

DR.B.R. AMBEDKAR'S THOUGHT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF MARGINAL

Dr. L.C. Mallaiah,

Associate Professor,

Department of Economics,

B. B. Ambedkar University, Lucknow

Introduction of economic reforms in early 1990's was not a break as the growth rate in the post-reforms was not significantly higher than 1980's. Growth rate, in fact, slowed down in the early years of 21st century, but significantly picked up after 2004. Industry and services both have escalation in their share in different pace and time. On the basis of the observed patterns of growth and structural changes, economic growth in post-Independence India can be divided into the four phases. First phase is known as initial and upswing period for an economy. Independence to mid-1960s, this period saw a significant acceleration in the growth rate over the past decades marked by a high growth of industry, and a significant structural change with a large increase in the share of non-agricultural sector, especially of the industry in the national output. Phase two conceals the period of 1960's to 1980s, this period was marked by a slower growth of GDP, accompanied by a deceleration in the growth of industry, a slower pace of structural shift from agriculture to non-agriculture and a very small increase in the share of industry. Next phase encompasses the period of 1980 to 1990. It shows a sharp acceleration in growth rate, mainly contributed by services. Structural changes were also swift with a large decline in the share of agriculture, but very little increase in the share of industry and services picking up the major share of the shift. The Structural changes continued at an accelerated pace with share of agriculture sharply declining and services emerging as the major sector and with very small increase in the share of industry. The best testimony to the success of the 1991

reforms arises from comparing the rate of growth of per capita incomes in the 25 years preceding the reforms and those succeeding it. Between 1965 and 1990, India's average annual gross domestic product (GDP) growth was a mere 4.1%, which translated to a per capita income growth of 1.9% per annum. Agriculture has continued to consistently decline since 1950-51 to 2010-11 from 40% to 16% respectively. The service has increased up to 60% and industry has stagnated. It appears that four services namely Trade, Transportation, Communication, Banking and Insurance have contributed more in the entire GDP growth during 1950 to 2012. Along with governance, policy non-tradable sectors like education, health, direct taxation and infrastructure are keys to making Indian industry globally competitive. Partially only profitable sectors of an economy are promoted by Union Government. However the agrarian sector has been dominating in India and its workforce has been still suffering and surviving in an agony since independence. This agony and afflictions are vibrant in terms of education, employment, socio-economic security and standard of living of the rural people particularly dalits. Hence this paper is an attempt to study the approach of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar for Economic development of Dalits with reference to agrarian sector. This agrarian sector advancement will be scrutinized in terms of distribution of Livelihood resources like land, employment, production income and poverty. The advancement of an economy with egalitarian notion in the comprehensive framework of Dr. Ambedkar tactics to economic development and justice can be

galvanized with execution of equity in economic resource allocation and distribution. Dr. Ambedkar's major center of attention was the Dalit's empowerment. The Dalits are the only segment of populace of an economy who are immense part of socio economic, religious disparity, exploitation and suppression. The empowerment of dalits have been encouraged and strengthened by introducing several plan and special budget under the Special Component Scheme, Special Component Plan for upliftment of dalits (SCs, STs).

The phenomenon of spatial inequality in human settlement and particularly in the case of Dalits settlement is not something new. Nevertheless, it is historically rooted. For centuries, the dalits have quarantined outside of the main villages, and denied access to most occupation. These untouchables out castes are left out from activity that involved collaboration with other caste. The traditional sociak norms, caste have with significantly determined settlement patterns of the human community. Even now in each one of the Indian villages of the dalits live in a separate settlement called the "Chamrura" in northern part and the 'cheri' in southern part usually located about between 1-2 kilometers away from the main village (Sundari, T.K. 1991).

The very high proportion of the dalits population is being engaged in the agricultural sector. Indian agriculture is still backward and characterized by low productivity and unequal distribution of land with high incidence of unemployment and poverty due to semi feudal structure. After independence several attempts were made to improve the agrarian structure by abolishing large intermediaries conferring ownership rights to tenants reducing skewed distribution of land through imposition of ceiling on land holdings and redistribution of surplus land to the landless dalits and organized small and marginal holdings along with cooperative lines and to regulate wages of agricultural laborers. These measures have not improved the agrarian structure to the desired extent. The success of agrarian reforms and institutional changes in bringing out rapid economic

growth with social justice depends more or less on the right type of institutional arrangements. Hence, the policy makers to emancipate the peasants from the clutches of semi feudalism on one hand and to foster agricultural growth on the other hand initiated numerous institutional reforms. The main aim of the massive institutional reforms in the option of congress agrarian committee under the Chairmanship of kumarappa was promotion of individual peasant farming on suitable unit of cultivation under the property.

Ambedkar had observed that economic and social development could be achieved through the advancement of agriculture in rural areas dehumanized and discriminated individuals. He had examined the problems of subdivision and fragmentation of agricultural land holdings affecting agricultural production and formulated very scientific definition of economic holdings. He said that existing holdings are uneconomic, not in the sense that they are small but they are too large in relation to the existing availability of agricultural inputs. This notion is applied to all rural populace equally. So there must not be any class division among the farmers. According to him, a solution to the ills of agriculture in India is relying in the matter of increasing capital goods like agricultural implements in right proportion to the farm size. Therefore, Ambedkar agrees that the proposal of enlarging the existing holding as a remedy for the ills of our agriculture. It is shown that farms have diminished land in size while the agricultural stock as increased in amount. He argued that our bad social economy was responsible for the ills of our agriculture and scattered farms and existence of idle labor in agriculture. This paper examines the economic development in terms of distribution of livelihoods like land, labor, employment, income generation, education and poverty and highlight the approach of Dr.B.R. Ambedkar for economic development of people particularly dalits.

LAND

Much of the human history is dominated by the relationship of man to land. Land is the most important asset. Unlike other assets, it maintains its capital value over time and offers more security. Its possession in these societies is a symbol of entitlements, power and privileges and is synonymous with not only the economic status of the household but its social status as well. In agrarian regimes "to own the land is the highest mark of esteem. Land ownership is also considered important for the purpose of bringing in permanent improvements on land and is variously described as an essential pre-requisite for technological changes in agriculture. Indian agriculture is dominated by small and marginal farmers. The agriculture is characterized by the incidence of tenancy and landlessness, and a high degree of fragmentation and skewed distribution of land holdings which have a direct effect on agricultural production and income. The average size of holdings is decreasing in most of the states. The quality of land and agricultural conditions vary from state to state. The analysis of land is based on six broad size classes like Landless holdings, marginal holdings, small holdings, semi-medium and large category of land holdings.

CHANGES IN LAND HOLDINGS AND AREA OWNED

Table-1 highlights the changes in the number of ownership holdings and the amount of area owned in rural India during 1971-72 to 2013. The percentage changes in the number of holdings and the amount of area owned by different categories of holdings from the 1990s to the 2013 in various states are given in Table-3. During 1991 to 2013, the percentage change in the number of ownership holdings varied from 0.78 per cent to 0.49 per cent in Andhra Pradesh and 0.30 per cent to 0.21 per cent in Kerala. The change in the amount of area owned ranged from 1.10 per cent to 0.63 per cent in Punjab and 1.41 per cent to 0.76 per cent in Haryana. In Tamil Nadu, the amount of area owned per household increased from 0.41 per cent to 0.35 per cent and in Gujarat, the amount of area owned per

households decreased from 1.38 per cent to 0.84 per cent. A maximum average area owned per household belongs to Karnataka and a minimum average area owned per households belongs to West Bengal. The average size of holdings and proportion of landless households are presented in table-2 for the major States. The estimated area owned by the rural households in India during 2013 was 92.369 million hectares (mha) with an average size of 0.61 hectare land per ownership holdings. Nearly 7.41 per cent of households have practically no land in India.

It is clear from table-2 that during 2013, West Bengal is showing the lowest value of average size of land at 0.18 (ha) and Rajasthan is reporting the highest size at 1.49 (ha). The states of Kerala, Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Odisha, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh reported an average area owned per household less than the national average size at 0.59 ha. The percentage of landless households in the major states also varied over a wide range with the highest percentage in Andhra Pradesh at 15.93 per cent and the lowest in Haryana at 1.05 per cent. In most of the states the increase in area owned was much less compared to an increase in the number of holdings resulting in a decline in the average size of holdings. Table-3 depicts and compares different size classes of land holdings, marginal holdings (0.01-0.99 acres) witnessed higher percentage increase in, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, and Haryana, Rajasthan and, small holdings (1.00-2.00 acres) there is a more reduction in ownership of holdings of households of small category in Jammu and Kashmir, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, west Bengal only; semi medium ownership of holdings (2.00 - 4.00 acres) of households found lesser in Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Odisha and West Bengal. Medium ownership of holdings (4.00 - 10.00 acres) of household in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh recorded the highest percentage as compared to other states. The highest per cent of households are seen in the marginal ownership category over the years till 2013, showing an increasing trend from 52.98 per

cent households in 1971-72 to 75.41 per cent households in 2013. The maximum percentage of area owned was reflected for the medium category of land holdings from 1971-72 till 2003. However, after four decades, the marginal category has become the maximum per cent of area owned during 2013. It is also observed that, over the last five decades since 1971, the percentage distribution of households has progressively declined for all the category of ownership holdings except for the marginal holders; whereas percentage distribution of area owned has increased for all the category of holdings, except for the medium and large holdings recording 30.73 per cent in 1971-72 to 18.9 per cent in 2013 and 22.91 percentage in 1971-72 to 5.81 percent in 2013 respectively. The large and medium holdings together, owned around 54 percent of the total land in 1971-72, which progressively declined over the years to reach to around 25 per cent of the total land in 2013 while the proportion of households with medium and large holdings declined to around 2 per cent from around 10 per cent during this period of 1971 to 2013. The variations in the number of holdings and the amount of area owned during 1971 to 1982 as compared to, were smaller in a majority of the states, during 1971 to 2013, changes in the number of holdings in different states varied from 3 per cent in Andhra Pradesh to 30 per cent in Jammu and Kashmir. On the other hand, the amount of area owned declined by varying degrees Seventeen major states. At all India level, the increase in number of marginal ownership holdings 12.9 per cent was accompanied by incline in the amount of area owned 19.3 per cent. Accordingly, the size of small, semi-medium, medium, large ownership holding declined across the states at all-India level. In Andhra Pradesh there is an increase in number of ownership holdings during the period of 1971-72 to 2003-2004, but there is again sharp decline of 14.52 per cent in the number of marginal ownership holdings between 2003-04. In Andhra Pradesh, Haryana and Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh moderate increase are in small holdings, whereas in Orissa, Assam, Jammu & Kashmir, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu,

Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal there is a declined trend in area owned under the ownership holdings. In Andhra Pradesh, the number of landless ownership holdings recorded 15.93 per cent, maximum among all the states. The decline in the shares of the top three classes (large, medium, semi-medium) both in number and area of ownership holdings, is noticeable in almost all the major States, though the pace of decline was not uniform across at all the states. Wide variations in the number of ownership holdings and the amount of area owned continued during 1971-72 also. The change in the number of holdings ranged from -36 per cent in Bihar to -64.2 per cent in Haryana. Likewise, the change in the amount of area owned varied from -0.40 per cent in Maharashtra to 11.76 per cent in Rajasthan. At the all India level, variation in the households for the different size category of ownership holdings and area owned is -47.28 per cent and -33.98 per cent respectively. In the first four periods, during 1971-72 to 2002-03 numbers of households owing no land holdings included in marginal land holdings for all states. In order to know exactly the percentage of landless households of ownership holdings during the period of 2003-2013 landless ownership holdings interpreted distinctly. Among land owning groups, marginal holdings witnessed a maximum increase in Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, Odisha, Himachal Pradesh, and Bihar. Maximum decrease in Small holdings found in Jammu and Kashmir, maximum decrease in semi medium, medium and large land holdings found in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Karnataka. The highest decrease in area owned has found in Odisha, West Bengal and Bihar. It is also important to note that in Bihar, Gujarat, Odisha, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh amount of area owned by large holdings is getting lower in fast pace as compared to other category of holdings, whereas in Assam, West Bengal, Kerala and Orissa decline in the amount of area owned by large holdings is much smaller than the other states. In sum, as a neat pattern of change is not discernible. Sudden increase or decrease in the number of holdings and the amount of area owned as taken place from one round to another, especially the steep and unexpected decline in the area owned

between 1971-72 and 2012-13 and by implication, the steep hike during the succeeding decade in a majority of the states, is difficult to comprehend. Nevertheless, going by broad structural aspects, the decade of the seventies was characterized by slight net upward mobility of the holdings followed by downward mobility in subsequent rounds. It was particularly sharp in the decade of 1970s.

It is clear from the above analysis that a substantial increase in the number of sub-marginal holdings seems to have taken place in large parts of rural India during the period of 1971-72 to 2013. Some of the explanations put forward were *first*, sub-division of holdings because of mounting population pressure without alternative employment opportunities and this land sub-division is a potential consequence of inheritance following the death of the household head or from the division of the joint family consisting of one or more married/unmarried brothers. Subdivision is a process by which land gets divided amongst the various heirs according to the laws of inheritance. *Second*, granting of ownership rights to erstwhile tenants as a consequence of the abolition of intermediaries and tenancy legislations. Third, definitional changes in ownership holdings between various rounds of National sample survey. However, to develop the inter-temporal and interstate comparisons in a more practical manner, the ratios and proportions are more useful techniques. Moreover, they are much less prone to bias than the absolute figures. We, therefore look into changes in the distribution of operational holdings and area owned in terms of these simple tools.

OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS

The distribution of operational holdings differs from that of ownership holdings. In spite of highly unequal distribution of ownership holdings in these agrarian settings, the distribution of operational holdings is expected to be much less unequal. The present section discusses the changes in the various aspects of operational holdings. Table 4 indicates the change in number of operational holdings and the

amount of area operated in Rural India since 1971 to 2012. The operational holdings are moving in favor of marginal farmers as their operational holdings and area operated has increased from 45.8 per cent to 73 per cent and 9.2 per cent to 27.7 per cent respectively. There has been decreasing trend in small operational holdings from 22.4 per cent to 15.3 per cent but their area operated has incremental change from 14.8 per cent to 23.4 per cent. There is a stagnant trend in case of semi medium operational holdings but their area operated has deteriorating trend. Concentration of medium and large operational holding and their area operated has deteriorating trend during the period of 1971 to 2013. data revealed that medium and large operational holding has declined from 11.1 per cent to 3.04 per cent and 3.10 per cent to 0.37 percent.

Table 5 provides the percentage change in the number of holdings and the amount of area operated over the period since 1971-72. Table 5 exhibits that medium and large category of operational holdings has around 40 per cent of area operated whereas, marginal category of operational holdings has just 14.28 per cent of area operated in Rajasthan. M.P. Haryana is states where major control of land found in the hands of landlords, medium and large category of operational holdings, have around 39 per cent, 36 per cent of area operated respectively, whereas marginal category of operational holdings of operated area around 16.7 per cent and 12.76 per cent respectively. Table 5 also highlights that small and semi medium, semi medium categories of operational holdings have enough operated area as compared to marginal category of holdings. Nevertheless, these factors cannot explain large fluctuations, Seems from one round to the other. The decade of 1970s was marked by reduction of varying degree in the number of holdings at the bottom such as marginal holdings, these holdings increased markedly during the decades of 1970s and 2013s. Furthermore, the extreme proliferation of tiny holdings was accompanied by a much increase in the amount of

area operated by such holdings particularly during 1971-72 and 2012-13.

It may be seen from the Table-6, that the number of operational holdings and the amount of area operated, as it happened in the case of ownership holdings and area owned, varied significantly not only between different states during the same period, but also from one period to the other. During 1971-72 and 2012-13, increase in the number of operational holdings ranged from 57.07 to 108.78 million. The most satisfactory state of affairs is surpassing through semi-medium, medium, large category of holdings, although imbalances in the distribution of area operated are still persisting in the Indian agricultural system. This scenario found in all major agricultural states, for example Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh respectively. In 1970-71 to 2012-13 during these five decades number of marginal category of operational holdings are gradually increasing in all major states. There is high inclined rate found in Punjab, Haryana, Karnataka, and Gujarat. Despite of its situation of all states revealed unequal and unorganized distribution of area operated with respect to number of operational holdings. In Andhra Pradesh, marginal category of operational holdings has increased from 47.30 per cent to 50.6 per cent. But these marginal operational holdings have 16.28 per cent of area operated. On the other hand, medium and large category of operational holdings consist of 5 per cent have around 20 per cent of area operated in 2012-13. In the same way state like Haryana, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan are following similar trends. Higher degree of unequal distribution of area operated for medium and large category of holdings found in Punjab, Haryana, M.P., Rajasthan, and Maharashtra. Major part of area operated is still in the hand or in the control of enormous landlords in these major states and it flaunts that marginalize farmers are even now have possessed fragmented and small piece of land which has been evidencing the fact of unequal distribution of economic resources.

LAND CONCENTRATION

Variation in the concentration of operational holdings is measured by the Gini coefficient shown in table-7. The table highlights up some of the following important features. The concentration of holdings showed a fairly sizable decline particularly in all the states during 1971-72 and 2012-13. At the all India level, the Gini coefficient declined from 0.567 to 0.516. The decline in the concentration of operational holdings during the period might be attributed to the disintegration of large ownership holdings, the active functioning of lease markets, etc. The decline in the concentration of holdings during 1971-72 and 2013 was much less pronounced as compared to the fifties. Gini coefficient explicates inclined path in case of Haryana, Punjab, Gujarat, and Rajasthan during the period of 1971 to 2003 for other states it doesn't revealing steady path of improved Gini coefficient. At all India level the Gini coefficient remained almost unchanged. This could possibly be due to the enactment and implementation of tenancy legislations. These legislations though failed to produce direct results in terms of the 'land to the tiller', but succeeded in creating psychological apprehensions among the land owners who allegedly resorted to the eviction of tenants in a bid to regain control of the leased out land largely under the pretext of self-cultivation. Against the declining trend in the concentration of holdings, the values of Gini coefficients increased by varying degree in majority of the states during 1971-72 and 1982. The notable exceptions were Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, and Rajasthan. The reasons are the same as mentioned above, but now with the spread of new agricultural technology and institutional support to the agriculture, the resumption of the leased out land for self-cultivation was perhaps more genuine. In net terms, with the changes in the value of Gini coefficient during 1970s, the concentration of operational holdings in 1982 was not much different as compared to 1971-72; in some states it was even higher except Rajasthan and Kerala. In 1992 it still increased to 0.591 at all India level and increased in almost all states except

Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh where it was constant. In 2002-03 it decreased to 0.557 at national level. The two most agriculturally developed states of Punjab and Haryana shows the most pronounced increase in the concentration ratio since 1970-71 to 2002-03 and decrease slightly in 2012-13 but they still have a higher coefficient of concentration among the states. In Haryana, the ratio rose substantially from 0.44 in 1970-71 to 0.68 in 2002-03 and thereafter decreasing slightly to 0.59 in 2012-13. In Punjab, the ratio increased sharply from 0.398 in 1970-71 to 0.706 in 2002-03 and thereafter decreasing slightly to 0.670 in 2012-13. In Gujarat, there has been a steady, though more gradual, rise in the index of concentration over the decades from 0.518 in 1970-71 to 0.605 in 2002-03 and further decreasing to 0.518 in 2012-13. However, the value of Gini coefficient could change due to many reasons and it does not reveal at what level the concentration of holdings has actually grown or thinned out. Gini coefficient does not tell the complete story; it gives only a surface view. It is, therefore, advisable to analyze the changes with the help of a Lorenz curve, which clearly examines the distribution of land. It is obvious that there is a high degree of inequality as the Lorenz curve is away from the line of equal distribution.

In brief, changes in the structural distribution of operational holdings over the last five decades, especially since 1970-71, reveals that while the numerical preponderance of holdings at the very bottom of the farm size ladder (e.g., marginal holdings) increased continuously, the proportion of total area operated by them also practically increased across the states except Kerala and West Bengal. In other words, land: man ratio among marginal holdings faced a continuous advancement in India and in economic terms, the vast majority of tiny farm operators were obliged to seek their living from a strikingly low land base. The decades of the 1960s and 1970s witnessed a sharp polarization in most parts of rural India; it seems almost certain that the base of the pyramidal land distribution structure has become much wider with the passage of time. A state by state analysis of the temporal

changes in the distribution of operational holdings and area operated since the beginning of our story (1971-72) reveals that small and marginal holdings better and their position in Bihar, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal and medium holdings in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. There was a sharp increase in the number of marginal holdings during the period of 1970-71 to 2013. There is an increase of around 29 per cent in number of marginal holdings at all India level. There was no stable consistent pattern in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana and Punjab. Nevertheless comparing the proportion of different categories of holdings and area operated accounted for by them in 2013 with that of 1971-72, small holdings have emerged much stronger practically in the states of Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh during 1971-72 to 2013. However semi- medium, medium and large categories of holdings have persisting declined in the period of 1971-72 to 2013. Despite the above noted changes in the distribution of operational holdings and area operated, glaring inequalities continue to persist, as witnessed in respect of operational holdings, very few holdings at the top has accounted for a disproportionately large amount of area operated. The increase in the number of marginal and small holdings may be attributed to the following factors. As per the agricultural census and other studies (Vishwa Ballabh & Thomas S. Walker, 1991) 1) Fragmentation of holdings due to inheritance and 2) Distribution of surplus land among weaker sections of the population, the effect of these had led to decline in the medium and large size groups of holdings, resulting in consequent increase in the lower categories of holdings like marginal and small holdings. These reasons are generally true in most of the states.

TENANCY

The tenancy perse is viewed as a source of exploitation of the tenants. In terms of common perceptions, the tenants are a lot of poor people who are susceptible to exploitation by their

landlords in varying forms such as rack-renting insecure tenure, usury, and forced labor and so on. Therefore, it is natural that tenurial relations have prompted, from time to time, the policy makers of different countries to enact and implement numerous tenancy legislations either to abolish the institutions of tenancy or protect the interests of the tenants. For instance, tenancy legislations enacted and implemented in India, *inter alia*, aimed at conferring the security of tenure to the tenants both in the interest of higher agricultural production and social justice, fixing fair rents for tenants and ending landlord tenant nexus on the non-presumable land.

On the strength of evidences gathered from rural sample surveys (various rounds of NSS Reports) reported not only the decline in the incidence of tenancy as such but also changes in the nature of tenurial contracts. For example, percentage distribution of leased-in operated area under terms of lease is fixed money (41.1 per cent) was found to be the most prevalent practice of leasing land followed by share of produce (28.7percent) and fixed produce (17.0 percent). Over the last five decades 1971-72 to 2012-13, the terms of lease against the share of produces slowly losing importance, whereas fixed money as terms of lease is increasingly gaining importance. In Punjab and Haryana - the two most agriculturally advanced states in the country – the most prevalent form of contract was 'fixed money'. In Punjab about 94.5 per cent of the tenanted land was contracted for fixed money. In Haryana, about 79.5per cent of the tenanted land was contracted for fixed money 75.8 per cent. Share of produce was found to be the most predominant form of tenancy in Assam and Karnataka. It has been reported that not only landlords are evincing a keen interest in the production affairs of their tenants in the form of sharing the input cost, but the share tenancy, considered to be the most pernicious tenurial arrangements, is also gradually inclining in favor of fixed rent (money) tenancy.

The incidence of tenancy in rural India is shown in Table 8. Since 1972-1992, it is clear that, the tenancy has been declining since 1971-72

continuously. The households leasing in land has continued decline during 1971-72 to 2013-14 respectively. The area leased in and leased out not showing a decreasing trend together. The area leased in decreased from 12 per cent in 1972 to 9 per cent by 1992 however; it further reduced to 7 per cent in 2003. The area leased in increased by 5 percent during 2003 and 2013. Overall area leased in shows stationary trend during the period of 1971 and 2013 at all India level. leased out land decreased from 6 per cent in 1972 to 5 per cent in 1992. It further decreased to 3 per cent in 2003, but over again area leased out increased by 1 per cent in the period of 2003-2013. At all India level there is a reduction of 2 percent in area leased out from 1971-72 to 2013-14. The effect of tenancy on farm incomes and poverty ratio is twofold in nature. First, it directly reduces the income of the cultivator by the amount of money paid towards rent. Secondly, it is expected to have an adverse impact on productivity of land if, with the reduced income levels, the incentive to invest in land is dampened. Tenancy affected land productivity has been examined by several researchers. It is believed by some that, on account of number of factors such as lack of funds (most tenant farmers belong to the small and marginal category and have little surplus income to invest,) fear of eviction, no stake in ownership of land, etc., tenants do not make investments in land they cultivate with the result the tenant farms are less productive than ownership farms.

Micro level studies have given rise to different conclusions. For instance, (Bell 1977) drawing a sample of 60 farms in the Kosi district of Bihar came to the conclusion that productivity of owned land was higher than leased in land. On the other hand, (Chakravarthy 1973) analyzing a bigger sample of 900 farms from the states of west Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Punjab come to the conclusion that there are differences between owners and tenants when one considers the classes of pure owners and pure tenants and also when one restricts the comparison to small cultivators. When one considers the class of cultivators who combine some

amount of leased in land with some amount of owned land they do not seem to distinguish between their own land and leased-in land in the matter of the intensity of cultivation. Hence, most of the characteristics of farming behavior do not vary according to the proportion of leased-in land to total land operated. However, as always, it is not proper to draw conclusions for the country as a whole, on the basis of micro level studies, especially when the conclusions arrived at are so diverse in nature.

Whether tenancy has significant impact on productivity or not, the fact remains that a large amount of production of the cultivator is siphoned off to the land owner leaving the former worse off than if he had owned the land himself. However, another way of looking at the same problem is to see what would be the national income of a tenant farmer if tenancy had been denied to him and he had to become a wage earner. It has been argued by some that tenancy is mutually beneficial to the tenant cultivator as well as the owner leading to a more efficient allocation of factor endowments than would be possible in the absence of tenancy arrangements. However, in the generally less developed and feudalistic regions of the country, even though the small tenant farmer may be exploited at the hands of the big landowner, it is expected that his income would still be higher than that of a wage laborer in that region.

Over the years there has been an absolute reduction in the number of leased in holdings as well as area under tenancy at the all India level. Percentage of tenant holdings declined from 15.2 per cent to 13.2 per cent between 1980-81 and 2012-13 and a corresponding increase in leased-in area was from 7.2 per cent to 10.2 per cent during the same period. But the Impact of the above trends in poverty will be difficult to determine without having some idea about the reasons for decline in tenancy. To that extent this decline is on account of eviction of tenants and is not fully compensated by increase in demand for hired labor (assuming that evicted tenants join the agricultural (labor force) there should be a deterioration of living standards. percentage of leased-in area by category of holdings

from the five land holding survey. It is seen that, the marginal and the small categories has registered a steady decline up to 2002-03 and then an increase during 2012-13. However, for the semi-medium, medium and large holdings, the percentage of area leased-in declined from 1970-71 to 1981-82, increased during 1991-92, decreased during 2002-03 and finally increased during 2012-13. It also reveals that during 2012-13, the percentage of area leased-in was more in 2012-13. Up to some extent decline in tenancy is on account of conferment of ownership rights to these tenants, as had occurred under the operation Barga in West Bengal, there should be an improvement in the economic status of erstwhile tenants who are now under no obligation to pay rent. In Kerala also there has been a sharp drop in the percentage of landless with the complete liquidation of the entire class of rent receivers and intermediaries at all-India level.

Another notable feature about tenancy is the decline of pure tenants in all size groups, but a relative increase in the importance of mixed tenants in the marginal category. In areas where new technology has taken root medium and large farmers are known to lease in additional land since there is a ceiling on ownership of holdings and none on operational holdings. On the other hand, it is not uncommon to find marginal farmers leasing-out land to bigger farmers as they are too small to make self-cultivation a viable activity. Evidence of "reverse tenancy" can be found in a number of studies as such as those by (Jodha 1981), (Nadkarni 1976), (Vyas 1970). According to NSS data also, 25.45 per cent of holdings leased-out land in the marginal category in 1992 compared to 22.67 per cent in 1971-72. This trend was more prominent in the prosperous states of Punjab, Maharashtra and Kerala where a class of prosperous and enterprising tenant farmers has emerged. (Rudra, Ashok 1982). However, micro level studies in the not so advanced regions of the economy show the tenant farmers to be as much in the grips of the exploitative land owner as before despite the enactment of various legislations to protect his interests. In the presence of these interstate and inter-regional differences in

the economic conditions of tenant farmers, it is difficult to arrive at any firm conclusions about the plight of this class of people at all-India level.

In poor agrarian economies, where the institution of tenancy is much more pronounced, the distribution of operational holdings differs from that of ownership holdings. In spite of highly unequal distribution of ownership holdings in this agrarian structure, the distribution of operational holdings is expected to be much less unequal. It is therefore, likely that land holdings at the bottom of landownership hierarchy, which did not benefit in the distribution process of ownership holdings, might have gained in terms of net operated area. In net terms, while the distribution of ownership holdings tells de jure position the de facto position is better indicated by the distribution of operational holdings.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Complete and analogous estimates of rural employment and unemployment situation in the country are obtainable from the survey carried out by the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) on a quinquennial basis. The first such comprehensive survey was conducted in the year 1972-73. Till now, various rounds of quinquennial surveys on employment and unemployment have been completed latest being for the period 2011-12. Going into details, table-9 shows that the overall employment scenario has some variations over the year. Workforce participation rate has been observed for rural males at stationary state during the period of 1971-72 to 2011-12. WFPR for rural males in the latest annual survey in comparing with the quinquennial survey it is found to be almost at the same level of around 54 per cent for the usual status. The rural female participation rate shows some negative variations. Current weekly status proportion, current daily status proportion also shows a parallel performance not very different from usual status rates in most case as it to be expected.

In rural areas, WPR for males was significantly higher than the corresponding WPR for females.

Table 10 gives unemployment rates along with the number of persons. Compared to the preceding rounds, the proportion of unemployment in the total and current weekly status has rather remained at the same level in rural sector. The unemployment rate does the two dominant aspects of unemployment scenario in the Indian context are the dominant role of agriculture and agriculture related activities in providing work and self-employed status of these employed. Both these factors help to absorb a large number of persons at a very low productivity level and with a marginal assignment. As Agronomic related doings are highly seasonal a person may not find enough work in lean season though they may get categorized as employed as per their "usual status". In glance to the prospectus for employment in rural areas the position has not been encouraging and promising data for the period of 1971-72 to 2011-12 shows that agriculture is still a single most important source of employment as nearly 54.6 per cent population is still dependent on agrarian sector.

POVERTY

Low productivity and inability to absorb the growing labor force make the agricultural sector in India witness to a pervasive process of marginalization of rural people towards urban areas. It is necessary to refer at the outset to select major trends characterizing the growth and development of agriculture in India since independence. Table-11 shows the total population growth and agricultural growth in India during 1971-2012. The population growth rate is related to the decade preceding the year against which it appears. The average exponential growth rate increased steadily from 2.20 per cent to 2.22 per cent in 1981 and afterwards it shows a declining trend. There is a sharp decline in the average exponential growth rate to 1.64 per cent in 2012. While this could be an optimistic estimate, one can at least have a fair measure of assurance that the population growth rate, which decreased by

a modest margin in 1981-91 would continue its downward trend in the near future.

Regarding agricultural growth a word needs to be said about periodisation of the post-Independence decades. The period 1950-65 could be identified as agricultural growth through area expansion. It shows that the growth rate was higher than that in yield. The next period 1968 to 1981 is usually reckoned as the green revolution period though it may be appropriate to regard it as the first round of the green revolution. This period is marked by a sharp reduction in area expansion and a per capital upward shift in yields. The first round of the green revolution was confined to only a few crops like rice and wheat being the major

beneficiaries and selected areas like Punjab and Haryana. In the first round, the yield improvement across all the crops was too modest to compensate for the decrease in the rate of area expansion and as a result growth rate of production came down from 3.31 per cent per annum during 1950 to 1965 to 2.38 per cent per annum during 1968-1981. The second round of the green revolution 1981-1992 had a more creditable record with the almost entire growth rate of 3.21 per cent coming from improvement in yields. The main point to be noted here is that over the post-independence decades the agricultural growth rate and in the last decade even the rate of yields increase has remained a head of the population growth rate. But it could not alter the poverty and unemployment in Indian economy. Table-12 shows the incidence of poverty among rural. It is clear that the percentage of rural poor has been deteriorating since 1970-71 to 2013.

Table13- exhibits the statistical fact that populace under SCs and STs in rural and urban India has been revealing lesser variation in rural SCs and STs Poverty, as in contrast with the urban SCs and STs during the period of 1983 to 2010. This table explains that diminution in the poverty of rural SCs has taken place during the year of 1983 to 2000, however it has been showing an increasing trend in a successive period 2000-01 to 2004-05 but in the period of 2004-05 to 2010-11 it again comes at attenuation track. By and large table depicts that

there is not desirable and advantageous transformation in rural poverty among SCs but there is more decline in urban poverty of rural SCs.

Poverty among STs in rural and urban India during the period of 1983 to 2010 has been elucidating the fact that there are more cutbacks in the urban poverty among STs as compared to match up with the rural poverty. There is a reduction in the rural and urban poverty among the STs during the period of 1983 to 2010-11 from 63.8 percent and 54.2 percent to 47.1 percent and 28.8 percent respectively. Data shows that in case of others there is lesser amount of poverty as compared to SCs and STs. There is a diminution in the rural and urban poverty among the others during the period of 1983 to 2010-11 from 37 percent and 39.1 percent to 21.1 percent and 11.9 percent respectively.

Table14- shows poverty ratios among the twenty states during the period of 1993 to 2004. There is dropping in the poverty of rural SCs around 12 percent and increase in the poverty of rural STs by 6 percent in Andhra Pradesh. There is a diminution in the rural poverty among SCs and STs from 45.38 percent and 41.44 percent to 27.7 percent and 14.4 percent respectively in Assam. There is a greater reduction in poverty of rural STs as compared to rural SCs. Bihar has the highest poverty ratio compared to all the states and it has very less decline in poverty ratio during the period of 1993 to 2004 and it has marginally decreased by 6 percent and 15 percent respectively. In case of Gujarat, there is cutback in the poverty of rural SCs but in case of rural STs, it shows marginally incline during the period of 1993 to 2004-05. In case of Haryana rural poverty is greater among SCs as compared to STs in 1993 and it comes to 26.8 percent in case of SCs and it become zero in case of rural poverty among STs in the year of 2004-05. Scenario is a little bit different in case of Himachal Pradesh among rural SCs and STs in the period of 1993 to 2004 there is a less fall in the poverty ratio of SCs but in case of STs There is a greater reduction in the poverty of STs during the period of 1993-2004-05 it has marginally decreased by 44.4 percent. In case of Karnataka there is a greater reduction in rural poverty by 15 percent and

13 percent during the period of 1993- 2004 among SCs and STs respectively. In Kerala ratio of rural poverty among the rural SCs is same as in Himachal Pradesh and in case of rural STs status of poverty it is same as in Karnataka in the year of 1993-94 and it is slightly decreased by 15 percent in case of rural SCs and slightly increased by 7.5 percent. In case of Maharashtra there is an equal ratio of poverty among SCs and STs in the year of 1993-94, and it comes to the 44.8 percent from 51.64 percent in case of rural poverty among SCs, and in case of STs, has increased by 6 percent during the period of 1993-94 to 2004-05. There is a decline in the rural poverty in the case of Madhya Pradesh among the rural SCs and it incline in case of rural STs it has been increased by 2 percent. In state Odisha there is an increase of 2.5 percent and 5 percent in case of rural SCs and STs respectively. Odisha is a single state which has extreme rural poverty in case of rural STs during the period of 1993 -2004-05. It has been observed that the Situation of Punjab is better and has improved in case of SCs rural poverty but poverty scenario among rural STs has been increased during the period of 1993-2004. There is a cutback in the rural poverty among SCs and STs in Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, west Bengal states. Data explicates that there is greater poverty among STs as compared with the SCs at India level. Hence it can be concluded from data that there is not very sharp decline in the rural poverty among SCs, STs during the period of 1993 to 2004-05.

Table 15-explicate coverage of SC/ST under MGNREGS at all India level, plans was implemented since the year of 2006. There is an upsurge in the total number of person households provided employment under MGNREGS during the period of 2006-07- 2013. There is an increase in the absolute number of household's beneficiaries around 265.84 lakhs. Total number of households incorporated in the initial year was 210.16 lakhs and it reaches to the 476 lakhs in the year of 2013. There is also an increase in the number of person days of employment from 9050.56 lakhs to 21867 lakhs during the period of 1993 to 2013-14. It has sharp increase in the person days of employment from

9050.56 lakh to 28359.60 lakh during the period of 2006 to 2009 but 2009-10 onwards it has some downfall till 2011-12 and it again augmented during the period of two successive years. However during the whole period of 2006 to 2013- it shows an up surging trend, but it has not been revealing optimal consistency through the period in its assenting trend.

Table 16, depicts the Central Assistance Released under the centrally sponsored Scheme for implementation of the protection of civil Right Act, 1955 and the SCs and STs (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. It explains central assistance released under the centrally sponsored scheme for implementation of the Protection of civil Right Act among twenty states. Allocation of released assistance in Andhra Pradesh has come under top five states who get maximum assistance it has declined from 878.79 Crores to 730.23 Crores during the period of 2009 to 2013. Bihar is the state which has marginal increase in the released assistance from 50 Crores to 330.42 Crores during these four years on the contrary, Chhattisgarh has comparatively less marginal increase in the released assistance in the phase of these four years. As it is clear that there is less rural SCs STs populace in Goa state, hence released fund are also at minimal in the period of this four year. SCs and STs Population is greater in Gujarat as compared to Chhattisgarh, Goa and Assam hence the amount released for assistance is also higher in contrast with these states. In the state of Haryana there is continuous increase from 19.59 Crores to 164.27 Crores in the released assistance during the period of 2009 to 2013. Himachal Pradesh explicates different observation as populace of rural SCs; STs are at concreteness hence amount liberated under central assistance is also lower as compared to Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. Devolution of released assistance in Karnataka has stagnation trend during period of 2009 – 2012 and released assistance in Karnataka and Kerala in the year of 2012-13 is identical. Madhya Pradesh flaunts that released assistance under the implementation of the protection civil rights Act has second highest place among all the

states over span of four years. Maharashtra is at the top in the year of 2009-10 in receiving financial assistance in top figure but it has declined over the period of four years. Odisha has significant increase from 69.58 Crores to 700 crores in gaining assistance. Punjab, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and puducherry get slighter amount of assistance according to their demographic dividend of rural SCs and STs. As population in Uttar Pradesh rural SCs, STs population is more in contrast with other states, therefore released assistance has been increasing from 904 Crores to 1680 Crores during the period of four years and it is highest devolved assistance in 2012- 13 as compared to the remaining states. Hence it can be concluded that released assistance has moderate pace in order to solve the atrocities against the rural SCs and STs it also flaunts fluctuating trend from year to year which clarifies, there is not consistent incline in the transferring assistance to all the states.

Table 17- Amount released and utilized under special Central Assistance for special component plan (SCP) for scheduled castes (2009-2012) table analyses the variation in the graph of released fund and number of beneficiaries throughout it. Andhra Pradesh flaunts an escalation in the released assistance as well as in its number of beneficiaries but there is around double incline in the number of beneficiaries in contrast with its amount of released fund. Although in case of Assam there is less intensification in the released assistance as compared to its number of beneficiaries yet both have up surging trend. Bihar shows an increasing drift in the amount of released assistance but the degree of declining in number of beneficiaries is higher as it becomes zero in the year of 2011. Data reveals that Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Chandigarh have decline in their released assistance and it becomes Zero in the year of 2011 but the number of beneficiaries have been showing variation. Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh have been indicating inverse linkage between the released assistance and number of beneficiaries while Haryana, Himachal Pradesh is screening direct relation between released assistance and number of

beneficiaries. Karnataka and Kerala also belonging to the same line of explication, there is an increase in the released assistance and number of beneficiaries as well. Odisha flaunts a decreasing trend in the amount of released assistance but the number of beneficiaries from this financial assistance is increasing. Released assistance of Punjab has been increasing from 1075.88 Lakhs to 1363.88 Lakhs and number of beneficiaries has inclined from 79275 Lakhs to 82410 Lakhs. Released assistance of Rajasthan has been up surging from 3460.63 Lakhs to 3743.48 Lakhs and number of legatees has stimulated from 36998 Lakhs to 41024 Lakhs. It is evident that the total populace of rural SCs and STs in Sikkim is extremely low hence, released assistance and number of legatee is also beneath. In case of Tamil Nadu amount of devolved assistance is increasing. Although number of beneficiaries is deteriorating yet it has maximum number of legatee as compared to all other states during the year of 2009-2012 Tripura has been explicating escalation in the number of legatee and amount of released assistance but there is only tremendous upturn in the number of beneficiaries from 59883 Lakhs to 384545 Lakhs. Uttar Pradesh obtains utmost released assistance for special component plan at topmost among all the states during the period of 2009 to 2012. West Bengal has been flaunting an escalating trend in the amount of released assistance nevertheless the number of beneficiaries has been dropped.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that poverty seems to have declined somewhat as a result of agricultural growth despite strong negative influences in the form of inequitable land distribution based tenurial relationship, growing population pressure and diminishing size of land holdings. The main factor underlying this decline has been growth in agricultural productivity with increased use of basic inputs such as water, fertilizers, and HYV seeds. Seeking to correct this imbalance which would have aggravated income inequalities and poverty levels, the government has taken measures to provide

essential inputs to farmers at highly subsidized rates and concession on land revenue and agricultural income tax causing for much higher inequality and injustice to the small and marginal farmers. This enabled the spread effects of growth to reach small and marginal farmers inducing them to adopt the new technology and augment their income levels. However, since the agricultural growth was super imposed on a highly unequal distribution of land holdings, even with notable growth in productivity, the increase in income levels in absolute terms was small. As a result substantial number of marginal farmers continued to subsist below the poverty line even during the eighties notwithstanding a slight reduction in the intensity of poverty among them. Hence, though it is possible that the processes of agricultural growth and government interventions in this regard resulted in an overall reduction in rural poverty. It is likely that hard-core poverty among marginal farmers persisted and may have become even more concentrated in some pockets in the Indian agricultural economy.

The agrarian structure in India has gradually slide towards extreme proliferation of tiny ownership units, particularly in the states of Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab and Haryana, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. Furthermore, across the states, the changes in the distribution of holdings and area owned over the last five decades have largely benefitted marginal holdings and area owned over the last five decades have largely benefitted marginal holdings comparatively more in all major states at the national level. The concentration of ownership holdings has also declined by varying degrees across the states. The most striking agrarian feature of India is that the changes in the distribution of ownership holdings outlined above eclipse the fact of glaring inequalities in the land distribution.

The changes in the distribution of land holdings and the area have their implications towards changes in the tennurial relations. The incidence of tenancy has also declined noticeably at national level. It came out from the decline in the proportion of operated area leased-in. The decline in

the tenancy is however more pronounced in respect of lower categories of land holdings. Due to green revolution agricultural production has increased and benefitted the large and medium land holdings and agricultural laborers have increased over the period. The wages of the agricultural laborers did not show any remarkable increase remained at low levels. Hence, the most of the agricultural laborers have been living below the poverty line. The poverty among them is very high compared to the general poverty. Most of the agricultural laborers are in the rural areas. Hence the rural poverty is high. Despite the growth in agricultural production, the rural poverty has not significantly reduced.

The agrarian features such as skewed distribution of land holdings, proliferation of sub-marginal and marginal holdings, and a decline in tenancy, preponderance of landless people directly impinge upon rural poverty which remained higher during the early 90s too. At this point of view since 1971-72 there has been no change in life standard of rural people. This scenario has been persisting since independence till today's first century. The socio economic status of rural SCs, STs is pathetic in terms of their poverty ratio and accessibility to released fund and its benefits to them. We could not find any change in Indian agriculture sector and our farmers in pre independence and post-independence as the lack of resources and capability deprivation have gone against the poorest section majority of whom are members of SCs as discrimination, socio-economic and political, appears to operate and at least partially through strong mechanism where the scheduled caste either not represented at all and if represented in gainful employment, they are poorly paid in dead end jobs. Hence, there is relevance in the strategy of Ambedkar on agricultural development with the notion of betterment of SCs, STs and marginalized strata of populace. . According to Ambedkar, the remedies are to shift the excess of the labor force from agriculture to industrial sector. This means industrialization of India is the soundest remedy for the agricultural problems in India. The striking feature of Ambedkar in argument is that he considered industrialization not only necessary, but

also sufficient conditions for consolidation of agricultural land holdings in India. Industrialization may reduce the population pressure on agriculture and increase the amount of capital goods, which will forcibly, creates the economic necessity of enlarging the land holdings.

Ambedkar preferred industrialization, as it reduces population pressure on agriculture and increases amount of capital goods which will forcibly create the economic necessity of enlarging the holding. The destroying the premium on land gives rise to a few occasions for its sub-division and fragmentation of land holdings. He was of the opinion that industrialization is an absolute necessity. The capital formation through industrialization was important as it could utilize the surplus labor of countryside for productive purpose. In essence, he had visualized what we now refer to as the forward and backward linkages of industrialization.

REFERENCES

1. Agricultural Census(1990-91) Number and Area of Operational Holdings 1990-91 - All India", *Agricultural Situation 1995*, Aug., Vol.L.II, No.5
2. Bardhan P.K. (1984) *Land, Labour and Rural Poverty*, Essays in Developmental Economics, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
3. Bella-Clive (1977) "Alternative Theories of Sharecropping: Some Tests Esing Evidence from Northest India", *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol.13, July-1977.
4. Bhall and Chadha G.K.(1983) *Green Revolution and the small peasant: A study of Income distribution among Punjab cultivators*, Concept, New Delhi.
5. Chakravarthy, Aparajita(1973) "Some Aspects of Farm Economics Under Varying Tenurial Conditions: A Comparative Study", unpublished thesis 1973.
6. Galgalikar V.P. (1976) "Changes in the Structure of Land Holdings: A Case Study" *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.XXXI, No.3, (P.32-35)
7. Govt. of India (1991) *Agricultural Census Report 1991*, Govt. of India.
8. Government of India (1976) "Report of National Commission on Agriculture" Vol.XV. Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, (Chap.III)
9. Jodha, N.S.(1981) "Agricultural Tenancy: Fresh Evidence from Dry Land Areas in India" *E.P.W. Vol.XVI, No.52*, 198)
10. Khusro, A.M.(1968) "Returns to School in Indian Agriculture", *Readings in Agricultural Development*, Allied Publishers, 1968.
11. Lipton, M.(1985) *Land Assets and Rural Poverty*", World Bank occasional paper No.774.
12. Mahendra Dev. (1991) *Rural Poverty in India: Incidence, Issues and Policies: Discussion paper 55*, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research.
13. Nadkarni, M.V. (1976) "Tenants from Dominant Class: A Developing Contradiction in Land Reforms", *E.P.W. Vol. XI, No. 52*.
14. Narain. D,(1961) "Distribution of Marked Surplus of Agricultural Production by size-level of holdings in India 1950-51" *Institute of Economic Growth, Occasional Paper, No.2*.
15. Narian.D,(1976) "Growth of Productivity in Indian Agriculture", *I.J.A.E.*, 32, Jan.-March. 42. Ray, S.K. (1972) "Development of Irrigation and its Impact on Pattern of land Use, output growth and Employment Generation", *Journal of Indian School of Political Economy*, October-Dec.192.
16. Pandey R.K. and Singh B.N.(1977) "Inter-temporal Changes in Distribution of

- Landholdings, Tenancy Structure in India”, *Indian Journal of Economics*, Vol.LVII, Part-III, No.226, Jan,1977, p.(329-340)
17. Parikh, Kirit(1992) “Who gets how much from PDS: How effectively does it reach the poor”, Indira Gandhi Institute for Developmental Research, Bombay.
 18. Rao. C.H.(1966) “Alternative Explanations of the Inverse Relationship between farm Size and Output per Acre in India”, *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. 1, Oct.
 19. Rudra, Ashok,(1982) “Indian Agricultural Economics”, Myths and Realities, Allied Publishers(1982).
 20. Sharma H.R. (1994) “Distribution of Land Holdings in Rural India, 1953-54 to 1981-82: Implications for Land Reforms” *E..P.W.*, Sept., 24, 1994 (PA-117)
 21. Sharma H.R. (1995) “Agrarian Relations in India: Patterns and Implications” *Har-Anand Publications*, New Delhi.
 22. Sharma H.R. (1994) Op.Cit.,
 23. Shergill. H.S. (1986) “Land Sales and Land Prices in Punjab: 1952-53 to 1977-78”, *E.P.W.*, Vol.XXI, Nos.38 and 39, (P.A-125-28)
 24. Sanyal. S.K. (1997) “Trends in Some Characteristics of Land Holdings: An Analysis”, *Sarvekshana*, Vol.I, Nos. 1&2.
 25. Sanyal S.K. (1986) “Trends in Land holdings and Poverty in Rural India” in *Rural Poverty in South Asia*, T.N. Srinivasan &PranabBardhan (Eds.) Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
 26. Sen. A.K.(1962) An Aspect of Indian Agriculture”, *EPW*, Vol.14, Feb.1962.
 27. ViswaBallabh and Thomas “Land Sub-division in India’s Semi-Arid
 28. S. Walker (1991) Tropics” *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.46, No.1, Jan.-March1991 P.2.
 29. Vyas, V.S.(1970) “Tenancy in a Dynamic Setting”, *E.P.W.*, Vol.5, No.26, 1970.
 30. Bhandutia, B. J. (2007).Champion of Human Right: Dr. B.R Ambedkar in 21 Century (Making India Indivisible). Jaipur: Oxford Book Company.
 31. MAURYA, N., & Ram, N. (2008). Dalits in Contemporary India, Vol. I. Discrimination and Discontent. Delhi: Siddhant Publications.

NOTES

Gini Coefficient: The formula used to compute the Gini Coefficient is $GC = (X_i Y_i + 1 - (X_i + 1 Y_i))$

100x100

Where X_i = The cumulative frequency of holdings in the i th class

Y_i = The cumulative frequency of the percentage of area in the i th class.

Table 1: Percentage Distribution of Households and Area Owned

Category of Ownership Holdings	Percentage Distribution of Households and Area Owned									
	1971		1982		1992		2003		2013	
	H	A	H	A	H	A	H	A	H	A
Landless	9.64	00	11.33	00	11.25	00	10.04	0.01	7.41	0.01
Marginal	52.98	9.76	55.31	12.22	60.63	16.93	69.63	23.01	75.41	29.75
Small	15.49	14.68	14.70	16.49	13.42	18.59	10.81	20.38	10.00	23.53
Sem medi	11.89	21.92	10.78	23.38	9.28	24.58	6.03	21.97	5.01	22.07
Medium	7.88	30.73	6.45	29.90	4.54	26.07	2.96	23.08	1.93	18.83
Large	2.12	22.91	1.43	18.01	0.88	13.83	0.53	11.55	0.24	5.81

Source: NSSO 70th round, report571

Table 2: State wise average size of ownership holdings

States/UT	Average Area Owned Per Household			Percentage of Landless Households		
	1992	2003	2013	1992	2003	2013
AndhraPradesh	0.78	0.620	0.491	11.8	14.33	15.93
Assam	0.70	0.551	0.631	13.4	8.05	7.42
Bihar	0.64	0.376	0.242	8.6	7.60	5.33
Gujarat	1.38	1.016	0.804	16.3	13.60	12.50
Haryana	1.41	0.833	0.764	3.7	9.21	1.05
HimachaPradesh	0.79	0.560	0.397	10.4	15.00	14.23
Jammu Kashmir	0.99	0.794	0.432	2.8	3.29	3.06
Jharkhand	0.00	0.560	0.488	0.0	4.80	1.35
Karnataka	1.39	0.979	0.851	10.0	14.09	10.22
Kerala	0.30	0.234	0.209	8.4	4.80	9.35
Madhya Pradesh	1.74	1.310	1.122	15.2	12.05	5.56
Maharashtra	1.59	1.021	0.903	19.6	17.66	12.84
Odisha	0.74	0.483	0.380	13.8	9.56	5.39
Punjab	1.10	0.838	0.632	5.9	4.57	6.84
Rajasthan	2.66	2.077	1.483	6.4	5.65	3.89
Tamil Nadu	0.41	0.338	0.348	17.9	16.55	8.84
Telangana	0.00	0.000	0.705	0.0	0.00	6.19
Uttarakhand	0.00	0.371	0.317	0.0	10.64	20.77
Uttar Pradesh	0.83	0.618	0.493	4.9	3.82	3.32
West Bengal	0.46	0.295	0.174	11.0	6.15	6.55
NE States	0.00	0.000	0.719	0.0	0.00	6.07
Group of Uts	0.00	0.193	0.143	0.0	40.25	30.18

Source: NSSO report no,571, 68th and 70th round.

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of Households and Area

State	year	percentage of households							percentage of area owned						
		landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all	landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Karnataka	2013	10.22	62.20	15.35	9.14	2.55	0.54	100	0.01	21.68	25.40	27.43	15.73	9.75	100
	2003		71.00	14.10	8.80	5.40	0.70	100		16.65	19.45	23.18	29.52	11.20	100
	1992		58.72	18.27	14.95	6.58	1.48	100		11.05	18.35	27.82	26.62	16.16	100
	1982		54.41	16.82	16.82	9.28	2.66	100		6.21	13.56	25.40	31.45	23.38	100
	1971-72		50.94	16.27	18.13	11.85	2.81	100		5.74	11.81	24.84	35.19	22.42	100
Kerala	2013	9.35	86.41	3.32	0.74	0.18	0.00	100	0.00	64.52	21.43	9.79	4.27	0.00	100
	2003		95.30	3.50	0.90	0.30	0.00	100		60.72	21.13	10.78	7.16	0.00	100
	1992		92.86	5.32	1.66	0.34	0.02	100		54.51	24.19	14.32	6.33	0.66	100
	1982		90.67	6.07	2.52	0.69	0.05	100		45.74	23.51	19.11	10.06	1.59	100
	1971-72		88.69	7.32	3.00	0.91	0.08	100		40.88	24.32	19.95	11.89	2.96	100
Madhya Pradesh	2013	5.56	61.25	17.83	9.24	5.16	0.96	100	0.01	17.50	22.15	20.68	26.44	13.23	100
	2003		61.70	18.00	12.10	7.10	1.10	100		11.61	19.07	25.80	31.25	12.29	100
	1992		52.38	19.19	16.20	10.34	1.88	100		7.61	15.49	24.97	35.38	16.57	100
	1982		48.77	16.24	18.24	13.76	2.99	100		4.99	11.08	24.30	37.93	21.72	100
	1971-72		40.26	16.96	20.72	17.20	4.86	100		3.34	9.16	21.36	37.80	28.34	100
Maharashtra	2013	12.84	55.90	16.66	10.14	4.09	0.38	100	0.01	16.43	24.97	29.15	24.81	4.62	100
	2003		69.00	13.10	12.00	5.10	0.80	100		12.38	17.57	30.88	27.35	11.78	100
	1992		59.47	14.19	15.14	9.14	2.05	100		7.02	12.61	25.54	33.43	21.41	100
	1982		54.89	14.96	14.83	11.83	3.50	100		4.65	10.90	20.82	36.23	27.40	100
	1971-72		48.36	14.94	16.28	14.99	5.43	100		3.48	8.59	18.34	35.45	34.14	100
Odisha	2013	5.39	85.48	6.83	1.97	0.33	0.00	100	0.00	56.15	24.83	14.23	4.71	0.08	100
	2003		85.50	9.70	3.70	0.90	0.10	100		41.52	27.06	19.72	9.98	1.78	100
	1992		75.15	14.42	7.34	2.40	0.12	100		26.37	27.16	25.99	18.08	2.40	100
	1982		66.06	20.84	9.31	3.42	0.37	100		19.88	29.73	25.04	19.50	5.84	100
	1971-72		68.94	18.08	9.04	3.52	0.42	100		20.45	26.95	25.88	20.72	6.00	100
Punjab	2013	6.84	74.91	7.88	6.86	3.03	0.49	100	0.01	14.79	18.03	28.29	29.01	9.88	100
	2003		76.30	9.50	7.90	5.10	1.00	100		9.16	15.63	25.30	34.50	15.31	100
	1992		69.63	9.98	12.21	7.11	1.08	100		7.18	12.35	30.21	38.04	12.22	100
	1982		66.87	10.08	11.61	9.94	1.47	100		5.59	10.76	22.87	42.23	18.56	100
	1971-72		67.50	8.37	12.71	9.19	2.23	100		4.47	8.87	25.06	37.96	23.64	100
Rajasthan	2013	3.89	57.45	18.81	10.51	7.63	1.70	100	0.00	14.03	17.64	19.73	30.84	17.75	100
	2003		55.20	16.50	14.00	10.10	4.10	100		9.26	11.19	18.61	28.40	32.52	100
	1992		44.50	18.53	17.71	13.89	5.37	100		5.42	10.04	18.90	31.55	34.10	100
	1982		37.08	16.23	20.07	19.60	6.53	100		3.63	7.29	17.29	35.19	36.59	100
	1971-72		26.96	19.87	20.49	22.63	10.05	100		2.03	6.78	13.15	32.89	45.15	100
Tamil Nadu	2013	8.84	82.01	5.19	2.90	1.01	0.04	100	0.00	40.39	20.41	21.62	16.18	1.39	100
	2003		90.10	5.70	2.90	1.20	0.00	100		33.21	23.10	22.09	20.57	1.23	100

State	year	percentage of households							percentage of area owned						
		landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all	landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
all India	1992		87.13	8.01	3.81	0.92	1.11	100		33.28	26.24	24.15	12.15	4.18	100
	1971-72		73.13	11.39	6.75	3.00	0.46	100		20.23	21.84	25.21	22.97	9.75	100
Telangana	2013	6.19	70.59	14.37	6.28	2.33	0.23	100	0.00	26.40	29.03	22.16	18.28	4.12	100
	2003	3.32	83.52	8.36	3.81	0.96	0.03	100	0.01	42.61	24.07	20.37	12.16	0.78	100
Uttar Pradesh	2003		81.00	12.30	4.80	1.60	0.10	100		34.89	27.38	20.74	14.65	2.34	100
	1992		74.40	14.73	7.92	2.76	0.21	100		27.42	24.88	25.82	18.14	3.73	100
	1982		67.95	17.38	10.23	4.06	0.37	100		20.36	24.08	28.11	22.25	5.18	100
	1971-72		65.58	18.60	10.84	4.49	0.49	100		17.49	24.65	27.94	23.85	6.07	100
	2013	6.55	90.53	2.44	0.43	0.05	0.00	100	0.01	73.32	18.90	6.43	1.35	0.00	100
West Bengal	2003		92.06	5.70	1.40	0.20	0.00	100		58.23	25.71	11.88	4.02	0.00	100
	1992		85.88	9.48	3.94	0.71	0.00	100		41.29	28.11	22.98	7.62	0.00	100
	1982		81.60	11.50	5.54	1.28	0.08	100		30.33	28.77	27.23	12.12	1.54	100
	1971-72		77.62	12.64	7.30	2.39	0.05	100		27.28	25.69	27.72	18.61	0.70	100
	2013	7.41	75.42	10.00	5.01	1.93	0.24	100	0.01	29.75	23.54	22.07	18.83	5.81	100

NSSO report no-571, 70th round

Table 4: Percentage of Operational Holdings and Area Operated

Category of Ownership	1971		1981		1991		2003		2013	
	OH	OA								
Landless	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0.03	00
Marginal	45.80	9.20	56.0	11.50	62.80	15.60	69.90	22.15	73.17	27.71
Small	22.40	14.80	19.3	16.60	17.80	18.70	16.50	20.60	15.30	23.44
Semi medium	17.70	22.60	14.20	23.60	12.00	24.10	8.95	22.40	8.10	23.50
Medium	11.10	30.20	8.60	30.20	6.10	26.40	4.30	22.65	3.04	19.33
Large	3.10	18.20	1.90	18.20	1.30	15.20	8	12.15	0.37	6.02

Source: NSSO Report No.571, 70th round, 59th round

Table 5: Changes of Operational Holdings and Area Operated during 1970-2013

Number of Operational Holdings (mil)	1970-71	1980-81	1990-91	2002-03	2012-13
	57.07	71.04	93.45	101.27	108.78
Percentage increase in operational holdings	-	24.5	31.5	8.4	7.4
Total area operated (ha)per holdings	125.68	118.57	125.10	107.65	94.48
Average area operated per holdings	2.20	1.67	31.5	8.4	7.4

Source: NSSO 59th, 70th round.

Table 6: Percentage Distribution of Households and Area Operated for Different Class of Operational Holdings

State	year	percentage distribution of number of household operational holdings								percentage distribution of area operated of household operational holdings							
		landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all	landless	marginal	small	semi-medium	medium	large	all		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)		
Andhra Pradesh	2012-13	0.04	50.66	27.08	18.38	3.58	0.26	100	0.00	16.28	28.07	36.08	17.04	2.52	100		
	2002-03		60.70	20.70	12.00	5.50	1.10	100		18.60	21.10	22.80	22.10	15.50	100		
	1991-92		59.70	21.40	13.20	5.40	0.80	100		17.50	23.20	26.30	23.50	9.40	100		
	1981-82		48.60	22.10	15.50	10.80	2.90	100		10.30	15.40	21.10	30.20	23.10	100		
	1970-71		47.30	19.10	18.20	11.90	3.50	100		9.30	11.70	21.90	31.30	25.80	100		
Assam	2012-13	0.00	72.91	20.39	6.14	0.56	0.00	100	0.00	40.21	36.53	19.44	3.78	0.03	100		
	2002-03		76.20	18.40	4.70	0.60	0.00	100		42.00	36.00	17.10	4.90	0.00	100		
	1991-92		70.80	20.00	7.50	1.50	0.20	100		34.20	31.20	22.90	9.10	2.60	100		
	1981-82		61.60	24.30	11.30	2.70	0.10	100		22.10	33.50	29.30	13.70	1.40	100		
	1970-71		52.40	30.20	14.30	3.00	0.10	100		21.60	34.90	30.80	12.20	0.70	100		
Bihar	2012-13	0.00	86.49	9.82	2.99	0.68	0.02	100	0.00	50.51	25.11	15.38	8.35	0.65	100		
	2002-03		82.60	12.20	4.00	1.00	0.20	100		43.00	27.40	17.60	8.70	3.20	100		
	1991-92		76.80	13.70	6.90	2.50	0.20	100		29.00	25.10	23.70	18.20	3.90	100		
	1981-82		68.70	17.60	9.90	3.40	0.40	100		22.40	25.90	27.10	18.80	5.90	100		
	1970-71		58.90	23.30	12.90	4.50	0.50	100		18.10	26.20	28.90	21.00	5.70	100		
Chhattisgarh	2012-13	0.00	59.52	26.71	11.90	1.71	0.17	100	0.00	29.42	33.37	27.41	8.21	1.58	100		
	2012-13	0.03	62.63	18.49	13.14	3.57	0.14	100	0.00	19.85	21.17	30.20	27.16	1.62	100		
	2002-03		60.00	17.30	11.10	9.80	1.80	100		13.10	15.00	19.00	37.30	15.60	100		
	1991-92		47.90	19.00	17.70	12.10	2.50	100		8.50	13.80	24.90	35.00	17.80	100		
	1981-82		38.60	20.40	21.30	15.80	3.90	100		6.50	11.30	22.40	38.60	21.10	100		
Gujarat	2012-13	0.00	63.45	14.31	15.15	6.76	0.32	100	0.00	12.76	17.79	34.10	31.29	4.05	100		
	2002-03		66.30	12.80	12.30	7.80	0.90	100		10.40	13.50	26.00	35.00	15.10	100		
	1991-92		50.70	13.50	20.30	11.50	4.00	100		5.30	8.80	25.50	29.40	31.00	100		
	1981-82		42.20	12.70	22.90	18.80	3.40	100		2.70	7.30	25.60	45.60	17.90	100		
	1970-71		17.50	17.50	28.30	31.10	5.60	100		2.50	6.50	19.90	49.20	21.80	100		
Haryana	2012-13	0.00	87.96	9.05	2.40	0.54	0.06	100	0.00	55.69	24.95	11.95	5.52	1.89	100		
	2012-13	0.00	92.29	5.61	1.72	0.38	0.00	100	0.00	69.09	16.77	9.06	5.04	0.05	100		
	2012-13	0.00	87.92	7.87	3.38	0.79	0.04	100	0.00	54.47	18.87	14.85	10.98	0.84	100		
	2012-13	0.01	60.81	21.10	12.70	4.52	0.85	100	0.00	20.50	23.07	25.58	20.53	10.32	100		
	2002-03		58.20	20.40	13.20	7.10	1.10	100		16.20	20.00	24.80	27.80	11.10	100		
Himachal Pradesh	2012-13	0.00	87.96	9.05	2.40	0.54	0.06	100	0.00	55.69	24.95	11.95	5.52	1.89	100		
	2012-13	0.00	92.29	5.61	1.72	0.38	0.00	100	0.00	69.09	16.77	9.06	5.04	0.05	100		
	2012-13	0.00	87.92	7.87	3.38	0.79	0.04	100	0.00	54.47	18.87	14.85	10.98	0.84	100		
	2012-13	0.01	60.81	21.10	12.70	4.52	0.85	100	0.00	20.50	23.07	25.58	20.53	10.32	100		
	2002-03		58.20	20.40	13.20	7.10	1.10	100		16.20	20.00	24.80	27.80	11.10	100		
Jammu & Kashmir	2012-13	0.00	87.96	9.05	2.40	0.54	0.06	100	0.00	55.69	24.95	11.95	5.52	1.89	100		
	2012-13	0.00	92.29	5.61	1.72	0.38	0.00	100	0.00	69.09	16.77	9.06	5.04	0.05	100		
	2012-13	0.00	87.92	7.87	3.38	0.79	0.04	100	0.00	54.47	18.87	14.85	10.98	0.84	100		
	2012-13	0.01	60.81	21.10	12.70	4.52	0.85	100	0.00	20.50	23.07	25.58	20.53	10.32	100		
	2002-03		58.20	20.40	13.20	7.10	1.10	100		16.20	20.00	24.80	27.80	11.10	100		
Karnataka	2012-13	0.00	87.96	9.05	2.40	0.54	0.06	100	0.00	55.69	24.95	11.95	5.52	1.89	100		
	2012-13	0.00	92.29	5.61	1.72	0.38	0.00	100	0.00	69.09	16.77	9.06	5.04	0.05	100		
	2012-13	0.00	87.92	7.87	3.38	0.79	0.04	100	0.00	54.47	18.87	14.85	10.98	0.84	100		
	2012-13	0.01	60.81	21.10	12.70	4.52	0.85	100	0.00	20.50	23.07	25.58	20.53	10.32	100		
	2002-03		58.20	20.40	13.20	7.10	1.10	100		16.20	20.00	24.80	27.80	11.10	100		
Kerala	2012-13	0.00	87.96	9.05	2.40	0.54	0.06	100	0.00	55.69	24.95	11.95	5.52	1.89	100		
	2012-13	0.00	92.29	5.61	1.72	0.38	0.00	100	0.00	69.09	16.77	9.06	5.04	0.05	100		
	2012-13	0.00	87.92	7.87	3.38	0.79	0.04	100	0.00	54.47	18.87	14.85	10.98	0.84	100		
	2012-13	0.01	60.81	21.10	12.70	4.52	0.85	100	0.00	20.50	23.07	25.58	20.53	10.32	100		
	2002-03		58.20	20.40	13.20	7.10	1.10	100		16.20	20.00	24.80	27.80	11.10	100		
Madhya Pradesh	2012-13	0.26	52.62	25.04	13.38	7.26	1.45	100	0.00	16.77	22.00	21.03	26.20	14.00	100		
	2002-03		51.20	23.30	16.70	7.70	1.20	100		13.10	20.30	28.50	27.00	11.20	100		
	1991-92		38.70	24.40	20.90	13.50	2.50	100		6.70	15.60	25.50	35.90	16.40	100		
	1981-82		32.90	22.50	23.10	17.90	3.60	100		4.70	12.30	24.20	38.60	20.20	100		
	1970-71		26.10	20.30	25.80	21.60	6.20	100		3.40	8.90	21.20	38.00	28.60	100		
Maharashtra	2012-13	0.00	49.52	26.70	15.93	7.21	0.65	100	0.00	15.21	24.83	28.38	26.37	5.01	100		
	2002-03		49.50	21.40	19.10	8.80	1.20	100		12.00	17.70	30.40	29.20	10.70	100		
	1991-92		43.60	18.90	20.40	14.10	3.00	100		6.70	11.80	24.70	36.60	20.30	100		
	1981-82		35.30	19.50	21.30	18.40	5.60	100		3.60	9.40	20.00	37.90	29.10	100		
	1970-71		23.70	21.70	23.40	22.40	8.70	100		3.10	8.40	17.60	35.30	35.70	100		
Odisha	2012-13	0.11	86.14	10.28	2.92	0.54	0.00	100	0.00	55.88	24.98	13.87	5.20	0.07	100		
	2002-03		78.40	15.20	5.20	1.10	0.10	100		43.00	28.70	18.80	8.60	0.90	100		
	1991-92		60.00	24.30	12.00	3.40	0.30	100		22.10	30.20	27.90	16.20	3.70	100		
	1981-82		54.50	26.10	14.10	4.60	0.70	100		17.00	26.50	26.20	17.80	12.50	100		
	1970-71		54.50	25.80	13.90	5.30	0.60	100		18.60	27.30	27.10	21.60	5.50	100		
Punjab	2012-13	0.03	63.64	12.49	14.69	7.92	1.24	100	0.00	7.81	13.61	31.47	34.48	12.62	100		
	2002-03		66.30	11.20	12.90	7.80	1.90	100		7.30	11.70	26.20	36.40	18.50	100		
	1991-92		63.20	11.40	13.90	9.80	1.70	100		6.20	10.70	26.70	40.60	15.80	100		
	1981-82		59.00	10.40	14.00	14.20	2.50	100		3.90	8.90	21.80	45.90	19.60	100		
	1970-71		11.70	19.10	32.70	30.50	6.00	100		1.50	7.10	24.30	45.10	22.10	100		
Rajasthan	2012-13	0.02	57.24	19.96													

Table 7: Change in Gini's Coefficient on the Size of Operational Holdings

State	Gini Coefficient				
	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Andhra Pradesh	0.582	0.573	0.529	0.543	0.455
Assam	0.388	0.465	0.412	0.366	0.351
Bihar	0.511	0.534	0.525	0.421	0.376
Chhattisgarh	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.361
Gujarat	0.518	0.544	0.573	0.605	0.518
Haryana	0.436	0.571	0.645	0.675	0.598
Jharkhand	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.350
Karnataka	0.509	0.562	0.577	0.543	0.509
Kerala	0.483	0.449	0.392	0.348	0.342
Madhya Pradesh	0.508	0.520	0.533	0.527	0.508
Maharashtra	0.514	0.570	0.570	0.526	0.474
Odisha	0.466	0.504	0.462	0.381	0.316
Punjab	0.398	0.685	0.694	0.706	0.670
Rajasthan	0.599	0.551	0.590	0.610	0.575
Tamil Nadu	0.480	0.555	0.527	0.508	0.480
Uttar Pradesh	0.471	0.520	0.498	0.450	0.444
West Bengal	0.433	0.494	0.430	0.313	0.223
All India	0.567	0.596	0.591	0.557	0.516

Source: NSS Report No.571, 70th round

Table 8: Percentage of Incidence of Leasing Out and Leasing in of Land by Households

Percentage of Households Leasing in Land	1971	1981	1992	2003	2013
		25	18	15	12
Percentage of area leased in to total area owned	12	7	9	7	12
Percentage of leased out to total area owned	6	4	5	3	4

Source: NSSO 70th round, report no.571no.571

Table 9: Employment Rates in Rural India

NSS Round and Year	Number of Employed Per 1000 Persons				Number of Employed Person Days Per 1000 Person Days	
	Usual Status		Current Weekly Status		Current Daily Status	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
27(1972-73)	545	318	530	277	NA	NA
32(1977-78)	552	331	519	232	488	194
38(1983)	547	340	511	227	482	198
43(1987-88)	539	323	504	220	501	207
45(1989-90)	548	319	528	230	NA	NA
46(1990-91)	553	292	535	230	NA	NA
47(July-Dec.1991)	546	331	519	232	NA	NA

Source: NSSO report on employment and unemployment 61st, 66th, 68th round

Table 10: Unemployment Rates in Rural India

NSS Round	Number of Unemployed Per 1000 persons				Number of Unemployed Person Days Per 1000 Person Days	
	US		CWS		CDS	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
27(1972-73)	NA	NA		5	NA	NA
32(1977-78)	22	55	36	41	71	92
38(1983)	21	44	37	43	75	90
43(1987-88)	28	35	42	44	46	67
45(1989-90)	16	8	26	21	NA	NA
46(1990-91)	13	4	22	21	NA	NA
47(1992-48 th)	18	12	22	12	NA	NA
	16	12	22	12	NA	NA
50(1993-94)	20	14	30	30	56	56
55(1999-00)	21	15	38	37	72	70
61(2004-05)	21	31	39	42	80	87
66(2009-10)	19	24	32	37	64	80
68(2011-12)	21	29	33	35	55	62

Source: NSSO report 61st, 66th, 68th round

Table 11: Growth of Population in India

Year	Total Population	Avg. Exponential Growth Rate	Rural Population
1971	548.2	2.20	439.0
1981	683.3	2.22	525.6
1991	846.4	2.16	630.6
2001	1028.4	1.97	742.6
2011	1210.6	1.64	833.5

Source: Reserve Bank of India

Table 12: State wise Level of Poverty in India during 1977 to 2011

Sl. No.	States/UTs	(1977)	(1987)	(1999)	(2011)
1	Andhra Pradesh	38.11	20.92	11.05	11.0
2	Arunachal Pradesh	59.82	39.35	40.04	38.9
3	Assam	59.82	39.35	40.04	33.9
4	Bihar	63.25	52.63	44.30	34.1
5	Goa	37.64	17.64	1.35	6.8
6	Gujarat	41.76	28.67	13.17	21.5
7	Haryana	27.73	16.22	8.27	11.6
8	Himachal Pradesh	33.49	16.28	7.94	8.5
9	Jammu & Kashmir	42.86	25.70	3.97	11.5
10	Karnataka	48.18	32.82	17.38	24.5
11	Kerala	51.48	29.10	9.38	9.1
12	Madhya Pradesh	62.52	41.92	37.06	35.7
13	Maharashtra	63.97	40.78	23.72	24.2
14	Manipur	59.82	39.35	40.04	38.8
15	Meghalaya	59.82	39.35	40.04	12.5
16	Mizoram	59.82	39.35	40.04	35.4
17	Nagaland	59.82	39.35	40.04	19.9
18	Orissa	72.38	57.64	48.01	35.7
19	Punjab	16.37	12.60	6.35	7.7
20	Rajasthan	35.89	33.21	13.74	16.1
21	Sikkim	59.82	39.35	40.04	9.9
22	Tamil Nadu	57.68	45.80	20.55	15.8
23	Tripura	59.82	39.35	40.04	16.5
24	Uttar Pradesh	47.60	41.10	31.22	30.4
25	West Bengal	68.34	48.30	31.85	22.5
26	Andaman & Nicobar	57.68	45.80	20.55	1.6
27	Chandigarh	27.32	14.67	5.75	1.6
28	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	37.64	67.11	17.57	62.6
29	Delhi	30.19	1.29	0.4	12.9

30	Lakshadweep	51.48	29.10	9.38	0.0
31	Pondicherry	57.68	45.80	20.55	17.1
	All India	53.07	39.09	25.74	20.26

Source: GOI, Planning commission

Table13- Poverty among SCs and STs- Rural, Urban India

(Percentage %)

Year	SC		ST	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
1983-84	58.1	56.5	63.8	54.2
1993-94	48.1	49.9	52.2	42.4
1999-2000	36.2	38.6	45.9	34.8
2004-05	52.7	40.0	61.9	35.0
2009-10	43.5	33.0	47.1	28.8

Source - GOI, Planning Commission, Eleventh Five Year Plan.

Table14- State-wise Poverty among SCs and STs

(Percentage)

State	1993-94		2004-05	
	SC	ST	SC	ST
Andhra Pradesh	26.02	25.66	15.4	30.5
Assam	45.38	41.44	27.7	14.1
Bihar	70.66	69.75	64.0	53.3
Gujarat	32.26	31.20	21.8	34.7
Haryana	46.56	41.55	26.8	-
Himachal Pradesh	36.89	63.94	19.6	14.9
Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	5.2	8.8
Karnataka	46.36	37.33	31.8	23.5
Kerala	36.43	37.34	21.6	44.3
Maharashtra	51.64	50.38	44.8	56.6
Madhya Pradesh	45.83	56.69	42.8	58.6
Odisha	48.95	71.26	50.2	75.6
Punjab	22.08	27.00	14.6	30.7
Rajasthan	38.38	46.23	28.7	32.6
Tamil Nadu	44.05	44.37	31.2	32.1
Uttar Pradesh	58.99	37.11	44.8	32.4
West Bengal	45.29	61.95	29.5	42.4
Chhattisgarh	-	-	32.7	54.7
Jharkhand	-	-	57.9	54.2
Uttarakhand	-	-	54.2	43.2
All India	48.11	51.94	36.8	47.2

Source: GOI, Planning Commission. (2012)

Table15- Coverage of SCs and STs under MGNREGS- All India

Year	Total no. of Household provided employment(lakhs)	Person days of employment (In lakhs)		
		SCs	STs	Totals
2006-07	210.16	2295.20	3298.73	9050.56
2007-08	339.09	3942.34	4205.6	14367.95
2008-09	451.15	6336.18	5501.64	21632.86
2009-10	525.30	8644.83	5874.39	28359.60
2010-11	549.54	7875.65	5361.80	25715.25
2011-12	498.00	3616.70	2822.61	16055.15
2012-13	497.00	4579.46	3445.45	21080.19
2013-14	476.00	4941.00	37.58	21867.00

Source: www.nrega.nic.in (2014)

Table 16-State wise Special Central Assistance

(In Rs. Crores)

State/UTs	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Andhra Pradesh	878.79	642.99	402.76	730.23
Bihar	55	90	200	330.42
Chhattisgarh	40.64	108.59	51.42	137.58
Goa	1.50	3.25	2.50	7.50
Gujarat	186.08	303.31	510.67	827.14
Haryana	19.59	136.18	240.25	164.27
HimachalPradesh	54.80	29	59.41	61.46
Karnataka	968.18	674.36	-	944.83
Kerala	361.81	-	473.11	944.38
Madhya Pradesh	1107.11	1869.09	2886.35	1336.22
Maharashtra	1197.47	869.79	681.36	995.27
Odisha	69.58	645.58	254.22	699.98
Punjab	76.35	114.70	152.68	-
Rajasthan	175.66	175.40	198.29	583.93
Tamil Nadu	612.15	176.77	494.67	-
Uttar Pradesh	904.36	960.98	435.30	1680.09
D & N Haveli	59.23	60	56.52	43.84
Daman and Diu	-	8.94	3	5.71
Puducherry	50	87.08	80.50	100
Total	6865.58	6982.91	7203.76	9749.55

Source: GOI, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (2013)

Table17- Special Central Assistance for Scheduled Castes (2009 to 2011-12)

(Rs. In Lakhs)

State	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Released	Beneficiaries	Released	Beneficiaries	Released	Beneficiaries
Andhra Pradesh	3668.49	354938	4492.78	603151	5159.59	N/A
Assam	249.22	15300	622.97	50809	0.00	N/A
Bihar	1916.86	408074	4857.64	0	3384.39	N/A
Chhattisgarh	666.69	162306	0.00	99180	1025.78	N/A
Gujarat	932.86	181073	1070.41	177017	769.88	N/A
Haryana	1350.53	100332	1431.17	80930	1671.44	N/A
Himachal Pradesh	498.20	65100	660.14	63657	817.11	N/A
Jammu & Kashmir	173.22	0	290.75	0		N/A
Jharkhand	0.00	00.00	0	932.03		N/A
Karnataka	2464.41	465763	2994.35	675071	4144.44	N/A
Kerala	763.24	9629	881.21	10010	1130.30	11581
Madhya Pradesh	3653.47	261457	4608.72	230067	4371.16	N/A
Maharashtra	2880.66	15575	0.00	40225	1977.98	N/A
Odisha	2209.99	285636	1261.37	305372	2508.97	N/A
Punjab	1075.88	79275	1362.33	82410	0.00	N/A
Rajasthan	3460.63	36998	4301.05	40494	3743.43	41024
Sikkim	22.60	310	82.84	641	56.02	N/A
Tamil Nadu	4605.30	1106440	6786.56	1078622	8404.64	N/A
Tripura	355.58	59883	460.21	49752	464.25	384545
Utter Pradesh	10426.82	111976	16621.42	0	17484.48	N/A
Uttarakhand	0.00	3389	621.41	0	0.00	N/A
West Bengal	4502.75	49960	5230.45	43587	7578.93	19343
Chandigarh	18.75	0	0.00	0	0.00	00
Puducherry	0.00	451	20.31	1507	0.00	N/A
Total	45896.15	3773865	58727.50	3632502	65639.94	456493

Source: GOI, Annual Report 2011-12, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment.