major food processing companies to come to Haryana to set up ancillary units in a variety of locations close to the farms. It has also to move out of dependence only on food grains and encourage production of vegetables, fruits, mushroom, flowers and other products based on farms. All these would naturally demand simultaneous growth of other industries like cold storage, basic processing at the farm site, new enterprises to help in producing newer and newer varieties of farm products and better methods of preservation, pest control etc. Though, all these are related to farming, they are technically included in the Non-farm sector.

7.5. The new budget has given fresh incentives for various forms of agro- processing including decontrol of sugar and benefits for utilizing Ethanol, which can be generated from sugar-cane. The rates of interest in the general economy have gone down significantly and are likely to go down further with the prospect that newer units for utilizing the products of Haryana farms could be set up at a lower cost than before and could be profitable faster than before on account of lower interest rates, cheaper capital equipment and better road net-work etc. The completion of the golden quadrilateral before schedule could also help Haryana move towards rural industries but the initiative to bring fresh capital and new entrepreneurs would rest squarely with the Government of Haryana rather than Government of India.

7.6. As regards the construction sector, there is evidence from the primary data collected from the two districts that it is a major area of activity for those interested in Non-farm employment. The new budget has given further incentives to the construction sector, specially housing at individual level. The inclination of Haryana workers towards construction sector could be cashed on by providing new means of training in different trades related to construction, both through the vocational schools already existing and through new training facilities to be set up in the private sector. In fact, the private sector is already active in this part of Human Resource Development both in Delhi and around and happily, there are no ideological factors against involving private sector in such components of training. The Government of Haryana

should, therefore, encourage setting up of not only private ITIs with the standardized two-year courses in various trades but also, shorter courses outside the ITI pattern. These have already been experimented by Community polytechnics and the Government can in effect, 'free' this sector of training with the stipulation that a Government appointed body would accredit such training providers. The demand for houses, specially those made out of bricks & mortar, has been accelerating in Delhi and around including most parts of Haryana and therefore, provision of such construction industry-related skills should also be accelerated by encouraging private training providers to the maximum extent possible. Delhi's labour force related to construction sector is almost All-India in character and the Haryana workmen do not have a dominant position in Delhi as they do not have much higher skills to command the higher wages which they expect, being from a relatively prosperous State. If they want to exploit the inherent demand for construction-related skills, they have to show higher productivity to justify their desire for higher wages—something demonstrated in the negative sense by the Haryana & Punjab opting for outside labour for agricultural operations and the special employment schemes rather than utilizing local labour. Since Haryana Government is aware of this anomaly, they ought to help in raising the skill profile of the Haryana labour to ensure that they are not displaced by outside labour due to lower nominal wages per person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The two selected districts, one in the western and the other in eastern region of Haryana, show rather different picture of Non-farm employment and its growth between 1997-98 and 2001-2002. The agriculturally advanced Kurukshetra district showed much higher rate of growth of Non-farm employment than Bhiwani - higher than 3-4 percent growth of labour force over the period as per latest NSSO Round.

The village level data expected of village functionaries in terms of population, labour force, employment and Non-farming employment did not materialize in terms of precise figures for the 2 periods. Whatever information could be gathered from them indicates rise of Non-farm employment between the two periods. However, the utilization of Special employment schemes by families/individuals fell from the year 1997-98 to the most recent period. Though loss of memory over the last 3-4 years could be a factor, the differences are so significant that reduction in employment through the Special employment schemes has to be accepted. The local explanations generally were that more and more outside labour is getting benefit of the Special employment schemes, operated more and more through contractors. It also appears that since these outside workers were more needy/poor, the village officials utilized their presence to benefit themselves personally as well..

The employment data or man-days collected from individuals was similar to the data collected from the households and clearly showed the following most important Non-farm activities, namely; Animal Husbandry, Construction and Trade. Manufacturing was hardly important. Mining/ quarrying was a significant activity only in Bhiwani district. The other district, Kurukshetra had some other Non-farm activities like Paddy processing, agricultural equipment and transportation vehicles. The physical infrastructure including roads etc. are not significantly different and there was evidence of decline of Farm-based employment in both districts – more in Kurukshetra than Bhiwani district.

DATA SHEET OF BHIWANI

4.1 Block and village wise distribution of Respondents

Block	Village	No. of households		Total No. of individuals with employment	
		No.	%	No.	%
Dadri	Charkhi	94	13.54	119	8.52
	Kalyana	122	17.58	260	18.62
	Total	216	31.12	379	27.15
Badra	Berla	120	17.29	245	17.55
	Nandha	117	16.86	246	17.62
	Total	237	34.15	491	35.17
Tosham	Khanak	120	17.29	270	19.34
	Sagwan	121	17.44	256	18.34
	Total	241	34.73	526	37.68
G.Total		694		1396	

4.2 Distribution of Individual Respondents by age group and sex

Age Distribution		<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
		Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
18-25	Male	19	65	84	58	66	124	51	52	103	311
	%	19.8	32.5	28.4	32.4	33.7	33.1	27.9	31.0	29.3	30.4
	Female	4	17	21	24	12	36	24	24	48	105
	%	17.4	28.3	25.3	36.4	24.0	31.0	27.6	27.3	27.4	28.1
Total		23	82	105	82	78	160	75	76	151	416
	%	19.3	31.5	27.7	33.5	31.7	32.6	27.8	29.7	28.7	29.8
26-45	Male	61	103	164	80	91	171	94	93	187	522
	%	63.5	51.5	55.4	44.7	46.4	45.6	51.4	55.4	53.3	51.1
	Female	16	37	53	32	25	57	55	52	107	217
	%	69.6	61.7	63.9	48.5	50.0	49.1	63.2	59.1	61.1	58.0
Total		77	140	217	112	116	228	149	145	294	739
	%	64.7	53.8	57.3	45.7	47.2	46.4	55.2	56.6	55.9	52.9
46-62	Male	16	32	48	41	39	80	38	23	61	189
	%	16.7	16.0	16.2	22.9	19.9	21.3	20.8	13.7	17.4	18.5
	Female	3	6	9	10	13	23	8	12	20	52
	%	13.0	10.0	10.8	15.2	26.0	19.8	9.2	13.6	11.4	13.9
Total		19	38	57	51	52	103	46	35	81	241
	%	16.0	14.6	15.0	20.8	21.1	21.0	17.0	13.7	15.4	17.3
District	Male	96	200	296	179	196	375	183	168	351	1022
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	73.2
	Female	23	60	83	66	50	116	87	88	175	374
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	26.8
G. Total		119	260	379	245	246	491	270	256	526	139

4.3 Distribution of Respondents by education levels

Block	Village	<-Illiterate->		<-R & W Pri-->		<---Middle--->		<--Voc. Tra-->		<-High School>		<-Graduate->		<-Total->
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Dadri	Charkhi	40	33.6	11	9.2	22	18.5	4	3.4	28	23.5	14	11.8	119
	Kalyana	99	38.1	36	13.8	62	23.8	6	2.3	49	18.8	8	3.1	260
	Total	139	36.7	47	12.4	84	22.2	10	2.6	77	20.3	22	5.8	379
Badra	Berla	102	41.6	15	6.1	38	15.5	11	4.5	64	26.1	15	6.1	245
	Nandha	78	31.7	19	7.7	60	24.4	4	1.6	74	30.1	11	4.5	246
	Total	180	36.7	34	6.9	98	20.0	15	3.1	138	28.1	26	5.3	491
Tosham	Khanak	149	55.2	34	12.6	48	17.8	7	2.6	31	11.5	1	0.4	270
	Sagwan	117	45.7	26	10.2	57	22.3	7	2.7	41	16.0	8	3.1	256
Total		266	50.6	60	11.4	105	20.0	14	2.7	72	13.7	9	1.7	526
G.Total		585	41.9	141	10.1	287	20.6	39	2.8	287	20.6	57	4.1	1396

4. Distributioi oæ Respondentó bñ thoså shifteä froi Farm to
Non-farm employment in 1997-98 to 2000-01 and reasons

Block	Village	<--1--> No.	<--2--> No.	<--3--> No.	<--4--> No.	<--5--> No.	<-Total-> No.
Dadri	Charkhi						3
	Kalyana		1				4
	Total		1				7
Badra	Berla						2
	Nandha						1
	Total						3
G.Total		0	1	0	0	0	10

Code: 1=Small land holding, 2= received vocational training, 3=no scope in agriculture in slack seasons,
4=received loans nder government income generation, 5=other

Note° Therå werå nĩ responseó froi Khanak/Sagwaî Villages

4.μ DistributioŃ œ Respondentó bù thoså shifteå froŃ Non-farm to
Farm employment in 1997-98 to 2000-01 and reasons

Block	Village	<--1--> No.	<--2--> No.	<--3--> No.	<--4--> No.	<-Total-> No.
Dadri	Charkhi					2
	Kalyana					2
	Total					4

Code: 1=Small land holding, 2= received vocational training, 3=no scope in agriculture in slack seasons,
4=received loans nder government income generation

Note° Therå werå responseó onlù froŃ Charkhé | Kalyaná Villages¬ withouô assigninç anù reasons

4.¶ Distributioi oæ Respondentó bñ incomå increaså froi Farm to
Non-farm activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-98

Block	Village	Increase in income in last 12 months					Increase in income 3 years back. 1997/1998				
		<----Yes---->		<---- No---->		<-Total->	<----Yes---->		<---- No---->		<-Total->
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Dadri	Charkhi	72	60.5	47	39.5	119	86	72.3	33	27.7	119
	Kalyana	95	36.5	164	63.1	260	127	48.8	132	50.8	260
	Total	167	44.06	211	55.67	379	213	56.20	165	43.54	379
Badra	Berla	97	39.6	148	60.4	245	106	43.3	137	55.9	245
	Nandha	72	29.3	174	70.7	246	86	35.0	160	65.0	246
	Total	169	34.42	322	65.58	491	192	39.10	297	60.49	491
Tosham	Khanak	87	32.2	182	67.4	270	85	31.5	184	68.1	270
	Sagwan	8	3.1	245	95.7	256	17	6.6	236	92.2	256
	Total	95	18.1	427	81.2	526	102	19.4	420	79.8	526
G.Total		431	30.9	960	68.8	1396	507	36.3	882	63.2	139

4.7 Distribution of Respondents by engagement of various activities in last 12 months & 3 years back 1997/1998

(Multiple Response)

Activities	-----In last 12 Months----->										<-----3 years back 1997/1998----->									
	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			G.Tot	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			G.Tot
	1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.		1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.	
Agri./Agri. Lab.	6	16	22	23	21	44	25	27	52	118	8	11	19	22	21	43	26	32	58	120
%	5	5	5	8	8	8	8	9	9	7	7	4	5	8	8	8	8	11	10	8
Animal Hus. etc	39	36	75	46	38	84	30	118	148	307	40	34	74	40	35	75	29	116	145	294
%	31	11	17	17	14	16	9	40	24	19	33	12	18	15	14	14	9	40	24	19
Mining Quarrying	0	163	163	1	1	2	190	7	197	362	0	155	155	1	1	2	190	7	197	354
%	0	51	37	0	0	0	60	2	32	23	0	53	37	0	0	0	61	2	33	23
Manufacturing	12	3	15	4	15	19	5	9	14	48	12	3	15	4	15	19	5	9	14	48
%	10	1	3	1	6	4	2	3	2	3	10	1	4	2	6	4	2	3	2	3
Electricity Gas	1	4	5	4	2	6	2	11	13	24	1	3	4	5	0	5	1	8	9	18
%	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	3	2	1
Construction	13	55	68	107	103	210	32	87	119	397	11	53	64	105	101	206	27	86	113	383
%	10	17	15	39	38	39	10	29	19	25	9	18	15	40	39	40	9	30	19	25
Trading/Resturant	10	14	24	40	42	82	18	13	31	137	9	13	22	40	41	81	18	10	28	131
%	8	4	5	15	16	15	6	4	5	9	7	4	5	15	16	16	6	3	5	9
Transport/Comm	8	5	13	11	8	19	10	6	16	48	6	5	11	11	8	19	10	6	16	46
%	6	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	5	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	3
Storage & Warehouse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financing Ins.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community/Social service																				
Govt.	26	13	39	16	14	30	1	9	10	79	25	14	39	17	12	29	1	9	10	78
Non-Govt.	10	8	18	19	25	44	3	7	10	72	9	3	12	18	23	41	2	7	9	62
Total	36	21	57	35	39	74	4	16	20	151	34	17	51	35	35	70	3	16	19	140
%	29	7	13	13	14	14	1	5	3	9	28	6	12	13	14	13	1	5	3	9
G. Total	125	317	442	272	269	541	316	295	611	1594	122	294	416	264	257	521	309	291	600	1537

Code --> 1=Charkhi, 2=Kalyana, 3=Nandha, 4=Berla, 5=Khanak, 6=Sagwan

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity. The proportions worked out for each village/activity correspondingly also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual respondents figure.

4.8 Distribution of Respondents by use of various employment schemes
in last 12 Months & 3 years back 1997/1998

(Multiple Response)

Schemes	-----In last 12 Months----->									<-----3 years back 1997/1998----->										
	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			G.Tot	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			G.Tot
	1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.		1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.	
S.G.S.Y.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	8	11	19	22	21	43	26	32	58	120
%	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	9	4	5	11	12	11	9	12	11	9
J.G.S.Y.	0	1	1	5	8	13	1	4	5	19	40	34	74	40	35	75	29	116	145	294
%	0	2	1	4	4	4	2	9	5	4	43	12	20	20	20	20	10	44	26	23
I.A.Y.	1	20	21	29	69	98	7	6	13	132	0	155	155	1	1	2	190	7	197	354
%	4	39	28	21	35	29	14	13	14	26	0	56	42	0	1	1	67	3	36	27
P.M.G.Y.	12	3	15	5	15	20	5	9	14	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	50	6	20	4	8	6	10	20	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M.V.Y.	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	0	5	1	8	9	18
%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	3	2	1
R.G.Y./EAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	53	64	105	101	206	27	86	113	383
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	17	52	57	54	10	32	21	30
P.M.G.S.Y.	9	14	23	45	41	86	18	11	29	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	38	27	31	33	21	26	37	24	31	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E.K.Y.	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	5	6	5	11	11	8	19	10	6	16	46
%	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	3	5	4	5	4	2	3	4
H.G.V.F.	0	8	8	43	46	89	0	4	4	101	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
%	0	16	11	31	23	26	0	9	4	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S.L.A.V.F.	0	2	2	3	13	16	1	7	8	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
%	0	4	3	2	7	5	2	15	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2	1	3	7	2	9	17	2	19	31	25	14	39	17	12	29	1	9	10	78
%	8	2	4	5	1	3	35	4	20	6	27	5	11	8	7	8	0	3	2	6
Total	24	51	75	137	200	337	49	46	95	507	92	275	367	202	178	380	284	265	549	1296
%	2°	18	19	42	58	50	17	17	17	31	91	99	97	92	89	90	99	97	98	95
Nil Response	94	230	324	190	143	333	241	232	473	1130	9	3	12	18	23	41	2	7	9	62
%	80	82	81	58	42	50	83	83	83	69	9	1	3	8	11	10	1	3	2	5
G. Total	118	281	399	32·	30³	67°	290	278	568	1637	101	278	379	220	201	421	286	272	558	1358

Code --> 1=Charkhi, 2=Kalyana, 3=Nandha, 4=Berla, 5=Khanak, 6=Sagwan

S.G.S.Y = Swarnjayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana, J.G.S.Y = Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana, I.A.Y.= Indira Awaas Yojana,
P.M.G.Y.= Pradhan Mantri Gramodhaya Yojana, M.V.Y. = Marubhumi Vikas Yojana, R.G.Y.= Rojgar Gurantee Yojana(EAS)
P.M.G.S.Y.=Pradhan Mantri Gram Sarak Yojana
E.K.Y. = Ekendri Karan Yojana, H.G.V.F.= Haryana Gram Vikas Fund, S.L.A.V.F.=Sansad/Vidhayak Local Area Vikas Fund
.paŠ

4.1 Distributioã œ Individualã Respondentó bñ problemó faceã iã Non-farm activities

Problems	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
1	38	155	193	157	186	343	185	205	390	926
%	14.6	18.5	17.6	18.4	20.3	19.4	18.3	21.3	19.7	19.1
2	35	136	171	121	172	293	177	170	347	811
%	13.4	16.2	15.6	14.2	18.7	16.5	17.5	17.6	17.6	16.7
3	32	115	147	153	149	302	191	159	350	799
%	12.3	13.7	13.4	17.9	16.2	17.0	18.9	16.5	17.7	16.5
4	87	217	304	213	181	394	204	208	412	1110
%	33.3	25.9	27.7	24.9	19.7	22.2	20.2	21.6	20.9	22.9
5	29	103	132	88	93	181	114	77	191	504
%	11.1	12.3	12.0	10.3	10.1	10.2	11.3	8.0	9.7	10.4
6	40	110	150	121	136	257	137	144	281	688
%	15.3	13.1	13.7	14.2	14.8	14.5	13.6	14.9	14.2	14.2
7	0	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	4	7
%	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1
G. Total	261	837	1098	854	918	1772	1011	964	1975	4845

Code 1 = Could not get bank loan, 2= No knowledge to initiate right work, 3 = Could not find right employment opportunity, 4= Very little scope in no farm employment, 5 = There is risk in noã-farã employment, ¶ coulã noã geã worã foã entirã year, 7 = Other

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity® The proportion worked out for each village/activity correspondingly by also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual respondents figure.

4.10 Distribution of Individual Respondents by interest shown
in Non-farm activities & employment, with reasons

(Multiplå response)

	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
Farm	13	16	29	74	96	170	9	83	92	291
%	11.0	6.2	7.7	33.2	39.8	36.6	3.4	32.8	17.7	21.4
Non-Farm	105	241	346	149	145	294	258	170	428	1068
%	89.0	93.8	92.3	66.8	60.2	63.4	96.6	67.2	82.3	78.6
Total -->	118	257	375	223	241	464	267	253	520	1359
Reasons										
1	60	56	116	75	42	117	13	95	108	341
%	55.6	22.9	32.9	44.1	21.9	32.3	4.9	40.9	21.7	28.1
2	4	1	5	3	76	79	7	30	37	121
%	3.7	0.4	1.4	1.8	39.6	21.8	2.6	12.9	7.4	10.0
3	44	111	155	79	26	105	147	91	238	498
%	40.7	45.3	43.9	46.5	13.5	29.0	55.5	39.2	47.9	41.1
4	0	7	7	4	0	4	11	10	21	32
%	0.0	2.9	2.0	2.4	0.0	1.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	2.6
5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.2
6	0	70	70	1	2	3	79	3	82	155
%	0.0	28.6	19.8	0.6	1.0	0.8	29.8	1.3	16.5	12.8
7	0	0	0	7	46	53	8	2	10	63
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	24.0	14.6	3.0	0.9	2.0	5.2
Total	108	245	353	170	192	362	265	232	497	1212

Code 1= More earning in Non-farm activities/More employment opportunity, 2 = small land holding with less irrigation facilities, 3= No land, 4 = No irrigation facilities, 5 = Involved in animal husbandry as a major source of income, 6= Others, 7 = No response.

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity. The proportion worked out for each village/activity correspondingly also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual respondents figure.

4.11 Distribution of Individual Respondents by suggestions to increase Non-farm employment

(Multiplå response)

Suggestions	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
1	37	140	177	107	125	232	103	133	236	645
%	31.4	54.5	47.2	44.0	51.2	47.6	38.3	52.2	45.0	46.5
2	20	42	62	46	38	84	70	58	128	274
%	16.9	16.3	16.5	18.9	15.6	17.2	26.0	22.7	24.4	19.8
3	22	38	60	53	43	96	44	29	73	229
%	18.6	14.8	16.0	21.8	17.6	19.7	16.4	11.4	13.9	16.5
4	12	6	18	14	6	20	8	6	14	52
%	10.2	2.3	4.8	5.8	2.5	4.1	3.0	2.4	2.7	3.8
5	0	3	3	2	4	6	3	3	6	15
%	0.0	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1
6	12	7	19	10	17	27	12	16	28	74
%	10.2	2.7	5.1	4.1	7.0	5.5	4.5	6.3	5.3	5.3
7	4	4	8	5	8	13	11	0	11	32
%	3.4	1.6	2.1	2.1	3.3	2.7	4.1	0.0	2.1	2.3
8	11	17	28	6	3	9	18	10	28	65
%	9.3	6.6	7.5	2.5	1.2	1.8	6.7	3.9	5.3	4.7
G. Total	118	257	375	243	244	487	269	255	524	1386

Code 1 = Government can setup industries/factories to provide employment, 2= Government can provide loans to set up small industries- 3 = Small cottage and village industries can be setup with Government assistance, 4 = Technical vocational training from Govt.- 5 = Employment facilities at Zilla Parishad Level, 6 = Loans for animal husbandry, 7 = Others, 8 = No response.

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity® The proportion worked out for each village/activity corospondingly also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual repondents figure.

No. of respondents	94	290	221	215	291	257	1368
Agri.Labour/Cultivator	6	15	19	20	19	27	106
%	6.0	4.6	7.9	8.5	6.1	9.2	7.1

G. Total	100	324	240	235	310	293	150

4.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and
3 years back 1997-1998

Activities	-----DADARI-----								
	<-----Charkri----->			<-----Kalyan----->			<--- Total --->		% Growth in last 12 month
	<---No. of Days--->		% Growth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days--->		
	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98		Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98		Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	
Animal husbandry etc %	10890 34.2	10737 35.3	1.4	9012 15.3	8482 15.4	5.9	19902 22.0	19219 22.5	
Mining/Quarrying %	200 0.6	200 0.7	0.0	31679 53.8	31131 56.4	1.7	31879 35.2	31331 36.6	1.7
Manufacturing %	2271 7.1	2112 7.0	7.5	100 0.2	95 0.2	5.0	2371 2.6	2207 2.6	7.4
Electricity Gas water %	150 0.5	150 0.5	0.0	180 0.3	225 0.4	-25.0	330 0.4	375 0.4	-12.0
Construction/Repairing %	2410 7.6	2438 8.0	-1.1	6234 10.6	5540 10.0	11.1	8644 9.5	7978 9.3	8.3
Trade %	2690 8.5	2320 7.6	15.9	3220 5.5	2740 5.0	14.9	5910 6.5	5060 5.9	16.8
TPT/Communication %	1790 5.6	1560 5.1	14.7	2040 3.5	1815 3.3	11.0	3830 4.2	3375 3.9	13.5
CSPS, Govt. %	9420 29.6	9150 30.1	3.0	3715 6.3	3715 6.7	0.0	13135 14.5	12865 15.0	2.1
Non-Govt. %	1540 4.8	1180 3.9	30.5	1650 2.8	750 1.4	54.5	3190 3.5	1930 2.3	65.3
Total no. of days in Non-farí employment %	31361 98.6	29847 98.3	5.1	57830 98.3	54493 98.7	6.1	89191 98.4	84340 98.6	5.8
No. of respondents	119	115		260	246		379	361	
Avg. No. of days	264	260		222	222		235	234	

Agri.Labour/Cultivator	454	529	-14.2	1024	700	31.6	1478	1229	20.3
%	1.4	1.7		1.7	1.3		1.6	1.4	

G. Total	31815	30376		58854	55193		90669	85569	
----------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------	--	-------	-------	--

Contd.....Tablå-4.13

4.1³ No. of days worked of various activities in last 1² months and 3 years back 1997-1998

Activities	-----BADRA----->								¥ Growth in last 1 ² month
	<-----Nandha----->			<-----Berla----->			<---- Total ---->		
	<---No. of Days---> Last 12 Months	<---No. of Days---> 3 years back 1997/98	% Growth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days---> Last 12 Months	<---No. of Days---> 3 years back 1997/98	% Growth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days---> Last 12 Months	<---No. of Days---> 3 years back 1997/98	
Animal husbandry etc %	11854 20.8	9776 17.7	21.3	9940 18.0	8684 16.5	12.6	21794 19.4	18460 17.1	18.1
Mining/Quarrying %	215 0.4	200 0.4	7.5	300 0.5	300 0.6	0.0	515 0.5	500 0.5	3.0
Manufacturing %	795 1.4	815 1.5	-2.5	3350 6.1	3334 6.3	0.5	4145 3.7	4149 3.8	-0.1
Electricity Gas water %	1190 2.1	1150 2.1	3.5	420 0.8	0 0.0	100.0	1610 1.4	1150 1.1	40.0
Construction/Repairing %	17951 31.5	18955 34.3	-5.3	17849 32.4	18133 34.4	-1.6	35800 31.9	37088 34.3	-3.5
Trade %	11210 19.7	11008 19.9	1.8	10614 19.3	10090 19.1	4.9	21824 19.5	21098 19.5	3.4
TPT/Communication %	2480 4.4	2530 4.6	-2.0	1680 3.0	1795 3.4	-6.8	4160 3.7	4325 4.0	-3.8
Finance/Insurance etc. %	150 0.3	150 0.3	0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	*****	150 0.1	150 0.1	0.0
CSPS Govt. %	4910 8.6	4900 8.9	0.2	3900 7.1	3300 6.3	15.4	8810 7.9	8200 7.6	7.4
Non-Govt. %	4305 7.6	4090 7.4	5.3	5895 10.7	5455 10.3	7.5	10200 9.1	9545 8.8	6.9
Total no. of days in Non-farm employment %	55060 96.6	53574 97.0	2.8	53948 97.9	51091 96.8	5.6	109008 97.2	104665 96.9	4.1
No. of respondent	243	235		245	233		488	468	
Avg. No. of days	227	228		220	219		223	224	

Agri.Labour/Cultivator	1916	1639	16.9	1170	1686	-44.1	3086	3325	-7.2
%	3.4	3.0		2.1	3.2		2.8	3.1	

G. Total	56976	55213		55118	52777		112094	107990	
----------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------	--	--------	--------	--

Contd.....Tablå-3.13

4.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998

Activities	-----TOSHAM-----								
	<-----Khanak----->			<-----Sagwan----->			<--- Total--->		% Growth in last 12 month
	<---No. of Days--->		% Growth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days--->		% Growth in last 12 month	<---No. of Days--->		
Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	Last 12 Months		3 years back 1997/98	Last 12 Months		3 years back 1997/98		
Animal husbandry etc	7909	7371	7.3	32468	32164	0.9	40377	39535	2.1
%	12.1	11.9		48.5	50.1		30.5	31.3	
Mining/Quarrying	43447	41895	3.7	2855	2840	0.5	46302	44735	3.5
%	66.6	67.7		4.3	4.4		35.0	35.5	
Manufacturing	630	660	-4.5	1350	1290	4.4	1980	1950	1.5
%	1.0	1.1		2.0	2.0		1.5	1.5	
Electricity Gas water	0	0	*****	3027	2446	19.2	3027	2446	23.8
%	0.0	0.0		4.5	3.8		2.3	1.9	
Construction/Repairing	3879	3112	24.6	15238	14316	6.1	19117	17428	9.7
%	5.9	5.0		22.8	22.3		14.5	13.8	
Trade	4710	4888	-3.6	(3 40	3 ² 40	13.4			
TPT/Communication	2480	2530	-2.0	1680	1795	-6.8	4160	4325	-3.8
%	4.4	4.6		3.0	3.4		3.7	4.0	
Finance/Insurance etc.	150	150	0.0	0	0	*****	150	150	0.0
%	0.3	0.3		0.0	0.0		0.1	0.1	
CSP Govt.	4910	4900	0.2	3900	3300	15.4	8810	8200	7.4
%	8.6	8.9		7.1	6.3		7.9	7.6	
Non-Govt.	4305	4090	5.3	5895	5455	7.5	10200	9545	6.9
%	7.6	7.4		10.7	10.3		9.1	8.8	
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment	55060	53574	2.8	53948	51091	5.6	109008	104665	4.1
%	96.6	97.0		97.9	96.8		97.2	96.9	

No. of respondent	243	235		245	233		488	468	
Avg. No. of days	227	228		220	219		223	224	
Agri.Labour/CulCultivator	844	565	49.4	1940	2003	-3.2	2784	2568	8.4
%	1.3	0.9		2.9	3.1		2.1	2.0	

G. Total	65265	61927		66908	64219		132173	126146	

Contd.....Tablå-4.13

4.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998
in District Bhiwani by the six village

Activities	<---Grand Total---> % Growth in last <---No. of Days---> 12 month		
	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	
Animal husbandry etc %	82073 24.5	77214 24.2	6.3
Mining/Quarrying %	78696 23.5	76566 23.9	2.8
Manufacturing %	8496 2.5	8306 2.6	2.3
Electricity Gas water %	4967 1.5	3971 1.2	25.1
Construction/Repairing %	63561 19.0	62494 19.5	1.7
Trade %	36184 10.8	34286 10.7	5.5
TPT/Communication %	12396 3.7	11921 3.7	4.0
Finance/Insurance etc. %	450 0.1	450 0.1	0.0
CSPS Govt. %	24545 7.3	23410 7.3	4.8
Non-Govt. %	16220 4.8	13965 4.4	16.1
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment	327588	312583	4.8

%	97.8	97.8	
No. of respondent	1393	1345	
Avg. No. of days	235	232	
Agri.Labour/Cultivator	7348	7122	3.2
%	2.2	2.2	
G. Total	334936	3197 5	

4.14 Details of family members in district Bhiwani

Age Distribution	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
Total Household	94	122	216	120	117	237	120	121	241	694
Total individual member	364	477	841	460	483	943	395	431	826	2610
Sex										
Male	208	264	472	245	273	518	205	234	439	1429
Female	156	214	370	215	210	425	190	197	387	1182
Age Distribution										
18-25	119	180	299	119	162	281	125	131	256	836
26-45	187	217	404	196	238	434	209	226	435	1273
46-62	58	81	139	145	83	228	61	74	135	502
Education level										
Illiterate	119	216	335	245	203	448	241	231	472	1255
Primary	41	58	99	32	42	74	50	43	93	266
Middle	64	94	158	57	96	153	57	81	138	449
Commercial Trained	18	11	29	17	8	25	9	7	16	70
Intermediate	82	83	165	88	117	205	36	60	96	466
Graduate & above	40	16	56	21	17	38	2	9	11	105
Activities during last year										
Non-farm	134	260	394	262	265	527	269	265	534	1455
Farm	157	60	217	145	165	310	58	112	170	697
Activities during 1997-1998										
Non-farm	128	247	375	254	251	505	263	258	521	1401
Farm	142	56	198	146	165	311	63	112	175	684

4.15 DistributioŃ oæ RespondeŃ householdó bŃ noŃ oæ familŃ
memberó remigrated in 3 years(1997-98) with reasons

	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
Yes	1	2	3	4	4	8	2	0	2	13
%	1.1	1.6	1.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	1.7	0.0	0.8	1.9
No	92	120	212	115	108	223	118	118	236	671
%	98.9	98.4	98.6	96.6	96.4	96.5	98.3	100.0	99.2	98.1
Total	93	122	215	119	112	231	120	118	238	68

Code 1= New Industries/Factories in the village, 2 = New option for non-farming employment
3= The govt. schemes are successfully running in the area, 4 = Others

4.16 Distribution of Respondent households by no. of family members migrated to town for employment in 3 years(1997-98), with reasons

	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
Yes	5	2	7	0	6	6	1	2	3	16
%	5.4	1.6	3.3	0.0	5.2	2.6	0.8	1.7	1.3	2.3
No	88	120	208	119	109	228	119	116	235	671
%	94.6	98.4	96.7	100.0	94.8	97.4	99.2	98.3	98.7	97.7
Total	93	122	215	119	115	234	20	118	238	687

Code 1= No employment opprtunities in village, Code 2 = Small/no land holding,
3= No work for entire year, 4 = Others

4.17 Distributioi oæ Respondent householdó bñ interesó showi iñ Non-farm employment with reasons

		<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
		Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
Farm		28	3	31	44	45	89	4	40	44	164
	%	31.1	2.5	14.8	37.0	40.2	38.5	3.4	33.3	18.6	24.2
Non-farm		62	116	178	75	67	142	112	80	192	512
	%	68.9	96.7	84.8	63.0	59.8	61.5	96.6	66.7	81.4	75.6
		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0.0	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total -->		90	120	210	119	112	231	116	120	236	677
Reasons											
1		3	21	24	10	0	10	5	0	5	39
	%	10.7	18.6	17.0	34.5	0.0	22.7	5.5	0.0	4.4	13.1
2		0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	5
	%	0.0	1.8	1.4	3.4	0.0	2.3	1.1	4.5	1.8	1.7
3		10	42	52	6	3	9	57	5	62	123
	%	35.7	37.2	36.9	20.7	20.0	20.5	62.6	22.7	54.9	41.3
4		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0.0	0.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
6		15	47	62	12	12	24	28	16	44	130
	%	53.6	41.6	44.0	41.4	80.0	54.5	30.8	72.7	38.9	43.6
Total		28	113	141	29	15	44	91	22	113	29
No Response		1	3	4	2	2	4	1	2	3	11
G.Total		29	116	145	31	17	48	92	24	116	309

Code 1= More earning in NFA/more employment opprtunities- 2½ Lesó agriculturai lanã witè lesó irrigatioi facilities-

3 ½ Nĩ lanã foð cultivation- 4 = No irrigation facilities- 5 = Animal husbandry is the main occupation, 6 = Others, 7 = No response

4.18 Distribution of Respondent households by suggestion of increasing Non-farm employment

Suggestions	<-----DADRI----->			<-----BADRA----->			<-----TOSHAM----->			Grand Total
	Charkhi	Kalyana	Total	Nandha	Berla	Total	Kanak	Sagwan	Total	
01	5	45	50	41	43	84	40	48	88	222
%	5.7	37.2	24.0	34.5	36.8	35.6	33.3	39.7	36.5	32.4
02	15	15	30	15	18	33	31	27	58	121
%	17.2	12.4	14.4	12.6	15.4	14.0	25.8	22.3	24.1	17.7
03	35	37	72	40	37	77	24	24	48	197
%	40.2	30.6	34.6	33.6	31.6	32.6	20.0	19.8	19.9	28.8
04	6	1	7	1	4	5	3	1	4	16
%	6.9	0.8	3.4	0.8	3.4	2.1	2.5	0.8	1.7	2.3
05	3	6	9	6	6	12	6	5	11	32
%	3.4	5.0	4.3	5.0	5.1	5.1	5.0	4.1	4.6	4.7
06	13	1	14	0	3	3	4	2	6	23
%	14.9	0.8	6.7	0.0	2.6	1.3	3.3	1.7	2.5	3.4
07	1	12	13	12	3	15	9	7	16	44
%	1.1	9.9	6.3	10.1	2.6	6.4	7.5	5.8	6.6	6.4
08	9	4	13	4	3	7	3	7	10	30
%	10.3	3.3	6.3	3.4	2.6	3.0	2.5	5.8	4.1	4.4
G. Total	87	121	208	119	117	236	120	121	241	685

Code 1 = Government can setup industries/factories to provide employment, 2= Government can provide loans to set up small industries- 3 = Small cottage and village industries can be setup with Government assistance, 4 = Technical vocational training from Govt., 5 = Employment facilities at block/district Level, 6 = Loans and support for animal husbandry from govt., 7 = Others, 8 = No response

DATA SHEET OF KURUKSHETRA

5.1 Block and village wise distribution of Respondents

Block	Village	No. of household No.	%	Total No. of individual with employment No.	%
Thanesar	Umri	100	16.69	207	16.44
	Amin	99	16.53	205	16.28
	Total	199	33.22	412	32.72
Pehowa	Batheri	101	16.86	203	16.12
	Talheri	100	16.69	215	17.08
	Total	201	33.56	418	33.20
Babain	Sanghor	98	16.36	214	17.00
	Beedkalwa	101	16.86	215	17.08
	Total	199	33.22	429	34.07
G.Total		599		1259	

5.2 Distributioi oæ Individualó Respondentó bù agå grouđ anå seø wiså iî Districô Kurukshetra,

Age Distribution		<-----Thanesar----->			<-----Pehowa----->			<-----Babain----->			Grand Total
		Umré	Amiî	Total	Batheré	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beedkalwá'		
18-25	Male	40	36	76	32	38	70	40	44	84	230
	%	26.3	24.5	25.4	21.8	23.6	22.7	25.3	27.5	26.4	24.9
	Female	10	14	24	17	10	27	11	10	21	72
	%	18.2	24.1	21.2	30.4	18.5	24.5	19.6	18.2	18.9	21.6
Total		50	50	100	49	48	97	51	54	105	302
	%	24.2	24.4	24.3	24.1	22.3	23.2	23.8	25.1	24.5	24.0
26-45	Male	92	89	181	107	97	204	99	97	196	581
	%	60.5	60.5	60.5	72.8	60.2	66.2	62.7	60.6	61.6	62.8
	Female	38	41	79	36	41	77	41	42	83	239
	%	69.1	70.7	69.9	64.3	75.9	70.0	73.2	76.4	74.8	71.6
Total		130	130	260	143	138	281	140	139	279	820
	%	62.8	63.4	63.1	70.4	64.2	67.2	65.4	64.7	65.0	65.1
46-62	Male	20	22	42	8	26	34	19	19	38	114
	%	13.2	15.0	14.0	5.4	16.1	11.0	12.0	11.9	11.9	12.3
	Female	7	3	10	3	3	6	4	3	7	23
	%	12.7	5.2	8.8	5.4	5.6	5.5	7.1	5.5	6.3	6.9
Total		27	25	52	11	29	40	23	22	45	137
	%	13.0	12.2	12.6	5.4	13.5	9.6	10.7	10.2	10.5	10.9
District	Male	152	147	299	147	161	308	158	160	318	925
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	73.5
	Female	55	58	113	56	54	110	56	55	111	334
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	26.5
G. Total		207	205	412	203	215	418	214	215	429	1259

5.3 Distribution of Respondents by education levels

Block	Village	<-Illiterate->		<-R & W Pri-->		<---Middle--->		<--Voc. Tra-->		<-High School>		<-Graduate-->		<-Total->
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Thanesar	Umri	65	31.4	14	6.8	55	26.6	8	3.9	45	21.7	20	9.7	207
	Amin	45	22.0	7	3.4	47	22.9	7	3.4	58	28.3	41	20.0	205
	Total	110	26.7	21	5.1	102	24.8	15	3.6	103	25.0	61	14.8	412
Pehowa	Batheri	96	47.3	15	7.4	53	26.1	5	2.5	26	12.8	8	3.9	203
	Talheri	69	32.1	13	6.0	64	29.8	13	6.0	43	20.0	13	6.0	215
	Total	165	39.5	28	6.7	117	28.0	18	4.3	69	16.5	21	5.0	418
Babain	Sanghor	51	23.8	18	8.4	65	30.4	7	3.3	56	26.2	17	7.9	214
	Beedkalwa	57	26.5	10	4.7	53	24.7	6	2.8	69	32.1	20	9.3	215
	Total	108	25.2	28	6.5	118	27.5	13	3.0	125	29.1	37	8.6	429
G.Total		383	30.4	77	6.1	337	26.8	46	3.7	297	23.6	119	9.5	1259

, 5.4 Distribution of Respondents by those shifted from farm to non-farm employment in 1997-98 to 2000-01 and reasons

Block	Village	<--1--> No.	<--2--> No.	<--3--> No.	<--4--> No.	<--5--> No.	<-Total--> No.
Thanesar	Umri						10
	Amin						8
	Total						18
Pehowa	Batheri						9
	Talheri						2
	Total						11
Babain	Sanghor						2
	Beedkalwa						6
	Total						8
G.Total		0	0	0	0	0	37

Code: 1=Small land holding, 2= received vocational training, 3=no scope in agriculture in slack seasons, 4=received loans under government income generation, 5=other

5.5 Distribution of Respondents by those shifted from non-farm to farm employment in 1997-98 to 2000-01 and reasons

Block	Village	<--1--> No.	<--2--> No.	<--3--> No.	<--4--> No.	<-Total-> No.
Pehowa	Batheri					1
	Total					1
Babain	Beedkalwa					1
	Total					1
	G.Total	0	0	0	0	2

Code: 1=Small land holding, 2= received vocational training, 3=no scope in agriculture in slack seasons,
4=received loans nder government income generation

5.6 Distribution of Respondents by Perception of income increase from Farm to Non-farm activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-98

Block	Village	Increase in income in last 12 months					Increase in income 3 years back. 1997/1998				
		<----Yes---->		<---- No---->		<-Total->	<----Yes---->		<---- No---->		<-Total->
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Thanesar	Umri	62	30.0	145	70.0	207	124	59.9	82	39.6	207
	Amin	106	51.7	99	48.3	205	156	76.1	49	23.9	205
	Total	168	40.78	244	59.22	412	280	67.96	131	31.80	412
Pehowa	Batheri	92	45.3	111	54.7	203	145	71.4	58	28.6	203
	Talheri	100	46.5	115	53.5	215	163	75.8	52	24.2	215
	Total	192	45.93	226	54.07	418	308	73.68	110	26.32	418
Babain	Sanghor	96	44.9	118	55.1	214	153	71.5	61	28.5	214
	Beedkalwa	99	46.0	116	54.0	215	165	76.7	50	23.3	215
	Total	195	45.5	234	54.5	429	318	74.1	111	25.9	429
G.Total		555	44.1	704	55.9	1259	906	72.0	352	28.0	1259

activities in last 12 months & 3 years back 1997/1998

(Multiple Response)

Activities	-----In last 12 Months----->										<-----3 years back 1997/1998----->									
	<---Thanesar--->			<---Pehowa--->			<---Babain--->			G.Tot	<---Thanesar--->			<---Pehowa--->			<---Babain--->			G.Tot
	1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.		1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.	
Agri./Agri. Lab.	52	38	90	61	85	146	56	84	140	376	61	40	101	64	93	157	61	88	149	407
%	20	16	18	23	28	26	20	28	24	23	25	19	22	26	33	30	24	31	28	27
Animal Hus. etc	49	48	97	84	89	173	72	61	133	403	46	44	90	79	85	164	65	54	119	373
%	19	20	19	32	29	31	26	20	23	25	19	21	20	32	31	31	26	19	22	25
Mining Quarrying	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	9	4	13	2	1	3	6	3	9	25	9	4	13	1	1	2	5	3	8	23
%	3	2	3	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	4	2	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	2
Electricity Gas	2	0	2	0	2	2	5	2	7	11	2	0	2	0	2	2	4	2	6	10
%	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1
Construction	76	62	138	58	49	107	46	71	117	362	65	57	122	56	35	91	42	64	106	319
%	29	26	27	22	16	19	17	24	20	22	26	27	27	23	13	17	17	23	20	21
Trading/Resturant	27	40	67	28	40	68	41	22	63	198	25	29	54	25	35	60	32	19	51	165
%	10	16	13	11	13	12	15	7	11	12	10	14	12	10	13	11	13	7	10	11
Transport/Comm	4	6	10	6	14	20	12	7	19	49	3	4	7	4	13	17	10	5	15	39
%	2	2	2	2	5	4	4	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	5	3	4	2	3	3
Storage & Warehouse	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community/Social Servic																				
Govt.	22	32	54	6	4	10	17	25	42	106	22	25	47	6	3	9	16	26	42	98
Non-govt	21	12	33	16	17	33	18	26	44	110	14	8	22	10	10	20	14	20	34	76
Total	43	44	87	22	21	43	35	51	86	216	36	33	69	16	13	29	30	46	76	174
%	16	18	17	8	7	8	13	17	15	13	15	16	15	7	5	6	12	16	14	12
G. Total	262	243	505	261	302	563	274	301	575	1643	247	211	458	245	278	523	250	281	531	151

Code --> 1=Umri, 2=Amin, 3=Batheri, 4=Talheri, 5=Sanghor, 6=Beedkalwa

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity. The proportion worked out for each village/activity correspondingly by also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual respondents figure.

5.8 Distribution of Respondents by use of various employment schemes in last 12 Months & 3 years back 1997/1998

(Multiple Response)

Schemes	-----In last 12 Months----->										<-----3 years back 1997/1998----->									
	<---Thanesar--->			<---Pehowa--->			<---Babain--->			G.Tot	<---Thanesar--->			<---Pehowa--->			<---Babain--->			G.Tot
	1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.		1	2	Tot.	3	4	Tot.	5	6	Tot.	
S.G.S.Y.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	40	101	64	93	157	61	88	149	407
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	24	27	31	40	36	31	37	34	33
J.G.S.Y.	4	2	6	5	6	11	0	4	4	21	46	44	90	79	85	164	65	54	119	373
%	6	4	5	12	10	11	0	8	4	7	23	26	24	38	37	37	33	23	27	30
I.A.Y.	7	2	9	4	4	8	5	10	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
%	11	4	8	10	7	8	10	20	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
P.M.G.Y.	9	4	13	1	1	2	5	3	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	14	9	12	2	2	2	10	6	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M.V.Y.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	4	2	6	10
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1
R.G.Y./EAS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	57	122	56	35	91	42	64	106	319
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	33	27	15	21	21	27	24	26
P.M.G.S.Y.	25	29	54	25	36	61	32	19	51	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	38	62	38	60	59	59	67	3	52	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E.K.Y.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4	13	17	10	5	15	39
%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	6	4	5	2	3	3
H.G.V.F.	10	1	11	6	9	15	4	10	14	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
%	15	2	10	14	15	15	8	20	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S.L.A.V.F.	1	5	6	1	5	6	0	4	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	2	11	5	2	8	6	0	8	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	9	4	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	15	22	25	47	6	3	9	16	26	42	98
%	14	9	12	0	0	0	4	0	2	5	11	15	13	3	1	2	8	11	10	8
Total	65	47	112	42	61	103	48	50	98	313	199	170	369	209	232	441	199	239	438	1248
%	26	20	23	1	25	22	1	2	1	21	93	96	94	95	96	96	93	92	93	94
Response	188	185	373	190	184	374	202	204	406	1153	14	8	22	10	10	20	14	20	34	76
%	74	80	77	82	75	78	81	80	81	79	7	4	6	5	4	4	7	8	7	6
G. Total	253	232	485	232	245	477	250	254	504	1466	213	178	391	219	242	461	213	259	472	1324

Code --> 1=Umri, 2=Amin, 3=Batheri, 4=Talheri, 5=Sanghor, 6=Beedkalwa

S.G.S.Y = Swarnjayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana, J.G.S.Y = Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana, I.A.Y.= Indira Awaas Yojana,
P.M.G.Y.= Pradhan Mantri Gramodhaya Yojana, M.V.Y. = Marubhumi Vikas Yojana, R.G.Y.= Rojgar Gurantee Yojana(EAS)
P.M.G.S.Y.=Pradhan Mantri Gram Sarak Yojana
E.K.Y. = Ekendri Karan Yojana, H.G.V.F.= Haryana Gram Vikas Fund, S.L.A.V.F.=Sansad/Vidhayak Local Area Vikas Fund

5.1 Distributioi oæ Individuali Respondentó bñ Problemó
faceã iî non-farí activities

Problems	<-----Thanesar----->			<-----Pehowa----->			<-----Babain----->			Grand Total
	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beedkalwa	Total	
1	143	146	289	137	157	294	131	116	247	830
%	30.4	27.5	28.9	35.6	28.4	31.4	34.7	30.5	32.6	30.8
2	97	96	193	80	126	206	83	77	160	559
%	20.6	18.1	19.3	20.8	22.8	22.0	22.0	20.3	21.1	20.7
3	32	50	82	18	46	64	24	20	44	190
%	6.8	9.4	8.2	4.7	8.3	6.8	6.4	5.3	5.8	7.1
4	122	139	261	104	128	232	89	101	190	683
%	26.0	26.2	26.1	27.0	23.2	24.8	23.6	26.6	25.1	25.4
5	26	33	59	2	33	35	12	8	20	114
%	5.5	6.2	5.9	0.5	6.0	3.7	3.2	2.1	2.6	4.2
6	50	62	112	42	58	100	33	58	91	303
%	10.6	11.7	11.2	10.9	10.5	10.7	8.8	15.3	12.0	11.2
7	0	4	4	2	4	6	5	0	5	15
%	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.6	1.3	0.0	0.7	0.6
G. Total	470	530	1000	385	552	937	377	380	757	2694

Code 1 = Could not get bank loan, 2= No knowledge to initiate right work, 3 = Could not find right employment opportunity
4 = Very little scope in non-farm employment, 5 = There is risk in non-farm employment, 6 could not get work for
entire year
7 = Others

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one
activity.
The proportion worked out for each village/activity corrspondingly by also exceed 100 in total, being based on
individual
repondents figure.

5.10 Distribution of Individual Respondents by interest shown
in non-farm activities & employment with reasons

		<-----Thanesar----->			<-----Pehowa----->			<-----Babain----->			Grand Total
		Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheré	Total	Sanghor	Beedkalwa	Total	
Farm		38	56	94	50	69	119	46	59	105	318
	%	19.5	27.7	23.7	24.9	32.7	28.9	22.0	28.4	25.2	25.9
Non-Farm		157	146	303	151	142	293	163	148	311	907
	%	80.5	72.3	76.3	75.1	67.3	71.1	78.0	71.2	74.6	74.0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.1
Total -->		195	202	397	201	211	412	209	208	417	1226
1		43	64	107	84	87	171	105	76	181	459
	%	33.3	43.5	38.8	54.9	56.5	55.7	64.4	47.5	56.0	50.7
2		37	7	44	15	5	20	6	13	19	83
	%	28.7	4.8	15.9	9.8	3.2	6.5	3.7	8.1	5.9	9.2
3		40	73	113	37	55	92	45	61	106	311
	%	31.0	49.7	40.9	24.2	35.7	30.0	27.6	38.1	32.8	34.3
6		3	1	4	0	1	1	2	0	2	7
	%	2.3	0.7	1.4	0.0	0.6	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.6	0.8
7		6	2	8	17	6	23	5	9	14	45
	%	4.7	1.4	2.9	11.1	3.9	7.5	3.1	5.6	4.3	5.0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.1
Total		129	147	276	153	154	307	163	160	323	90

Code 1= More earning in Non-farm activities/More employment opportunity, 2 = small land holding with less irrigation facilities- 3= No land, 4 = No irrigation facilities, 5 = Involved in animal husbandry as a major source of income- 6= Others, 7 = No response

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity® The proportion worked out for each village/activity correspondingly by also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual repondents figure.

5.11 Distribution of Individual Respondents by suggestions to increase Non-farm employment

Suggestions	<-----Thanesar----->			<-----Pehowa----->			<-----Babain----->			Grand Total
	Umré	Amiî	Totaî	Batheré	Talheré	Totaî	Sanghor	Beedkalwá	Total	
1	74	86	160	81	80	161	74	89	163	484
%	35.9	42.2	39.0	40.7	37.4	39.0	35.1	42.2	38.6	38.9
2	27	51	78	35	51	86	47	37	84	248
%	13.1	25.0	19.0	17.6	23.8	20.8	22.3	17.5	19.9	19.9
3	38	26	64	22	25	47	23	25	48	159
%	18.4	12.7	15.6	11.1	11.7	11.4	10.9	11.8	11.4	12.8
4	17	11	28	8	3	11	19	14	33	72
%	8.3	5.4	6.8	4.0	1.4	2.7	9.0	6.6	7.8	5.8
6	38	21	59	46	34	80	31	28	59	198
%	18.4	10.3	14.4	23.1	15.9	19.4	14.7	13.3	14.0	15.9
7	3	1	4	3	5	8	4	0	4	16
%	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.3	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.9	1.3
8	9	8	17	4	16	20	13	18	31	68
%	4.4	3.9	4.1	2.0	7.5	4.8	6.2	8.5	7.3	5.5
G. Total	206	204	410	199	214	413	211	211	422	1245

Code 1 = Government can setup industries/factories to provide employment, 2= Government can provide loans to set up small industries- 3 = Small cottage and village industries can be setup with Government assistance, 4 = Technical vocational training from Govt., 5 = Employment facilities at Zilla Parishad Level, 6 = Loans for animal husbandry, 7 = Others- , ½ Nî response.

Note --> Total no. of respondents exceeds the no. of respondents because in many cases individuals performed more than one activity@ The proportion worked out for each village/activity corospondingly by also exceed 100 in total, being based on individual repondents figure.

5.12 Distribution of Respondents by distance travelled for work during the last 12 months with in 20 Km.

(Multiplã Response)

Activitiẽó	Umri	Amin	Batheri	Talheri	Sanghor	Beed	Kalwa	Grand Total
Animal husbandry etc %	47 19.7	48 21.1	84 36.1	91 33.6	71 32.3	55 21.2	396 27.3	
Manufacturing %	6 2.5	3 1.3	2 0.9	0 0.0	2 0.9	3 1.2	16 1.1	
Electricity Gas water %	0 0.0	2 0.9	0 0.0	2 0.7	1 0.5	1 0.4	6 0.4	
Construction/Repairing %	78 32.8	60 26.3	61 26.2	49 18.1	49 22.3	74 28.5	371 25.6	
Trade %	26 10.9	41 18.0	28 12.0	36 13.3	34 15.5	22 8.5	187 12.9	
TPT/Communication %	2 0.8	3 1.3	4 1.7	11 4.1	5 2.3	4 1.5	29 2.0	
Storage & Warehousing %	0 0.0	1 0.4	0 0.0	1 0.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 0.1	
CSPS Govt. %	18 7.6	22 9.6	3 1.3	2 0.7	10 4.5	18 6.9	73 5.0	
Non-Govt. %	16 6.7	11 4.8	12 5.2	15 5.5	14 6.4	15 5.8	83 5.7	
Total no.of Non-farm employment	193	190	193	207	186	192	1161	
No. of respondents	193	190	193	207	186	192	1161	
Agri.Labour/Cultivator %	45 18.9	37 16.2	39 16.7	64 23.6	34 15.5	68 26.2	287 19.8	
G. Total	238	228	233	271	220	260	1450	

5.13 No.of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998

Activities	-----THANESAR-----								
	<-----Umri----->			<-----Amin----->			<---Grand Total--->		
	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth in last
	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	in last 12 month	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	in last 12 month	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	12 month
Animal husbandry etc	13170	11180	17.8	12900	11036	14.4	26070	22216	17.3
%	24.5	24.5		24.5	27.0		24.5	25.7	
Mining/Quarrying	0	0	*****	150	140	6.7	150	140	7.1
%	0.0	0.0		0.3	0.3		0.1	0.2	
Manufacturing	2080	1820	14.3	830	720	13.3	2910	2540	14.6
%	3.9	4.0		1.6	1.8		2.7	2.9	
Electricity Gas water	0	0	*****	330	320	3.0	330	320	3.1
%	0.0	0.0		0.6	0.8		0.3	0.4	
Construction/Repairing	15895	11906	33.5	11170	8520	23.7	27065	20426	32.5
%	29.6	26.1		21.2	20.9		25.4	23.6	
Trade	7850	6915	13.5	11380	7491	34.2	19230	14406	33.5
%	14.6	15.2		21.6	18.4		18.1	16.7	
TPT/Communication	1090	700	55.7	1690	1010	40.2	2780	1710	62.6
%	2.0	1.5		3.2	2.5		2.6	2.0	
Storage & Warehousing	0	0	*****	290	0	100.0	290	0	*****
%	0.0	0.0		0.5	0.0		0.3	0.0	
CSPS Govt.	5825	6030	-3.4	8780	6545	25.5	14605	12575	16.1
%	10.8	13.2		16.7	16.0		13.7	14.6	
Non-Govt.	5100	2900	75.9	2990	1750	41.5	8090	4650	74.0
%	9.5	6.4		5.7	4.3		7.6	5.4	
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment	51010	41451	23.1	50510	37532	34.6	101520	78983	28.5
%	94.8	90.9		95.8	92.0		95.3	91.4	

No. of respondent	205	180		204	172		409	352	
Avg. No. of days	249	230		248	218		248	224	
Agri.Labour/Cultivator %	2770 5.2	4145 9.1	-33.2	2222 4.2	3284 8.0	-47.8	4992 4.7	7429 8.6	-32.8

G. Total	53780	45596		52732	40816		106512	86412	

5.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998

Activities last	-----PEHOWA-----								
	<-----Batheri----->			<-----Talheri----->			<---Grand Total--->		
	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		12 month
Last 12	3 years	in last	Last 12	3 years	in last	Last 12	3 years		
Months	back	12 month	Months	back	12 month	Months	back		
	1997/98			1997/98			1997/98		
Animal husbandry etc	23660	19490	21.4	22286	19150	14.1	45946	38640	18.9
%	45.2	45.1		39.4	39.7		42.2	42.3	
Manufacturing	440	200	120.0	250	200	20.0	690	400	72.5
%	0.8	0.5		0.4	0.4		0.6	0.4	
Electricity Gas water	0	0	*****	760	650	14.5	760	650	16.9
%	0.0	0.0		1.3	1.3		0.7	0.7	
Construction/Repairing	11975	10030	19.4	9145	5480	40.1	21120	15510	36.2
%	22.9	23.2		16.2	11.4		19.4	17.0	
Trade	7950	6625	20.0	10610	9092	14.3	18560	15717	18.1
%	15.2	15.3		18.8	18.9		17.1	17.2	
TPT/Communication	1520	570	166.7	3440	2780	19.2	4960	3350	48.1
%	2.9	1.3		6.1	5.8		4.6	3.7	
Storage & Warehousing	0	0	*****	580	440	24.1	580	440	31.8
%	0.0	0.0		1.0	0.9		0.5	0.5	
CSPS									
Govt.	1750	1610	8.7	1170	845	27.8	2920	2455	18.9
%	3.3	3.7		2.1	1.8		2.7	2.7	
Non-Govt.	3970	2270	74.9	3865	2370	38.7	7835	4640	68.9
%	7.6	5.3		6.8	4.9		7.2	5.1	
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment	51265	40795	25.7	52106	41007	27.1	103371	81802	26.4
%	98.0	94.4		92.2	85.1		95.0	89.5	

No. of respondent	200	177		214	187		414	364	
Avg. No. of days	256	230		243	219		250	225	
Agri.Labour/Cultivator	1045	2400	-56.5	4399	7187	-63.4	5444	9587	-43.2
%	2.0	5.6		7.8	14.9		5.0	10.5	

G. Total	52310	43195		56505	48194		108815	91389	

5.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998

Activities	<-----BABAIN----->								
	<-----Sanghor----->			<-----Beedkalwa----->			<-----Grand Total----->		% Groth in last 12 month
	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		% Groth	<---No. of Days--->		
	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	in last 12 month	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	in last 12 month	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	
Animal husbandry etc %	20360 35.5	17850 37.1	14.1	16050 29.1	13940 29.4	13.1	36410 32.4	31790 33.3	
Manufacturing %	1450 2.5	1270 2.6	14.2	720 1.3	520 1.1	27.8	2170 1.9	1790 1.9	21.2
Electricity Gas water %	1140 2.0	860 1.8	32.6	470 0.9	430 0.9	8.5	1610 1.4	1290 1.4	24.8
Construction/Repairing %	8260 14.4	6460 13.4	27.9	11900 21.6	9775 20.6	17.9	20160 17.9	16235 17.0	24.2
Trade %	11490 20.0	8340 17.4	37.8	6475 11.7	5295 11.2	18.2	17965 16.0	13635 14.3	31.8
TPT/Communication %	3290 5.7	2590 5.4	27.0	1780 3.2	1150 2.4	35.4	5070 4.5	3740 3.9	35.6
CSPS									
Govt. %	4980 8.7	4545 9.5	9.6	7170 13.0	6950 14.7	3.1	12150 10.8	11495 12.0	5.7
Non-Govt. %	4680 8.2	3365 7.0	39.1	7095 12.9	4930 10.4	30.5	11775 10.5	8295 8.7	42.0
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment %	55650 97.1	45280 94.2	22.9	51660 93.6	42990 90.7	20.2	107310 95.4	88270 92.5	21.6
No. of respondent	214	187		211	190		425	377	
Avg. No. of days	260	242		245	226		252	234	
Agri.Labour/Cultivator %	1660 2.9	2785 5.8	-40.4	3540 6.4	4410 9.3	-24.6	5200 4.6	7195 7.5	-27.7
G. Total	57310	48065		55200	47400		112510	95465	

5.13 No. of days worked on various activities in last 12 months and 3 years back 1997-1998
in District Kurukshetra by the six village

Activities	<---Grand Total---> % Groth in last <---No. of Days---> 12 month		
	Last 12 Months	3 years back 1997/98	
Animal husbandry etc %	108426 33.1	92646 33.9	17.0
Mining/Quarrying %	150 0.0	140 0.1	7.1
Manufacturing %	5770 1.8	4730 1.7	22.0
Electricity Gas water %	2700 0.8	2260 0.8	19.5
Construction/Repairing %	68345 20.8	52171 19.1	31.0
Trade %	55755 17.0	43758 16.0	27.4
TPT/Communication %	12810 3.9	8800 3.2	45.6
Storage & Warehousing %	870 0.3	440 0.2	97.7
CSPS			
Govt. %	29675 9.1	26525 9.7	11.9
Non-Govt. %	27700 8.4	17585 6.4	57.5
Total (Govt® Non-Govt.© %	57375 17.5	44110 16.±	30.0
Total no.of days in Non-farm employment %	312201 95.2	249055 91.1	25.4
No. of respondent	1248	1093	
Avg. No. of days	250	228	

Agri.Labour/Cultivator
%

15636 24211 -35.4
4.8 8.9

G. Total

327837 273266

5.14 Details of family members in district Kurukshetra

Distribution	<-----THANESAR----->			<-----PEHOWA----->			<-----BABAIN----->			Grand Total
	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beed	Total	
Total Household	100	99	199	101	100	201	98	101	199	599
Total member	354	348	702	365	380	745	358	396	754	2201
Sex										
Male	194	189	383	200	209	409	201	210	411	1203
Female	160	159	319	165	171	336	157	186	343	998
Age Distributio										
18-25	110	108	218	109	110	219	105	97	202	639
26-45	189	186	375	206	207	413	204	242	446	1234
46-62	55	54	109	50	63	113	49	57	106	328
Education level										
Illiterate	127	90	217	189	131	320	108	118	226	763
Primary	18	13	31	30	33	63	29	27	56	150
Middile	90	83	173	83	104	187	104	94	198	558
Commercial Trainded	10	7	17	9	16	25	14	11	25	67
Intermidiate	74	102	176	43	72	115	80	112	192	483
Graduate & above	35	53	88	11	24	35	23	34	57	180
Activities durin										
last year										
Non-farm	206	209	415	204	219	423	211	216	427	1265
Farm	66	50	116	93	84	177	44	62	106	399
Activities durin										
1997-1998										
Non-farm	179	175	354	183	190	373	184	192	376	1103
Farm	76	58	134	98	98	196	50	73	123	453

5.15 Distribution of Respondent Households by no. of family members remigrated
in 3 years(1997-98) with reasons

		<-----THANESAR----->			<-----PEHOWA----->			<-----BABAIN----->			Grand Total
		Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beed	Total	
Yes		1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	3
	%	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.8	1.0	1.3	*****	0.0	0.0	0.7
No		99	89	188	55	97	152	0	100	100	440
	%	99.0	100.0	99.5	98.2	99.0	98.7	*****	100.0	100.0	99.3
Total		100	89	189	56	98	154	0	100	100	44

Reasons 1= New Industries/Factories in the village, 2 = No option for non-farming employment
3= The govt. schemes are successfully running in the area, 4 = Others

5.16 Distribution of Respondent Households by no. of family members migrated to town
for employment in 3 years(1997-98) with reasons

		<-----THANESAR----->			<-----PEHOWA----->			<-----BABAIN----->			Grand Total
		Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beed	Total	
Yes		3	4	7	5	3	8	2	4	6	21
	%	3.0	4.4	3.7	6.5	3.0	4.5	28.6	4.0	5.6	4.4
No		97	87	184	72	96	168	5	97	102	454
	%	97.0	95.6	96.3	93.5	97.0	95.5	71.4	96.0	94.4	95.6
Total		100	91	191	77	99	176	7	101	108	47

Reasons 1= No employment opprtunities in village, 2 = Small/no land holding,
3= No work for entire year, 4 = Others

5.17 Distribution of Respondent Households by interest shown in
Non-farm employment with reasons

	<-----THANESAR----->			<-----PEHOWA----->			<-----BABAIN----->			Grand Total
	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beed	Total	
Farm	19	31	50	21	35	56	23	29	52	158
%	19.2	31.3	25.3	20.8	35.7	28.1	23.5	28.7	26.1	26.5
Non-farm	80	68	148	80	63	143	75	72	147	438
%	80.8	68.7	74.7	79.2	64.3	71.9	76.5	71.3	73.9	73.5
Total -->	99	99	198	101	98	199	98	101	199	596
1	15	7	22	3	36	39	4	22	26	87
%	15.6	10.3	13.4	3.8	37.1	22.0	5.8	27.8	17.6	17.8
2	46	8	54	2	61	63	15	26	41	158
%	47.9	11.8	32.9	2.5	62.9	35.6	21.7	32.9	27.7	32.3
3	6	29	35	28	0	28	11	23	34	97
%	6.3	42.6	21.3	35.0	0.0	15.8	15.9	29.1	23.0	19.8
4	6	2	8	2	0	2	3	1	4	14
%	6.3	2.9	4.9	2.5	0.0	1.1	4.3	1.3	2.7	2.9
5	2	0	2	14	0	14	5	3	8	24
%	2.1	0.0	1.2	17.5	0.0	7.9	7.2	3.8	5.4	4.9
6	21	22	43	31	0	31	31	4	35	109
%	21.9	32.4	26.2	38.8	0.0	17.5	44.9	5.1	23.6	22.3
Total	96	68	164	80	9	177	69	79	148	489
No Response	4	31	35	21	0	21	26	21	47	103
G.Total	100	99	199	101	97	198	95	100	195	592

Code 1= More earning in NFA/more employment opprtunities,
2= Less agricultural land with less irrigation facilities, 3 = NO land for cultivation,
4= No irrigation facilities , 5 = Animal husbandry is the main occupation, 6 = Others, 7 = No response

5.18 Distribution of Respondent Households by suggestions of increasing Non-farm employment

Suggestions	<-----THANESAR----->			<-----PEHOWA----->			<-----BABAIN----->			Grand Total
	Umri	Amin	Total	Batheri	Talheri	Total	Sanghor	Beed	Total	
01	28	31	59	40	29	69	25	45	70	198
%	28.0	31.3	29.6	39.6	29.0	34.3	26.0	45.5	35.9	33.3
02	31	17	48	13	17	30	26	14	40	118
%	31.0	17.2	24.1	12.9	17.0	14.9	27.1	14.1	20.5	19.8
03	25	29	54	17	20	37	11	6	17	108
%	25.0	29.3	27.1	16.8	20.0	18.4	11.5	6.1	8.7	18.2
04	5	1	6	4	2	6	6	3	9	21
%	5.0	1.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	6.3	3.0	4.6	3.5
05	1	4	5	3	5	8	3	0	3	16
%	1.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.1	0.0	1.5	2.7
06	7	10	17	18	23	41	9	15	24	82
%	7.0	10.1	8.5	17.8	23.0	20.4	9.4	15.2	12.3	13.8
07	2	4	6	6	0	6	10	15	25	37
%	2.0	4.0	3.0	5.9	0.0	3.0	10.4	15.2	12.8	6.2
08	1	3	4	0	4	4	6	1	7	15
%	1.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.3	1.0	3.6	2.5
G. Total	100	99	199	101	100	201	96	99	195	595

Code 1 = Government can setup industries/factories to provide employment, 2= Government can provide loans to set up small industries- 3 = Small cottage and village industries can be setup with Government assistance, 4 = Technical vocational training from Govt.- 5 = Employment facilities at block/district Level, 6 = Loans and support for animal husbandry from govt.- 7 = Others, 8 = No response