



Distribution of households assets and the resultant pattern of Income and employment among the rural households of mid-hill zone in Himachal Pradesh

Dr. Vinod Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Govt. College Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.) 175024

Email – vinodkeshavthakur@gmail.com

Abstract: *Since the beginning of planning in India the programmes are being designed, keeping in view the objectives of poverty alleviation and social justice. In the every five year plan, emphasis has been placed on the common man, weaker section and the less privileged of the society. Repeatedly, the objectives of the every plan have kept removal of poverty, unemployment and inequality at the top priority. But the planned development efforts have failed to bring improvement in the standard of living of the people belonging to the lower income group irrespective of all section of society. The landless households, marginal and small farmers, agricultural wage earners constitute the majority of rural poor. The lower literacy percentage and lack of other vocational skill also perpetuates poverty. During the past six decades, perceptible development has taken place across various regions in India. Notwithstanding all these achievements, issue of uneven development has reared its ugly head more often than expected. This disparate development achievement has led to serious social inequalities and disparities of income and wealth distribution. The present paper focuses on distribution of household assets and the resultant pattern of Income and employment among the rural household of mid-hill zone of Himachal Pradesh.*

Key words: *poverty, unemployment, inequality, households, income, assets*

1. INTRODUCTION:

In the rural areas, land is the main productive asset and inequality in the distribution of land is followed by inequality in the distribution of income which further leads to unequal access to the decision making process. The real cause of Indian socio-economic disparities lies more in unemployment and inequality and distortions in the structure of production than in population increase, rigidity in the social system and stagnation of national products. Mass poverty and chronic under utilization of the vast human potential are widely recognized as our most pressing problems. The term poverty or inequality may be defined as the socio-economic phenomenon whereby the resources available to a society are used to satisfy the wants of the few while the many do not have even their basic need met. It is true that the problems of Poverty and unemployment are both associated in several ways with per capita income. If per capita income is falling, absolute poverty cannot be reduced much, nor can unemployment, since there is a direct link between per capita income and the population living in poverty. It is a hard fact that poverty will be eliminated much more rapidly if any rate of economic growth is accompanied by a declining concentration of wealth. The Planning Commission has regarded unemployment and inequalities as twin problems and the solution of unemployment has been envisaged through reduction in inequalities and of inequalities through reduction in unemployment. One of the most striking experience of planned efforts in India that economically backward and socially oppressed people in the underdeveloped regions have gained little. Benefits of successive Five year Plan have passed more to the already developed regions and even within sub-region, benefits accrued proportionately more to the already rich and socially privileged section of the society, perpetuating social inequalities and disparities of wealth and income distribution. The benefits of Planning accruing only to a selected region and selected people is undesirable from the point of balanced regional development and distributive justice. In this paper an **attempt has been made** to analyses the distribution of household assets and the resultant pattern of Income and employment among the rural household of mid-hill zone of Himachal Pradesh.



2. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY :

The specific objectives of the present study are to analyse the distribution of household assets and the resultant pattern of income and employment among the rural household of mid-hill zone in Himachal Pradesh. For the present empirical investigation Mandi district has been selected purposively. Further, the district-wise percentage of poor varies between 20 percent to 54 percent, whereas this percentage in district Mandi is 20 percent. Therefore both from the topography as well as from the percentage poor point of view this selected district can represent the economic activities as well as the level of living of the rural household in the state of Himachal Pradesh as a whole. Mandi district has ten development blocks viz. Mandi Sadar, Rewalsar, Drang, Chauntra, Chachiot, Siraj, Dharampur, Gopalpur, Sunder Nagar and Karsog. With the help of multi-stage random sampling a sample of 300 households was selected from Dharampur and Gopalpur development blocks. Out of the total 300 sample households, 165 households fall in the category of marginal farmers, 75 households fall in the category of small farmers, 54 households fall in the category of medium farmers and the remaining 6 households fall in the category of large farmers. In order to achieve the objective of the present study, the required information has been collected from the selected sample with the help of pre-tested schedule by conducting personal interviews for the year 2010-11. The collected data has been analyzed by simple percentage. The primary data collected in tabular form has been analyzed with mathematical and statistical tools.

3. ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND RESULT:

1) Value of Productive Assets and Household Durables among the Sample Households:

The distribution pattern of all household assets (i.e. of both productive assets and household durables) among the sample households has been presented in Table 1. This table clearly shows that the percentage value of land to the total value of all household assets has been worked out 61.17, 50.63, 49.45 and 74.77 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 54.72. The percentage value of livestock to the total value of all household assets have been worked out 1.16, 0.69, 0.76 and 0.45 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.83. The percentage value of agricultural implements to the total value of all household assets has been worked out 0.08, 0.06, 0.06 and 0.03 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.06. The percentage value of shops to the total value of all household assets have been worked out 1.85, 3.49, 1.18 and 0.39 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 2.06. The percentage value of household industries to the total value of all household assets have been worked out 0.00, 0.02, 0.09 and 0.10 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.04. Land, livestock agricultural implements, transport equipments, shops and household industries have been treated as productive assets in the present study. The percentage value of these productive assets together has been worked out 66.05, 56.04, 54.66 and 77.96 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together the percentage value of these productive assets came out 59.78 per cent. The percentage value of household durables, i.e. of furnishing articles, electrical appliances, utensils, and, bedding, jewellery, buildings etc. to the total value of household assets also varies sharply from one size of holding group to the other. The variations in the distribution of these durable necessarily indicate the variations in the levels of living of sample households but have a negligible direct effect on the pattern of household income and employment. The percentage value of furnishing articles to the total value of household assets has been worked out 1.48, 3.58, 1.59 and 0.88 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 2.16. The percentage value of electrical appliances to the total value of household assets has been worked out 1.97, 2.34, 2.14 and 1.03 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 2.09. The percentage value of utensils to the total value of household assets has been worked out 0.48, 0.58, 0.82 and 0.39 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.62. The percentage value of beddings to the total value of household assets has been worked out 0.81, 0.01, 1.45 and 0.55 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.07. The percentage value of jewelry to the total value of household assets has been worked out 3.68, 6.98, 8.29 and 4.12 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 6.31. The percentage value of buildings to the total value of household assets has been worked out 25.30, 29.35, 30.94 and 15.03 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 27.84. The percentage value of household durables together to the



total value of household assets has been worked out 33.95, 43.96, 45.34 and 22.04 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 40.22.

Table 1 Distribution Pattern of Productive Assets and Household Durables among the Sample Households (Value in Rs.)

S.N.	Assets	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings
A	Productive Assets					
	1) Land	853636.36 (61.17)	1785411.87 (50.63)	2497535.19 (49.45)	6429350.00 (74.77)	1493996.30 (54.72)
	2) Livestock	16251.52 (1.16)	24453.33 (0.69)	38333.33 (0.76)	38833.33 (0.45)	22728.33 (0.83)
	3) Agricultural Implements	1112.12 (0.08)	2130.80 (0.06)	2894.44 (0.06)	2850.00 (0.03)	1722.37 (0.06)
	4) Transport Equipments	24939.39 (1.79)	40733.33 (1.16)	157592.59 (3.12)	190833.33 (2.22)	56083.33 (2.05)
	5) Shops	25757.58 (1.85)	122933.33 (3.49)	59814.81 (1.18)	33333.33 (0.39)	56333.33 (2.06)
	6) Household Industries	0.00 (0.00)	666.67 (0.02)	4629.63 (0.09)	8333.33 (0.10)	1166.67 (0.04)
	7) Sub Total (1 to 6)	921696.97 (66.05)	1976329.33 (56.04)	2760800.00 (54.66)	6703533.33 (77.96)	1632030.33 (59.78)
B	Household Durables					
	8) Furnishing Articles	20623.03 (1.48)	126350.67 (3.58)	80331.48 (1.59)	76083.33 (0.88)	58911.67 (2.16)
	9) Electrical Appliances	27493.85 (1.97)	82620.67 (2.34)	108288.07 (2.14)	88500.00 (1.03)	57038.64 (2.09)
	10) Utensils	6701.82 (0.48)	20357.33 (0.58)	41638.89 (0.82)	33583.33 (0.39)	16942.00 (0.62)
	11) Beddings	11233.76 (0.81)	35234.67 (1.00)	73268.52 (1.45)	47033.33 (0.55)	29116.23 (1.07)
	12) Jewelry	51387.58 (3.68)	245973.33 (6.98)	418777.78 (8.29)	354000.00 (4.12)	172216.50 (6.31)
	13) Buildings	352994.55 (25.30)	1035066.67 (29.35)	1562629.63 (30.94)	1292500.00 (15.03)	760037.00 (27.84)
	14) Others*	3333.33 (0.24)	4413.33 (0.13)	5000.00 (0.10)	4000.00 (0.05)	3916.67 (0.14)
	15) Sub-Total (8 to 14)	473767.91 (33.95)	1550016.67 (43.96)	2289934.37 (45.34)	1895700.00 (22.04)	1098178.70 (40.22)
	16) Grand Total (7+15)	1395464.88 (100.00)	3526346.00 (100.00)	5050734.37 (100.00)	8599233.33 (100.00)	2730209.04 (100.00)

Source: Primary data collected from households of study area.

Note:-Figures in parenthesis denote the percentage to the column total.

*Others includes gas cylinder etc.

Thus, the above distribution pattern of household assets shows that there exists an unequal distribution of these assets among the different holding groups. The percentage value of land to the total value of household assets is the highest, i.e. 54.72 per cent among all the sample households. The second major household asset is the buildings which accounted for 27.84 per cent followed by jewelry which constituted 6.31 per cent. The percentage value of total productive assets came out 59.78 per cent, and the percentage value of household durables came out 40.22 per cent. There exist sharp variations in the distribution of household durables from one size of holding group to the other.



2) Pattern of Household Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Income:

The pattern of household total income (i.e., both from agricultural and non-agricultural income) has been presented in Table 2. The percentage share of income earned from field crops to the total household income has been worked out 0.11, 1.26, 1.88 and 1.65 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.03. The percentage share of income earned from field crops is the highest on the medium size of holdings as compared to the small, marginal and large size of holdings. It happened mainly due to the reason that the households falling on the medium size of holdings make intensive use of their land which is comparatively more fertile. Whereas, contrary to it, the households falling on the marginal size of holdings due to their uneconomic size of holdings which is generally steep sloped, stony and thick surfaced cannot produce food grains even to meet out their domestic needs. Whereas, the large size of holdings due to sufficient land area, can afford to spare larger land area for horticultural uses. The percentage share of horticulture income to the total household income has been worked out 00, 00, 0.08 and 0.21 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.03.

Table 2 Pattern of Total Household Income among the Sample Households (Value in Rs.)

S.N.	Source of Income	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings
A	Farm Income					
	1) Agricultural Income	115.15 (0.11)	2706.67 (1.26)	4537.04 (1.88)	5333.33 (1.65)	1663.33 (1.03)
	2) Horticulture Income	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	203.70 (0.08)	666.67 (0.21)	50.00 (0.03)
	3) Income from Live Stock	2248.48 (2.12)	2240.00 (1.04)	3425.93 (1.42)	5833.33 (1.80)	2530.00 (1.56)
	4) Other Income *	736.36 (0.69)	1493.33 (0.70)	2703.70 (1.12)	10833.33 (3.34)	1481.67 (0.91)
	5) Sub-Total Income(1 to 4)	3100.00 (2.92)	6440.00 (3.00)	10870.37 (4.50)	22666.67 (7.00)	5725.00 (3.53)
B	Non-Agricultural Income					
	1) Services					
	I) Government Job	41364.24 (38.92)	115387.73 (53.76)	129650.37 (53.69)	243333.33 (75.10)	79801.00 (49.24)
	II) Private Job	14743.03 (13.87)	33469.33 (15.59)	39868.89 (16.51)	0.00 (0.00)	23652.40 (14.59)
	III) Sub Total (I + II)	56107.27 (52.79)	148857.07 (69.35)	169574.81 (70.22)	243333.33 (75.10)	103463.40 (63.84)
	2) Business	11878.79 (11.18)	16457.60 (7.67)	14737.04 (6.10)	10666.67 (3.29)	13513.73 (8.34)
	3) Household Industry	3021.82 (2.84)	484.27 (0.23)	222.22 (0.09)	2666.67 (0.82)	1876.40 (1.16)
	4) Wage Work	18109.09 (17.04)	826.67 (0.39)	837.04 (0.35)	6000.00 (1.85)	10437.33 (6.44)
	5) Pension	12429.09 (11.69)	40992.00 (19.10)	34476.30 (14.28)	26666.67 (8.23)	23823.07 (14.70)
	6) Other Income**	1633.94 (1.54)	584.00 (0.27)	10766.67 (4.46)	12000.00 (3.70)	3222.67 (1.99)
	7) Sub-Total (1 to 6)	103180.00 (97.08)	208201.60 (97.00)	230614.07 (95.50)	301333.33 (93.00)	156336.60 (96.47)
C	Grand Total Income (A + B)	106280.00 (100.00)	214641.60 (100.00)	241484.44 (100.00)	324000.00 (100.00)	162061.60 (100.00)

Source: Primary data collected from households of study area.

Note:-Figures in parenthesis denote percentage to column total.

* includes other agricultural income for poultry and grass etc.



** includes other non-agricultural income from contractor, religious work, lawyer and income from vehicles for commercials use.

The percentage share of household income earned from livestock activities to the total household income has been worked out 2.12, 1.04, 1.42 and 1.80 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.56. The percentage share of income earned from livestock activities to the total household income is the highest on the marginal size of holdings as compared to small, medium and large size of holdings. The percentage share of livestock income to the total household income shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It happened mainly due to the reason that marginal farmers have received milch cattle under Integrated Rural Development Programmes (IRDP). The percentage share of other agricultural income to the total household income has been worked out 0.69, 0.70, 1.12 and 3.34 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.91. The percentage share of total agricultural income to the total household income has been worked out 2.92, 3.00, 4.50 and 7.00 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively, whereas, among all the holdings together this percentage came out 3.53. The percentage share of agricultural income to the total household income shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It happened mainly due to the stony, scattered, uneconomic size of holdings, lack of fertilizers, manures, irrigation facilities, inferior quality of seeds, and lack of modern inputs used by the household fallings on the smaller holding groups as compared to the households falling on the larger size of holdings. The percentage share of household income earned from services to the total household income has been worked out 52.79, 69.35, 70.22 and 75.10 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 63.84. The percentage share of household income earned from services to the total household income shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. This happened mainly due to the sound and regular sources of household income and higher literacy percentage among the larger size of holding groups. The percentage share of household income earned from business activities to the total household income has been worked out 11.18, 7.67, 6.10 and 3.29 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 8.34. The percentage share of household income earned from business activities to the total household income is the highest on the marginal size of the holdings, mainly on account of the financial assistance received by the marginal households on subsidized rates under the Government scheme for providing them gainful self employment opportunities with a view to supplement their meager household income. The percentage share of household income earned from households industries to the total household income has been worked out 2.84, 0.23, 0.09 and 0.82 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.16. The percentage share of household income earned from household industries is highest on the marginal size of holdings, is mainly due to the financial assistance and skill formation provided under the ' Anti-Poverty Programmers ' as well as to supplement the meagre household income of the poor households. Most of the households falling on the marginal size of holdings are provided with the financial assistance, skill formation and instruments mainly for the expansion of their household industries with a view to raise their household income. The table further reveals that the percentage share of household's income earned from wage work to the total household income has been worked out 17.04, 0.39, 0.35 and 1.85 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 6.44. The percentage share of household income earned from wage work is the highest on the marginal size of holdings. It happened mainly on account of their meagre household income and lack of gainful employment opportunities on their own farm they prefer to go for wage work nearby, mainly in road construction and projects. These households due to meagre household income, high dependency ratio and higher debt burden cannot afford to remain without work and as a result of it, they lay their hand on any wage work irrespective to the nature of the work as well as wage rate given to them. On the larger holdings, the percentage share of wage income to the total household income is low mainly due to the reason that these households on their large size of holdings get gainful work throughout the full agricultural year and therefore, they do not prefer to work on wage basis which they considered below status. The percentage share of income derived from pension to the total household income has been worked out 11.69, 19.10, 14.28 and 8.23 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 14.70. The percentage share of household income earned from other sources (mainly from the religious work, commercial vehicles and contract work etc.) to the total household income has been worked out 1.54, 0.27, 4.46 and 3.70 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.99. Thus, the percentage share of household non- agricultural income to the total household income has been worked out 97.08, 97.00, 95.50 and 93.00 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 96.47. The percentage share of household's non agricultural income to the total income shows a decreasing



tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It occurred mainly due to the well developed and fertile agricultural land, which contribute to the total household's income of the large farmer, whereas the households falling on the smaller size of the holdings due to the uneconomic size of the holdings, meagre household income, higher dependency ratio and higher burden of the debt repayment, generally supplement their meagre household income mainly by way of wage work and partly through other non-agricultural source of household's income.

3) Pattern of family Human Labour Days Utilization in Agricultural, Non-Agricultural and Necessary Household Activities:

The pattern of family human labour days utilization in agricultural, non-agricultural and necessary household activities among the sample households have been presented in Table 3. This table clearly shoes that the percentage of mandays spent in crop production to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 6.14, 10.26, 16.47 and 18.29 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 9.72. The percentage of mandays spent in crop production to the total mandays utilized in different activities is the lowest on the marginal size of holdings as compare to small, medium and large size of holdings. The percentage of mandays spent in horticultural activities to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 00, 00, 0.26 and 1.22 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.09. Thus the percentage of mandays spent in crop production and horticultural activities shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It happened mainly due to the reason that male members of the families falling on the smaller size of holding groups are not necessarily required on their own uneconomic size of holdings even during the peak agricultural seasons and hence, they keep themselves busy in more remunerative regular jobs outside agriculture. Whereas, the households falling on the larger holding groups due to gainful employment on their own economic size of holdings as well as due to sufficient income earned from crops, devote maximum time in agricultural and horticultural activities. The percentage of mandays spent in livestock activities to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 14.12, 18.01, 19.06 and 19.51 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 16.31. Thus the percentage of mandays spent in livestock activities shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It is observed that during the busy agricultural periods, less mandays are spent per household in looking after cattle, whereas, during the lean agricultural seasons, the farmers spent most of their time of looking after the animals. All this goes to suggest that probably larger proportions of the mandays spent exclusively in looking of livestock, is more in the nature of doing something since there was nothing to do. The percentage of mandays spent in all the agricultural activities to the total mandays utilized in all the activities came out 20.27, 28.27, 35.79 and 39.02 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 26.12. The percentage of mandays spent in services to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 23.62, 29.55, 27.92 and 29.88 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 26.21. The percentage of mandays spent in services is the lowest on the marginal size of holdings as compared to small medium and large size of holdings. The percentage of mandays spent in services, shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. This happened mainly on account of the higher literacy percentage among the households fallings on the larger size of holdings as compared to the smaller size of holdings. The percentage of mandays spent in business activities to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 5.99, 7.25, 6.61 and 2.13 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holding groups together this percentage came out 6.34. The percentage of mandays spent in business activities is the highest on the small size of holding as compared to medium, large and marginal size of holdings. The percentage of mandays spent in business activities by the households falling on the small size of holdings, is the highest mainly on account of the fact that these households have received loans at low rate of interest under the self-employment scheme to start their business to supplement their meagre household income. Whereas, the households fallings on the medium and large size of holdings due to their sound and regular source of household income as well as higher literacy percentage, can afford to make investment in business activities. Contrary to it, most of the households on the marginal size of holdings due to their uneconomic size of holdings, meagre household income and higher illiteracy percentages are not prepared to take risk by taking Government loans for business activities which are advanced by the Government agencies against the security of their land and houses. The percentage of mandays spent in household industries to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 0.28, 0.56, 0.67 and 1.14 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.46. The percentage of mandays spent in household industries shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage of mandays spent in wage work to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 12.84, 1.34, 0.91



and 3.05 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 7.11. The percentage of mandays spent in wage work is the highest on the marginal size of holdings as compared to small, medium and large size of holdings. This happened mainly due to the reason that smaller being poor, are ready to get work irrespective to the nature of work as well as the wage rate. Due to the higher dependency ratio, uneconomic size of holdings and meagre household income, they cannot afford to remain unemployed during the lean agricultural season and or even during the peak agricultural season, when they are not necessarily required on their own uneconomic size of holdings. Whereas, on the large size of holdings due to higher percentage of literacy, sound and regular sources of income and social status, most of well-to-do families consider wage work below status.

Table 3 Pattern of family Human Labour Days Utilization in Agricultural, Non-Agricultural and Necessary Household Activities Among the Sample Households (Standard Mandays)

S.N.	Activities	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	large Holdings	All Holdings
A	Agricultural Activities					
	I) Crop Production	48.06 (6.14)	88.67 (10.26)	167.41 (16.47)	200.00 (18.29)	82.73 (9.72)
	II) Horticulture Activities	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	2.59 (0.26)	13.33 (1.22)	0.73 (0.09)
	III) Live Stock Activities	110.48 (14.12)	155.60 (18.01)	193.70 (19.06)	213.33 (19.51)	138.80 (16.31)
	IV) Sub-Total (I+II+III)	158.55 (20.27)	244.27 (28.27)	363.70 (35.79)	426.67 (39.02)	222.27 (26.12)
B	Non- Agricultural Activities					
	I) Services	184.73 (23.62)	255.33 (29.55)	283.70 (27.92)	326.67 (29.88)	223.03 (26.21)
	II) Business	46.82 (5.99)	62.60 (7.25)	67.22 (6.61)	23.33 (2.13)	53.97 (6.34)
	III) Household Industries	2.21 (0.28)	4.87 (0.56)	6.76 (0.67)	12.50 (1.14)	3.90 (0.46)
	IV) Wage work	100.47 (12.84)	11.60 (1.34)	9.26 (0.91)	33.33 (3.05)	60.49 (7.11)
	V) Other*	11.70 (1.50)	18.67 (2.16)	14.17 (1.39)	29.17 (2.67)	14.23 (1.67)
	VI) Sub-Total(I to V)	345.93 (44.22)	353.07 (40.86)	381.11 (37.50)	425.00 (38.87)	355.63 (41.79)
C	Necessary Activities					
	I) Family Affairs	155.37 (19.86)	145.57 (16.85)	145.09 (14.28)	125.42 (11.47)	150.47 (17.68)
	II) Social Affairs	61.30 (7.84)	64.20 (7.43)	80.10 (7.88)	83.75 (7.66)	65.86 (7.74)
	III) Sickness	61.10 (7.81)	56.93 (6.59)	46.25 (4.55)	32.50 (2.97)	56.81 (6.68)
	IV) Sub-Total (I+II+III)	277.77 (35.51)	266.70 (30.87)	271.44 (26.71)	241.67 (22.10)	273.14 (32.10)
D	Grand Total (A+B+C)	782.24 (100.00)	864.04 (100.00)	1016.26 (100.00)	1093.33 (100.00)	851.04 (100.00)

Source: Primary data collected from households of study area.

Note:-Figures in parenthesis denote the percentages to the column total.

*Other activities include time spent in religious work and contractorship etc.



The percentage of mandays spent in other activities to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been works out 1.50, 2.16, 1.39 and 2.67 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 1.67. The percentage of mandays spent in all the non-agricultural activities such as services, business, household industries, wage work and other activities to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been works out 44.22, 40.86, 37.50 and 38.87 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 41.79. The percentage of mandays spent in family affairs to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 19.86, 16.85, 14.28 and 11.47 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 17.68. The percentage of mandays spent in social affairs to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 7.84, 7.43, 7.88 and 7.66 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 7.74. The mandays spent in sickness to the total mandays utilized in different activities has been worked out 7.81, 6.59, 4.55 and 2.97 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 6.68. The percentage of mandays spent in 'necessary activities' to the total mandays spent in all the activities, has been worked out 35.51, 30.87, 26.71 and 22.10 percent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 32.10. Thus, the percentage distribution of mandays spent in different activities by the sample households show that the major proportion of mandays spent in non-agricultural activities followed by necessary and agricultural activities.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:

The above empirical results clearly established the inter relationship between the value of household productive assets, gainful employment opportunities and household income. On the smaller size of holdings due to the lack of sufficient productive assets (i.e., mainly land, live stock, and machinery), the family human labours are either unemployed and/or underemployed, which resulted into meagre household income with the help of which they are not even in a position to meet out their minimum food and non-food requirement. Whereas, contrary to it, the household falling on the large size of holdings have sufficient productive assets which provide gainful employment opportunities to the family human labour as well as regular and sound sources of household income with the help of which they can afford to maintain a good standard of living.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Therefore in order to reduce the inequalities in the distribution of household productive assets, employment opportunities, household income and consumption expenditure between the rich and poor as well as to raise the socio-economic conditions of the poor rural households through increased availability of productive assets, skill formation and gainful employment opportunities, the planning strategy for rural development should be judicious mix of beneficiary oriented programmes, human resource development and infrastructure development. The emphasis should be placed on the minor irrigation, soil and water conservation, co-operation, rural roads and reforms in the infrastructure Sector; drinking water supply, general education, technical education and health in the social service sector; horticulture, animal husbandry, dairy development, fisheries and forestry in the agricultural sector and small village and cottage industries in the industrial sector. Therefore, in order to raise the socio-economic conditions as well as to reduce the gap between the rich and poor, the planners, policy maker and administrator should implements the poverty alleviation programmes more effectively in the rural area in such a way so that most poor be benefited the most and the least poor be benefited the least.

REFERNCES:

1. Bagalkoti, S.T. and R.V. Dadivabhai.(2006), Reform and regional Inequalities in India: An Analysis, *The Indian Economic Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 2, New Delhi.
2. Basu, S. (1976), Pattern of Assets Holding in the Rural India-A Study of Top Assets Holders, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.11, No. 28, Bombay.
3. Dandekar, V.M. and Rath, N. (1971), *Poverty in India*, Indian School of political Economy, Bombay.
4. Dantwala, M.L. (1973), *Poverty in India Then and Now; 1870-1970*, The Macmillan Company of India Ltd. Delhi.



5. Sharma, K.C.(1992), Variations in the Levels of Living of the Tribals in Himachal Pradesh-An Empirical Investigation, *Social Change*, Vol. 22, No. 4, New Delhi.
6. Sharma, K.C. (1994), *Poverty, Unemployment and Inequalities in Tribal India: With Special Reference to Himachal Pradesh*, Reliance Publishing House, New Delhi.
7. Sharma, K.C. (2007), Labour Utilization Pattern and Unemployment in Hilly Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh, *Manpower Journal*, Vol. XLII, No. 4, Oct.-December, Delhi.
8. Sharma K.C. and Devi Lalita, (2013), Distribution of Household Assets and the Resultant Pattern of Income among the Tribals Areas of Himachal Pradesh, *Research Digest*, Vol. 8, Issue-2, Bilaspur(C.G.).
9. Sharma K.C. and Sharma, Anju. (2007), Disparities in the Distribution of Household Assets and Resultant Pattern of Income in the Low-Hill Zone Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh – An Empirical Investigation, *Research Digest*, Vol. 2, Issue I, Bilaspur (C.G.).
10. Sharma K.C. and Thakur, D.S. (1988), Distribution of the Rural Household Assets and the Resultant Pattern of Employment and the Income in the Low Hill Zone Aggregation Economy of Himachal Pradesh: An Empirical Investigation, *Manpower Journal*, Vol.24, No.2, New Delhi.
11. Sharma, K.C. and Thakur, Vibha. (2005) Disparities in the Distribution of Household Assets and Resultant Pattern of Employment and Income Amon g Gaddis of Himachal Pradesh, *PSE Economic Analyst*, Vol. XXV No. 2, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar.
12. Sharma, L.R. (1982), Poverty and Inequality in the Rural Sector of Himachal Pradesh, *Economic Affairs*, Vol. 27, No. 7-9, Calcutta.
13. Srinivasan, T.V.and Bardhan, P.K.ed.(1974), *Poverty and Income Distribution in India*, Statistical Publishing Society, Calcutta.
14. Thakur Bimla,(1991) *A Socio-Economic Analysis of the Weaker Sections in Himachal Pradesh*, Daya Publishing House, Delhi.
15. Thakur, Dalip S. (1985), *Poverty, Inequality and Unemployment in Rural India: Some Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Measurement*, B.R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi.
16. Thakur Dalip S. (1983), Measuring of Inequality and Poverty in Hilly Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh, *Artha-Vikas*, Ahmadabad.
17. Thakur Dalip S. and Neeraj Sharma, (2008), Distribution of Household Assets and the Resultant Pattern of Income and Employment among the Weaker Sections in the Rural Areas of Haryana, *Social Change*, Vol. 38, No. 3, New Delhi.
18. Thakur Dalip S. and Sarbjeet Singh. (2006), Extent of Absolute Poverty, Among the Different socio-economic groups in the rural area of Himachal Pradesh: A Nutrition and Nutrition Plus Approach, *Indian Journal of Economics*, Vol. LXXXVII, Part-2, No. 345, Allahabad.
19. Thakur, Davender, (1986), *Social Economics Development of Tribes in India*, Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi.