



Email: [editorijless@gmail.com](mailto:editorijless@gmail.com)

Volume: 4, Issue 3, 2017 (July-Sept)

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW, EDUCATION, SOCIAL AND SPORTS STUDIES (IJLESS)

<http://www.ijless.kypublications.com/>

ISSN:2455-0418 (Print), 2394-9724 (online)

2013©KY PUBLICATIONS, INDIA

[www.kypublications.com](http://www.kypublications.com)

Editor-in-Chief

Dr M BOSU BABU

(Education-Sports-Social Studies)

Editor-in-Chief

DONIPATI BABJI

(Law)

©KY PUBLICATIONS



## **An Analytical Study of Farm Assets in Tehsil Rania**

**Harjwant Singh**

Associate Professor

Department of Economics

Sri Guru Hari Singh College, Sri Jiwan Nagar

E-mail:- prof.harjwant.rania701@gmail.com



**Harjwant Singh**

### **ABSTRACT**

The objective of the present study is to analyse the respondent's response regarding the farm assets in tehsil Rania. This study is a survey based, primarily, on the enumeration method. The different tools which are used in this study are schedule, interview, direct observation and informal conversation. In the study, primary as well as secondary data used to achieve the objective of the study. The primary data was collected through the survey in tehsil Rania with the help of a well structured questionnaire. For the purpose of the study ten villages will be selected from the tehsil. Considering various aspects of the study, we have decided to survey of 600 agricultural workers include marginal and small farmers and landless agricultural labour from each sample village.

**Keywords:** Agriculture, Haryana, Tehsil, Rania, Assets.

### **Introduction**

As a dominant sector of an economy, agriculture plays a vital role in generating income, employment and subsistence for of our population and this role dominates effects the level of living of the people. Agriculture dominates the economy to such an extent that a high proportion of working population in India is engaged in agricultural production and agricultural activities. Haryana is one of the smallest States in India with 4.4 million hectares of land, forming 1.34 percent of the aggregate geological range of the nation. Almost 80 percent of the aggregate land region of the State is under development of which around 84 percent is irrigated with cropping intensity of 184 percent. Rania is a town and a municipal committee in Sirsa district in the Indian state of Haryana. Rania Town is the biggest grain market in Sirsa district. The main employment is agriculture and retail while wheat, vegetables, rice, and cotton are the main crops in the region. The grain market of Rania is noted for its quality basmati rice.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to get the first hand knowledge of the farming assets in Tehsil Rania.

### **Objective of the Study**

The objective of the present study is to analyse the respondent's response regarding the assets they are having for their farming.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study entitled '**An Analytical Study of Farm Assets in Tehsil Rania**' is of great significance for the tehsil, district as well as in the state of Haryana. Agricultural economy and rural economy have a distinctive character and individual it of their own. This study is likely to be useful to

all Governments and Non-Government officials dealing with the problem of farm assets, economic conditions of marginal and small farmers and landless labour and other related to these problems.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

**Table 1 Source of Irrigation**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 294       | 49.0    | 1.51       |
| No      | 306       | 51.0    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 1** shows the respondent’s response towards source of Irrigation use by the farmers. It’s found that most of respondents i.e. 306 (51 percent) out of 600 are not having source of Irrigation and remaining 294(49 percent) respondents are having source of Irrigation use by farmers with overall mean value of table is 1.51.

**Table 2 Canal**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 257       | 42.8    | 1.57       |
| No      | 343       | 57.2    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 2** shows the respondent’s response towards Irrigation through Canal by the farmers. It’s found that most of respondents i.e. 347 (57.2 percent) out of 600 are not use canal for Irrigation and remaining 257(42.8 percent) respondents are use canal for Irrigation with overall mean value of table is 1.57.

**Table 3 Well**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| No      | 600       | 100     | 2.00       |
| Total   | 600       | 100     |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 3** shows the respondent’s response towards Irrigation through Well by the farmers. It’s found that all respondents i.e. 600 (100 percent) out of 600 are not use Well for Irrigation with overall mean value of table is 2.00.

**Table 4 Tubewell/Pumpset**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 200       | 33.3    | 1.67       |
| No      | 400       | 66.7    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 4** shows the respondent’s response towards Irrigation through Tubewell/Pumpset . It’s found that most of respondents i.e. 400 (66.7 percent) out of 600 are not use Tubewell/Pumpset for Irrigation and remaining 200(33.3 percent) respondents are use Tubewell/Pumpset for Irrigation with overall mean value of table is 1.67.

**Table 5 Rainfall**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| No      | 600       | 100     | 2.00       |
| Total   | 600       | 100     |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 5** shows the respondent’s response towards Irrigation through Rainfall. It’s found that all respondents i.e. 600 (100 percent) out of 600 are not use Rainfall for Irrigation with overall mean value of table is 2.00.

**Table 6 Detail of Asset type (Owned house)**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 592       | 98.7    | 1.01       |
| No      | 8         | 1.3     |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 6** shows the respondent's response towards Detail of Asset type (Owned house). It's found that most of respondents i.e. 592 (98.7 percent) out of 600 are having Owned house and remaining 8(1.3 percent) respondents are not having Owned house with overall mean value of table is 1.01.

**Table 7 Farm Building Structure**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 160       | 26.7    | 1.73       |
| No      | 440       | 73.3    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 7** shows the respondent's response towards Farm Building Structure. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 440 (98.7 percent) out of 600 are not Farm Building Structure and remaining 160(26.7 percent) respondents are having Farm Building Structure with overall mean value of table is 1.73.

**Table 8 Cattle Shed**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 370       | 61.7    | 1.38       |
| No      | 230       | 38.3    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 8** shows the respondent's response towards Cattle Shed. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 370 (61.7 percent) out of 600 are having Cattle Shed and remaining 230(26.7 percent) respondents are not having Cattle Shed with overall mean value of table is 1.38.

**Table 9 Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 19        | 3.2     | 1.97       |
| No      | 581       | 96.8    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 9** shows the respondent's response towards Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 581 (96.8 percent) out of 600 are use Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees use in farming and remaining 19(3.2 percent) respondents are not Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees use in farming with overall mean value of table is 1.97.

**Table 10 Axes/Sickles/Spades**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 542       | 90.3    | 1.10       |
| No      | 58        | 9.7     |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 10** shows the respondent's response towards Axes/Sickles/Spades agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 542 (90.3 percent) out of 600 are use Axes/Sickles/Spades agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming and remaining 58(9.7 percent) respondents are not use Axes/Sickles/Spades agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming with overall mean value of table is 1.10.

**Table 11 Seed Drills/Water Lift**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 259       | 43.2    | 1.57       |
| No      | 341       | 56.8    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 11** shows the respondent's response towards Seed Drills/Water Lift agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 341 (56.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Seed Drills/Water Lift agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming and remaining 259(43.2 percent) respondents are use Seed Drills/Water Lift agriculture equipments and machinery in farming with overall mean value of table is 1.57.

**Table 12 Tractor/Trolley**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 109       | 18.2    | 1.84       |
| No      | 491       | 81.8    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 12** shows the respondent's response towards Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 491 (81.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming and remaining 109(18.2 percent) respondents are use Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery in farming with overall mean value of table is 1.84.

**Table 13 Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 103       | 17.2    | 1.83       |
| No      | 497       | 82.8    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 13** shows the respondent's response towards Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 497 (82.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming and remaining 103(17.2 percent) respondents are use Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine agriculture equipments and machinery in farming with overall mean value of table is 1.83.

**Table 14 Agriculture**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 240       | 40.0    | 1.60       |
| No      | 360       | 60.0    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 14** shows the respondent's response towards Income through agriculture. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 360 (60 percent) out of 600 are not having income through agriculture and remaining 240(40.0 percent) respondents are having income through agriculture with overall mean value of table is 1.60.

**Table 15 Live stocks**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 467       | 77.8    | 1.23       |
| No      | 133       | 22.2    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 15** shows the respondent's response towards Income through Live stocks. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 467 (77.8 percent) out of 600 are having income through Live stocks and remaining 133(22.2 percent) respondents are not having income through Live stocks with overall mean value of table is 1.23.

**Table 16 Poultry**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 35        | 5.8     | 1.96       |
| No      | 565       | 94.2    |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 16** shows the respondent's response towards Income through Polutry. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 565 (94.2 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Polutry and remaining 35 (5.8 percent) respondents are having income through Polutry with overall mean value of table is 1.96.

**Table 17 Fishery**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 7         | 1.20    | 2.01       |
| No      | 593       | 98.80   |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 17** shows the respondent's response towards Income through Fishery. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 593 (98.8 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Fishery and only 7(1.2 percent) respondents are having income through Fishery with overall mean value of table is 2.01.

**Table 18 Horticulture**

| Schemes | Frequency | Percent | Mean value |
|---------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Yes     | 7         | 1.20    | 2.01       |
| No      | 593       | 98.80   |            |
| Total   | 600       | 100.0   |            |

**Source:** Survey

**Table 18** shows the respondent's response towards Income through Horticulture. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 593 (98.8 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Horticulture and only 7(1.2percent) respondents are having income through Horticulture with overall mean value of table is 2.01.

**Findings**

- Respondent's response towards source of Irrigation use by the farmers. It's found that most of respondents are not having source of Irrigation.
- Response towards Irrigation through Canal by the farmers, found that most of respondents are not use canal for Irrigation and remaining respondents are use canal for Irrigation.
- Respondent's response towards Detail of Asset type (Owned house). It's found that most of respondents i.e. 592 (98.7 percent) out of 600 are having Owned house and remaining 8 (1.3 percent) respondents are not having Owned house.

- Respondent's response towards Farm Building Structure, found that most of respondents i.e. 440 (98.7 percent) out of 600 are not Farm Building Structure and remaining 160(26.7 percent) respondents are having Farm Building Structure with.
- Towards Cattle Shed, found that most of respondents i.e. 370 (61.7 percent) out of 600 are having Cattle Shed and remaining 230(26.7 percent) respondents are not having Cattle Shed with overall mean value of table is 1.38.
- The respondent's response towards Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees use in farming, found that most of respondents i.e. 581 (96.8 percent) out of 600 are use Livestock, Poultry, Fishery, Bees use in farming.
- Towards Axes/Sickles/Spades agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming, found that most of respondents i.e. 542 (90.0 percent) out of 600 are use Axes/Sickles/Spades agriculture equipments and machinery use in farm.
- Towards Seed Drills/Water Lift agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 341 (56.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Seed Drills/Water Lift agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming.
- The respondent's response towards Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming, found that most of respondents i.e. 491 (81.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming and remaining 109(18.2 percent) respondents are use Tractor/Trolley agriculture equipments and machinery in farming.
- The respondent's response towards Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming, found that most of respondents i.e. 497 (82.8 percent) out of 600 are not use Harvester/Rotavator/Threshar/Combine agriculture equipments and machinery use in farming.
- Income through agriculture, It's found that most of respondents i.e. 360 (60 percent) out of 600 are not having income through agriculture.
- The respondent's response towards Income through Live stocks. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 467 (77.8 percent) out of 600 are having income through Live stocks.
- Respondent's response towards Income through Polutry. It's found that most of respondents i.e. 565 (94.2 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Polutry.
- Respondent's response towards Income through Fishery, It's found that most of respondents i.e. 593 (98.8 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Fishery.
- Response towards Income through Horticulture, It's found that most of respondents i.e. 593 (98.8 percent) out of 600 are not having income through Horticulture.

#### References

- [1]. Report on Rain brings cheer to wheat farmers in Haryana, Punjab Last modified January 16, 2015 13:29 The Tribune. New Delhi, 15 January 2015.
- [2]. <http://www.agrometeorology.org/news/news-highlights/rain-brings-cheer-to-wheat-farmers-in-haryana-punjab> [Accessed Dated : 19/12/2016]
- [3]. Aggarwal, A.N. (1981), *Indian Agriculture*, Mittal Publication, Delhi, pp.160-160.
- [4]. Bardhan, P. (1970), "Green Revolution and Agricultural Labourers", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 1, No. 29-31, pp. 52-52.
- [5]. Pandhey, M.K. (2004), "Real Face of Globalization", *People's Democracy*, (Weekly Organ of the Communist Party of India-Marxist), No.18, Vol. XI, May 01, pp. 03, Website: [www.pd.cpim.org](http://www.pd.cpim.org).
- [6]. Verma, Anil Kumar (2006), "Pattern of Wages and Loans Among Migrant and Local Agricultural Labourers in Punjab", *Journal of Agricultural Development and Policy*, Jan-Dec, pp. 141-141.
- [7]. Jha, P. (1997), "Economic Reforms and Agricultural Labourers", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXII, No. 20 and 22, May 30.

- [8]. Bhaumik, Sankar Kumar (2007), "Growth and Composition of Rural Non-Farm Employment in India in the Era of Economic Reforms", *The Indian Economic Journal*, Vol. 55, Number 3, Oct-Dec., pp. 64-64.
- [9]. Singh, Gurdial (2007), *Punjab Vich Zaat Ate Pesh: Badalde Rujhan-Ik Punjabi Pind Da Sarvekhan* (Punjabi), Lokgeet Parkashan, S.C.O. 26-27, Sector 34-A, Chandigarh, India, pp. 62-76.
-