

Participatory Poverty Assessment through Livelihood Analysis: An Indian Case

M.V. Sajeev¹, S. Naskar², G. Biswas³, N.K. Meena⁴ and R.S. Jat⁵

¹Zonal Project Directorate, Zone - III, Barapani, Meghalaya, India

Telephone: +919436707013, E-mail: sajeevmv@yahoo.co.in

²National Research Centre on Pig, Guwahaty, Assam, India

³Central Institute of Brackishwater Aquaculture, Kakdwip, West Bengal, India

⁴National Research Centre on Orchids, Pakyong, Sikkim, India

⁵Directorate of Groundnut Research, Junagarh, Gujarat, India

KEYWORDS Poverty.India.Indicators.Livelihood Analysis Wealth Ranking. CrisisAnalysis

ABSTRACT Analysis of poverty and its dimensions are various as the ways in which poverty affects the daily sustenance of the poor. Poverty, many a times is simply viewed as an issue of income. What poverty means for the poor is a wide range of dynamic aspects. This paper presents results of analysis that emanate from Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) which was conducted in Sohenkhara village, Chittorgarh district of Rajasthan. Using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods, entire households of the village were covered for the study. Results revealed the indicators of wealth as land ownership, livestock and possession of agricultural machinery. While categorising rich and poor, a 'Very poor' category emerged representing a whopping 62 per cent of village population. Livelihood analysis exposed the highly skewed patterns of housing, land holding, livestock ownership patterns and income sources and expenditure patterns. Further, crisis analysis revealed that the poor and medium farmers are perpetually indebted to moneylenders. The exercise provided data on the otherwise hidden and side lined indicators of poverty and crisis management in villages which are otherwise unavailable through official surveys.

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is widespread in India, with the nation estimated to have a third of the world's poor. World Bank estimates that 80% of India's population lives on less than \$2 a day. According to a 2005 World Bank estimate, 41% of India falls below the international poverty line of US \$ 1.25 a day (PPP, in nominal terms ₹ 21.6 a day in urban areas and 14.3 in rural areas); having reduced from 60% in 1981 (World Bank 2010).

According to the criterion used by the Planning Commission of India, 27.5% of the population was living below the poverty line in 2004–2005, down from 51.3% in 1977–1978, and 36% in 1993–1994 (Anonymous 2007). A study by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative using a Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI) found that there were 645 million poor

living under the MPI in India, 421 million of whom are concentrated in eight north India states of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. This number is higher than the 410 million poor living in the 26 poorest African nations.

Estimates by NCAER (National Council of Applied Economic Research), show that 48% of the Indian households earn more than 90,000 (US\$1,953) annually (or more than US\$3 PPP per person). According to NCAER, in 2009, of the 222 million households in India, the absolutely poor households (annual incomes below 45,000) accounted for only 15.6 % of them or about 35 million (about 200 million Indians). Another 80 million households are in income levels of 45,000–90,000 per year (Singhal 2008).

Since the 1950s, the Indian government and non-governmental organizations have initiated several programs to alleviate poverty, including subsidizing food and other necessities, increased access to loans, improving agricultural techniques and price supports, and promoting education and family planning. These measures have helped eliminate famines, cut absolute pov-

Address for correspondence:

M.V.Sajeev

(Agricultural Extension),

Zonal Project Directorate, Zone - III,

Barapani, Meghalaya, India.

Telephone: +919436707013,

E-mail: sajeevmv@yahoo.co.in

erty levels by more than half, and reduced illiteracy and malnutrition (World Bank 2006).

People's participation is the foundation of current thinking in any developmental issue. Farmers have become the focal point and major stakeholder in agricultural research. The 21st century has opened up new possibilities for the farmer and now he has become more aware and has started to demand a variety of technologies for him to choose from. The researchers have to identify the researchable problems and give possible solutions within no time. Field experience and teamwork is needed to succeed in the endeavour of good research where the researcher knows what the farmer needs and how the solutions can be evolved. PRA provides a 'basket of techniques' for development practitioners interested in measuring various socio-economic indicators of rural development. In India, the dimensions of rural poverty are varied and linked with unemployment, underemployment, low levels of productivity, severe demographic pressures and illiteracy. Agricultural development must take into account the differences in wealth among farmers in order to determine the priorities for research and to develop the interventions and technical packages that are to be adopted by the majority of the farmers (Barbara 1988).

Wealth ranking is a PRA tool based on the assumption that community members have a good sense of who among them is more or less well off (Theis and Grady 1991). It refers to placing the people on different categories according to their own criteria. The purpose is to find out the persons of the village, who belong to the rich, middle, poor and very poor group categories as perceived by the villagers themselves. Wealth ranking is based on the assumption that the community members have a good sense about fellow villagers in their own village and are able to categorize themselves. Wealth ranking and resultant livelihood analysis helps the extension workers, developmental staff, researchers and other concerned for rural and agricultural development to find out the inequalities and differences in wealth in every farmer and which in turn lead to overall understanding of socio-economic conditions of entire village community. This will also help in selecting the right type of beneficiaries for the various programmes. The present study was undertaken to identify the wealth status of the people of a

typical Indian village and to understand various indicators used by the villagers for classifying their own economic status.

METHODOLOGY

The study team camped at Sohenkhera village, Chittorgarh district, Rajasthan for 14 days and conducted a full-fledged PRA exercise. Basic information about the village was collected from the villagers (KIs), which constituted the primary data. Five key informants other than Gram Panchayat members were utilised in gathering the primary data. Apart from this secondary data were collected from the Agriculture Department, Panchayat Office, Revenue Department, Veterinary Officer, KVK, Chittorgarh and Bio-resource Centre of MPUAT, Udaipur at Bhadsoda Sanwalia Ji Mandir. The primary and secondary data collected from different sources were then crosschecked through triangulation between different stakeholders. A mix of quantitative methods and qualitative methods were used to collect data from all the households of the village. The field exercise lasted 14 days.

For wealth ranking, list of all households was obtained from the village Panchayat Office situated at Bagund. The head of each household along with number of household members was written in separate cards meant for wealth ranking. Four Key Informants (KIs) who know each and every house in the village was asked separately to sort out the cards (having the name, number of family members and household number) into as many groups according to their own classification of different wealth classes. The criteria on which each KI was sorting the households was asked and noted separately. Each KI had full freedom to use as many numbers of categories as possible.

Scoring of Households

Scores were given to various households according to the following formulae:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{n+1-C_i}{n} \times 100$$

Where, n= Total no. of categories made by KIs, C_i= ith category in which a particular household placed by the KIs.

Then average wealth score for each household is calculated by the formulae:

$$\text{Average wealth score} = \frac{\text{Score of KI-1} + \text{KI-2} + \text{KI-3} + \text{KI-4}}{4}$$

Since different KIs used four nos. of wealth categories, Average no. of wealth categories= Sum of no. of categories used by each KI/Total no. of KI. Categories = $3+5+4+4/4=4$

The four categories are:

1. Rich
2. Medium
3. Poor
4. Very poor

All the households at Sohenkhera village are to be categorized into these four categories. All the wealth categories should have equal interval of scores. This can be calculated as follows:

Correction factor = (Max. – Min. score)/wealth category

$$CF = (100 - 25.75)/4 = 18.56$$

$$100 - 18.56 = 81.44$$

$$81.44 - 18.56 = 62.88$$

$$62.88 - 18.56 = 44.32$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The basic information collected from primary and secondary sources show that the village is entirely dependent on agriculture and animal husbandry for the livelihood. The primary information on the village is provided in Table 1. The farmers grow crops in all the three seasons and animal husbandry is also practiced along with. Almost all the *Kharif* and *Rabi* crops are cultivated regardless of the productivity. Productivity is not a primary concern with respect to rearing of animals also. The details are given in Table 2. The categorization/classification, criteria as well as wealth status of each household at Sohenkhera village according to the four KIs are given in Tables 3 to 6.

All the households at Sohenkhera village were categorized into four categories. The score

Table 1: Primary information of the village

<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Name of the village</i>	<i>Sohenkhera</i>
<i>Details of Study Area</i>	Gram panchayat Panchayat samiti Uptehsil District State	Bagund Bhadesar Bhadsoda Chittorgarh Rajasthan
<i>Climate</i>	Mean annual rainfall Temperature (Annual Range)	1100 mm (2006) 13-45° C (Max. 45° C, Min. 1° C)
<i>Geographical Coordinates</i>	Relative humidity Total area Cultivated area Irrigated area Residential area Fallow land Pasture land Panchayat land	20% 412.87 ha 332 ha 138.14 ha 6.07 ha 35.16 ha 35.05 ha 3.25 ha
<i>Demographic Pattern</i>	Total households Total number of families Number of joint families Number of nuclear families Total population Number of male members Number of female members	99 Nos 124 109 15 530 263 267
<i>Community Categorization</i>	Literacy Number of Hindu families Number of Muslim families Number of tribal families Name of tribe(s) Major castes Major social occupation	31.35% (M- 51%, F- 12%) 113 11 5 Bheel Gayaris and Jats (OBC) Agriculture and animal husbandry
<i>Occupational Distribution</i>	Families engaged in agriculture Families engaged in agriculture + business Families with government service (+animal husbandry)	121 1 2

Table 2: Agricultural scenario of the village

<i>Particulars</i>		
<i>Land Distribution</i> (in ha) (I-Irrigated, UI- Un Irrigated)	<i>Kharif</i>	189 (0.18 I + 188.82 UI)
	<i>Rabi</i>	147.48 (138.14 I + 9.34 UI)
	Summer	1.56 (I)
	Average land holding per household	2.9
	Largest land holding by any person	8.0
<i>Kharif Crops</i> (in ha for 2006-07) (I-Irrigated, UI- Un Irrigated)	Maize	137.26 (UI)
	Black Gram	3.28 (UI)
	Sesame	0.34 (UI)
	Groundnut	39.86 (UI)
	Soya bean	2.3 (UI)
	Lucerne	0.17 (I)
	Sorghum (fodder)	5.78 (UI)
	Total area cultivated	0.17 (I) and 188.82 (UI)
<i>Rabi Crops</i> (in ha for for 2006-07) (I-Irrigated, UI- Un Irrigated)	Wheat	35.32 (I)
	Barley	2.47 (I)
	Chick pea	5.24 (I)
	Fenugreek	1.22 (I)
	Mustard	93.61 (I) and 3.94 (UI)
	Taramira	0.16 (UI)
	Potato	0.5 (I)
	Lucerne	3.73 (I)
	Onion	0.11 (I)
	Total area cultivated	138.14 (I) and 9.34 (UI)
<i>Summer Crops</i> (in/ha for 2006-07)	Sorghum fodder	0.05(I)
	Ground nut	1.51(I)
	Total area cultivated	1.56(I)
<i>Highest Recorded Yield/Ha</i>	Wheat	50 qtl
	Mustard	23 qtl
	Maize	28 qtl
	Chick pea	14 qtl
	Total cropped area	332 ha
<i>Water Sources</i>	Wells- 26, tube wells- 1, water harvesting structure- 10.8 ha	
<i>Fish Species Found</i>	Murrells, minnows, spiny eels, glass fish and barb (during monsoon)	
<i>Animal Husbandry</i>	Cattle: 234	Breeding bull- 5, Bullock- 158, Desi cow-63, Crossbred cow- 8
	Buffalo: 303	Breeding bull- 2, Bullock-50, She buffalo- 251
	Sheep: 103	Ram and young male- 15, Ewe and young female-88
	Goat: 332	Buck and young male- 46, Doe and young female- 286
	Horse: 12 All mare	
<i>Major Breeds of Livestock</i>	Cattle	<i>Nagori, Nimari</i> , Jersey and HF crossbred nondescript
	Buffalo	Nondescript, upgraded stock with <i>Surti</i> (earlier) and <i>Murrah</i> (ongoing), Pure <i>Murrah</i>
	Sheep	Nondescript, Sonadi
	Goat	Marwari, Jhakrana, Sirohi (Deogarh) pure and crossbred, nondescript
<i>Average Milk, Meat and Wool Yield</i>	Horse	<i>Kathiawari</i>
	Cattle	Crossbred- 5-7 litre/day, Nondescript- 2-2.5 little/day
	Buffalo	<i>Murrah</i> - 6.5 litre/day, Nondescript (with <i>Surti</i>) - 4-5 litre/day
	Goat	20-22 Kg at one year
	Sheep	200-250 gm wool/shearing, three shearing/year
<i>Fodder Grasses Available</i>	<i>Cyanodon dactylon</i> , Sudan grass, Napier grass and Doob grass.	

Table 3: Categories according to KI (1)

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Household No.</i>
1.	<i>Rich</i>	Land>60 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo>10 TV/Mobile	33, 63, 64, 94, 95, 96, 119, 120
2.	<i>Medium</i>	Land: 30-60 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 4-5 TV/Mobile	3, 35, 37, 38, 41, 45, 48, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 79, 83, 103, 104, 118, 126, 127
3.	<i>Poor</i>	Land <30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo <1-2 Sheep/Goat	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 43, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 97, 99, 100, 101, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134

Table 4: Categories according to KI (2)

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Household No.</i>
1.	<i>Very Rich</i>	Land: 50-70 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo>10 Tractor	3, 33, 37, 41, 48, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 79, 94, 95, 96, 104, 119, 120
2.	<i>Rich</i>	Land: 30-50 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 8-10	38, 45, 47, 61, 62, 83, 103
3.	<i>Medium</i>	Land: 20-30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 5-8 House	7, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, 40, 49, 58, 59, 69, 70, 61, 72, 74, 82, 88, 90, 93, 112, 116, 118, 126
4.	<i>Poor</i>	Land:10-20 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 2-5 Sheep/Goat	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 51, 54, 60, 65, 66, 75, 78, 89, 91, 92, 100, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, 117, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 129, 132, 133, 134
5.	<i>Very Poor</i>	Land <10 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo <2 Sheep/Goat	8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 43, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 76, 77, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 97, 99, 101, 114, 125, 131

Table 5: Categories according to KI (3)

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Household No.</i>
1.	<i>Rich</i>	Land >30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo >5 Tractor Tube well Bike	3, 9, 33, 37, 38, 41, 45, 47, 48, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 79, 83, 94, 95, 96, 103, 104, 116, 118, 119, 120, 122, 126
2.	<i>Medium</i>	Land: 20-30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 4-5 Well	7, 11, 14, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 70, 74, 82, 88, 90, 112
3.	<i>Poor</i>	Land: 6-20 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 2-3	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 30, 49, 51, 54, 66, 69, 72, 75, 91, 92, 93, 100, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, 117, 121, 128, 132, 133, 134
4.	<i>Very Poor</i>	Land <5 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo <2	8, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 35, 43, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 97, 99, 101, 107, 114, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 131

Table 6: Categories according to KI (4)

S. No.	Category	Criteria	Household No.
1.	Rich	Land >30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo >5 <i>Pucca</i> house Tractor Bike Gold	3 33, 48, 63, 64, 69, 94, 95, 96, 103, 118, 119, 120, 123, 126
2.	Medium	Land: 15-30 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 4-5 <i>Pucca</i> house Bike	7, 35, 37, 38, 41, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 83, 91, 104, 116
3.	Poor	Land: 5-15 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo: 2-3 <i>Kachcha</i> house	1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 45, 47, 48, 79, 90, 93, 100, 109, 110, 111, 112, 121, 122, 124
4.	Very Poor	Land <5 <i>bigha</i> Buffalo <2 <i>Kuchcha</i> house	2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 43, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 756, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 92, 97, 99, 101, 107, 108, 113, 114, 117, 125, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134

Table 7: Score ranges for different wealth categories

S. No.	Category	Score range
1.	Rich	81.44 to 100
2.	Medium	62.88 to 81.44
3.	Poor	44.32 to 62.88
4.	Very poor	25.76 to 44.32

Table 8: Common criteria identified for wealth ranking

S. No.	Common criteria	Rich	Medium	Poor	Very poor
1.	Land owned	>30 <i>bigha</i>	20-30 <i>bigha</i>	5-20 <i>bigha</i>	<5 <i>bigha</i>
2.	Buffalo	>5	4-5	2-3	<2
3.	Sheep/Goat	-	-	5-10	<5
4.	Tractor	One	-	-	-

ranges for different categories arrived through addition of correction factors is provided in Table 7. Based on the above exercise, the common criteria for wealth ranking in Sohenkhera village was identified (Table 8). Based on the score range and categories, the final wealth ranking table for the village was prepared (household addresses kept blank when could not be identified by KI). The wealth score obtained is tabulated in Table 9.

Based on the above tabulation, population belonging to various wealth categories of Sohenkhera village were delineated. The categorisation of village households to various wealth categories is provided in Table 10.

Livelihood Analysis

Livelihood analysis refers to find out the degrees to which the pattern of life differs from one social class to another social class in term of size of family, size of landholding, type of house, implements, annual income, source of income, expenditure pattern, crisis management pattern, indebtedness etc. The livelihood analysis at Sohenkhera village was carried out after completion of wealth ranking. One representative villager from each of the wealth category (Rich, Medium, Poor and Very poor) was selected randomly. The data on relevant information were collected from each of the categorized farmer which is presented in Table 11 below and explained.

Among the four wealth categories, there is a clear cut indication in the type of house owned by the villagers. Rich category people have *pucca* houses and medium and poor category people of the village live in *kuchcha* houses, whereas, very poor category people live in mud houses. There is no marked difference in family size of rich, medium and poor category but slightly big family was observed in very poor category people. Rich category invariably has more than 30 *bigha* land and more than 5 buffaloes, while many of the very poor category villagers have land size less than 5 *bigha* with less than two buffaloes. Regarding source of income, rich category villager has another source of income other than agriculture, while medium and poor category villagers are totally dependent

Table 9: Wealth score of households

<i>House No.</i>	<i>Head of household</i>	<i>KI-1</i>	<i>KI-2</i>	<i>KI-3</i>	<i>KI-4</i>	<i>Avg. score</i>	<i>Wealth category</i>
1.	Onkar Gayari	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
2.	Mangu Lohar	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
3.	Udailal	66	100	100	100	91.50	Rich
4.	Uda Chamar	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
5.	Dhapu Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
6.	Bhagwan Gayari	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
7.	Nimaram Jat	33	60	75	75	60.75	Poor
8.	Sarif Mohd	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
9.	Amar Chand	33	40	100	50	55.75	Poor
10.	Shankar	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
11.	Nagjiram	33	20	75	50	44.50	Poor
12.	Gokul Bheel	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
13.	Hakim Khan	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
14.	Gangaram	33	40	75	25	43.25	Very poor
15.	Nangjiram	33	20	50	50	38.25	Very poor
16.	Mewa Regar	33	20	50	25	32.00	Very poor
17.	Bhola Regar	33	20	50	25	32.00	Very poor
18.	Chunni Bai	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
19.	Lakhma Regar	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
20.	Bhairulal	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
21.	Bhagwan Nai	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
22.	Naran Jat	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
23.	Jetun Bai	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
24.	Ramlal	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
25.	Shankar Nayak	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
26.	Rameswar Nayak	33	20	50	25	32.00	Very poor
27.	Nanda Regar	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
28.	Dalla Regar	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
29.	Vardhu Lohar	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
30.	Amarchand Lohar	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
31.	Kajor Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
32.	Dalla Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
33.	Rama Jat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
34.	Chatra Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
35.	Harli Bai	66	60	25	75	56.50	Poor
36.	Not identified by KI						
37.	Gangaram Gayari	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
38.	Kishore Gayari	66	80	100	75	80.25	Medium
39.	Rameswar Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
40.	Bhera Jat	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
41.	Hajarilal Jat	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
42.	Not identified by KI						
43.	Laxmilal	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
44.	Not identified by KI						
45.	Hiralal Jat	66	80	100	50	74.00	Medium
46.	Not identified by KI						
47.	Narayan Jat	33	80	100	50	65.75	Medium
48.	Shankar Jat	66	100	100	100	91.50	Rich
49.	GhasiGayari	33	60	50	25	42.00	Very poor
50.	Sardar Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
51.	Rameswarlal	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
52.	Govind	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
53.	Bhagchand	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
54.	Kishan Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
55.	Amir Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
56.	Sardar Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
57.	Aziz Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
58.	Shankar Gayari	33	60	50	25	41.25	Very poor
59.	Kishan	33	60	50	25	21.25	Very poor

Table 9: Contd....

<i>House No.</i>	<i>Head of household</i>	<i>KI-1</i>	<i>KI-2</i>	<i>KI-3</i>	<i>KI-4</i>	<i>Avg. score</i>	<i>Wealth category</i>
60.	Narayan Nai	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
61.	Heera	66	60	-	75	67.00	Medium
62.	Bhairu	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
63.	Harlal Jat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
64.	Bhagwan Jat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
65.	Badridas	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
66.	Shankardas	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
67.	Gopu Jat	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
68.	Gokal Gayari	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
69.	Navanram	33	60	50	100	60.75	Poor
70.	Mangilal	33	60	75	-	56.00	Poor
71.	Gangaram Jat	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
72.	Udailai Gayari	33	60	50	25	42.00	Very poor
73.	Not identified by KI						
74.	Bhaira Chamar	33	60	75	25	48.25	Poor
75.	Madhu Lohar	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
76.	Appar Khan	33	20	-	25	26.00	Very poor
77.	Nola Regar	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
78.	Shankarlal Gayari	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
79.	Narayan Gayari	66	100	100	50	79.00	Medium
80.	Kashiram	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
81.	Bhagwan Bheel	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
82.	Pratap Gayari	33	60	75	-	56.00	Poor
83.	Bhairalal Gayari	66	80	100	75	80.25	Medium
84.	Bhanwar Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
85.	Muneer Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
86.	Naranilal Bheel	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
87.	Bhagawandas Bheel	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
88.	Ganeshlal	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
89.	Mohan	33	40	-	-	36.50	Very poor
90.	Prithviraj Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
91.	Jeetmal	33	40	50	75	49.50	Poor
92.	Bhairu Nayak	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
93.	RamuJat	33	60	50	50	48.25	Poor
94.	Bhaira Jat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
95.	Shyani Bai	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
96.	Shankar Singh	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
97.	Rais Mohd	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
98.	Not identified by KI						
99.	Ramjan Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
100.	Ratanlal Gayari	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
101.	Dalchand Nai	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
102.	Rama Jat						
103.	Shankarlal	66	80	100	100	86.50	Rich
104.	Rameswar Jat	66	100	100	75	85.25	Rich
105.	Not identified by KI						
106.	Not identified by KI						
107.	Gangaram Lohar	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
108.	Onkarlal	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
109.	Laluram	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
110.	Roda Gayari	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
111.	Narayan	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
112.	Chuna Gayari	33	60	75	50	54.50	Poor
113.	Mangilal Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
114.	Basir Khan	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
115.	Bhairulal Gayari	33	40	50	-	30.75	Very poor
116.	Narayan Gayari	33	60	100	75	67.00	Medium
117.	Champalal Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
118.	Sabairam	66	60	100	100	81.50	Rich
119.	RatanlalJat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich

Table 9: Contd....

House No.	Head of household	KI-1	KI-2	KI-3	KI-4	Avg. score	Wealth category
120.	Lachhiram Jat	100	100	100	100	100	Rich
121.	Bhagwan	33	40	50	50	43.25	Very poor
122.	Amarchand	33	40	100	50	55.75	Poor
123.	Kaluram	33	40	25	100	49.50	Poor
124.	Sadhu	33	40	25	50	37.00	Very poor
125.	Bhera Nayak	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
126.	Amarchand	66	60	100	100	81.50	Rich
127.	Shankar	66	40	25	25	39.00	Very poor
128.	Lakhma Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
129.	Champalal Jat	33	40	25	25	30.75	Very poor
130.	Not identified by KI						
131.	Shambudas	33	20	25	25	25.76	Very poor
132.	Rama Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
133.	Naran Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor
134.	Lalu Gayari	33	40	50	25	37.00	Very poor

Table 10: Wealth categories of Sohenkhera village

S. No.	Category	Number of families	Percentage
1.	Rich	20	16.13
2.	Medium	7	5.64
3.	Poor	20	16.13
4.	Very poor	77	62.10

on agriculture along with very poor families in the village (especially in *Lohar* community having 43 per cent income from blacksmith works). There are almost uniform expenditure patterns among the different groups with slight difference. Poor category people spend more on food and clothing due to their bigger family size and

less in entertainment and there is no way of saving in very poor category. All rich category people go for saving like Insurance instruments etc. and very poor category people borrow money from local money lenders for crisis management.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the livelihood analysis conducted for the three different categories of wealth ranking results, it may be pointed out that with respect to the size of land holdings the rich farmer had 50 percent more the size of the medium and as such large as 9 times that the

Table 11: Livelihood analysis of Sohenkhera village

Variables	Rich (Ratan Lal Jat)	Medium (Pema Lal Gayari)	Poor (Ganeshlal Gayari)	Very poor (Ganga Lohar)
Type of house	Pucca	Kuchcha	Kuchcha	Mud made
Family size	5	5	2	7
Men	2	2	1	3
Women	2	1	1	3
Children	1	2	-	1
Land holding	37 <i>bigha</i>	25 <i>bigha</i>	12 <i>bigha</i>	4 <i>bigha</i>
Nature of farming	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed
Livestock:				
Buffalo	12	4	3	1
Cow	-	1	-	1
Sheep/goat	-	-	5	2
Income source	Agriculture-50%, business- 50%	Agriculture- 91%, livestock- 9%	Agriculture- 97%, ghee selling- 3%	Agriculture - 43%, Blacksmith 43%
Expenditure	Agriculture-30%, food- 20%, celebration- 20%, health- 5%, savings- 25%	Agriculture- 45%, food- 36%, clothes - 9%, education- 3%, livestock - 3%, health- 2%, savings- 2%	Agriculture- 33%, food- 17%, celebration- 14%, livestock- 16%, transport- 3%, health- 3%, savings- 15%	Agriculture - 15%, food- 70%, clothes- 15%

poor farmer. The rich farmer had an incomparably large number of cattle with respect to his counterparts. While the rich farmer received monthly income equally from agriculture and business, the medium and poor farmer almost solely depended on agriculture for income. The very poor farmers depended on agriculture and other enterprises such as black smithy but with very poor returns. Furthermore, from the expenditure pattern observed, the rich farmer were inclined to save nearly 25% of his monthly income, while the poor farmer was always in need of loan to meet his monthly needs since no saving pattern was observed. As a consequence the crises analysis indicated that the poor farmer as well as the medium farmer usually takes a loan of 50 per cent towards meeting any calamities faced in their agricultural and livestock sectors as well as meeting day to day expenses which continue to make them poorer.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous 2010. "8 Indian States Have More Poor Than 26 Poorest African Nations". *Times of India*. July 12, P. 4.
- Barbara E Grandin 1988. *Wealth Ranking in Small Holder Communities: A Field Manual*. Rugby, U.K: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Government of India 2007. *Poverty Estimates for 2004-05*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- Jat RS, Meena NK, Biswas Gouranga, Naskar Soumen, Sajeev MV 2007. *Field Experience Training Report*. 80th FOCARS, Hyderabad: National Academy of Agricultural Research Management.
- Joachim Theis, Heather M Grady 1991. Participatory Rural Appraisal for Irrigation Management Research.; *Working Paper No. 38*, Colombo: International Irrigation Management Institute, P.18.
- Singhal Arvind 2008. A Market at the Bottom of the Pyramid? From < http://www.ncaer.org/downloads/MediaClips/Press/businessstandard-arvind_singal.pdf> (Retrieved January 11, 2011).
- World Bank 2006. Inclusive Growth and Service delivery: Building on India's Success. "From <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOUTHASIAEXT/Resources/DPR_FullReport.pdf> (Retrieved January 16, 2011).
- World Bank 2010. "New Global Poverty Estimates — What it means for India". From < http://www.worldbank.org.in/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/SOUTHASIAEXT/INDIAEXTN/0,,contentMDK:21880725~page_PK:141137~piPK:141127~theSitePK:295584,00.html> (Retrieved December 23, 2010).