

SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

Analysis of socioeconomic features of the households, such as demographic structure, education, land-use system, cropping patterns, crop yields, availability of infrastructural facilities, and so on, enables the understanding of problems and prospects of development in any given region. These features, besides indicating the possible constraints in launching a particular development strategy, offer clues and insights for devising appropriate development strategies for the future. The failure of several development programmes in the past could be attributed mainly to insensitivity and alienation from the given socioeconomic characteristics of households at the grassroots' level. Perhaps it is the need to understand these features that has led to the recent emphasis on a bottom-up approach rather than a conventional top-down approach and the increasing popularity of methodological approaches such as Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) for devising suitable development strategies. The present chapter describes the salient socioeconomic features of sample households in the study areas. An attempt has also been made to indicate temporal changes in the availability of infrastructural facilities, cropping patterns, crop yields, and livestock inventory, wherever possible.

Infrastructural Facilities

The availability of basic infrastructural facilities is essential for accelerating the process of economic development in any region. In fact, the whole debate on sustainable development, in general, and on mountain development, in particular, centres around the provision of basic physical, institutional, and social infrastructure. The availability of some of these facilities and changes, over time, in the study areas has been provided in Table 3. As shown, households in the transformed areas are favourably endowed with all the basic infrastructural facilities, and these are available on their doorstep. In the case of non-transformed areas, not only are the basic facilities lacking, there has been no significant change over the past two decades. It is precisely this lack of basic facilities that is hampering the development of these areas in more ways than one, and which is also responsible for excessive pressure on natural resources (e.g., forests).

Demographic Features

The demographic features of sample households are given in Table 4. The following comments are in order. First, the percentage of working population in the age group 15 to 60 years is marginally higher in the transformed areas than in the non-transformed areas. Second, there is no significant difference in the male-female ratio between the transformed and non-transformed areas. Third, the aver-

Table 3: Comparison of Temporal Changes in Infrastructural Facilities

S. No	Particulars	Transformed Areas		Non-transformed Areas	
		1975	1995	1975	1995
i)	Per cent of houses with electricity*	100	100	50.00	88.24
ii)	Roads	1	0.50	4	4
	a) Distance from unmetalled road (km)				
	b) Distance from metalled road (km)	1	1	4	4
iii)	Distance from post office (km)	1	1	2	2
iv)	Distance from primary health centre (km)	1	1	5	5
v)	Distance from district hospital (km)	20	20	50	50
vi)	Distance from veterinary hospital	1	1	5	5
vii)	Distance from school (km),				
	primary school	1	1	2	2
	secondary school	1	1	8	8
viii)	Number of cooperatives	5	22	1	1
ix)	Number of bank branches	1	2	-	-
x)	Distance from college (km)	20	20	50	50
xi)	Distance from the market (km)	18	2	5	5
xiii)	Availability of drinking water (per cent of houses)	100	100	-	100

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Note* Some small households do not have electricity because their houses are unsafe.

age family size is equal in both areas. Across different farm categories, in both areas, the family size is higher among medium and large households, and lower in small households.

Educational Status

The extent of human resource development (Table 5) in terms of literacy, particularly female literacy and percentage of persons with secondary education, is noticeably higher in the transformed areas than in the non-transformed areas. Differences are more pronounced in female literacy in both regions. For example, the percentage of illiterate women/girls is 26.70 per cent in the transformed areas and 46.80 per cent in the non-transformed areas. Likewise, while 6.67 per cent of females in the transformed area have education above secondary level, there are none in the non-transformed areas. Among different categories of household, the differences are more pronounced with respect to small households. For instance, in the non-transformed areas, 34.88 per cent of all persons are illiterate in comparison to 17.33 per cent in the transformed areas. The difference is equally pronounced between male and female. However, medium farmers are the exception; the percentage of illiterate population is almost equal in both types of area.

Inventory of Physical Assets

The inventory of assets (which also indicates physical capital formation) is shown in Table 6. The table shows that households in the transformed areas own nearly

Table 4: Age-wise Distribution of Sample Population

Particulars	Transformed Areas			Non-transformed Areas		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Small						
8-14	16.05	15.72	31.77	22.08	15.15	37.23
15-68	31.44	29.43	60.87	30.74	27.27	58.01
Above 60	5.35	2.01	7.36	2.16	2.60	4.76
All	52.84	47.16	100.00	54.98	45.02	100.00
Male-female ratio	-	-	1.12	-	-	1.22
Average family size	-	-	6.36	-	-	5.78
Medium						
8-14	13.43	23.88	37.31	13.74	19.85	33.59
15-60	28.36	28.36	56.72	30.53	28.24	58.77
Above 60	4.48	1.49	5.97	3.82	3.82	7.64
All	46.87	53.73	100.00	48.09	51.91	100.00
Male-female ratio	-	-	0.86	-	-	0.93
Average family size	-	-	8.00	-	-	8.19
Large						
0-14	10.34	12.07	22.41	15.63	17.18	32.81
15-60	13.43	34.48	72.41	23.44	37.50	60.94
Above 60	3.12	2.06	5.18	6.25	-	6.25
All	53.45	46.55	100.00	45.32	54.68	100.00
Male-female ratio	-	-	1.12	-	-	0.83
Average family size	-	-	8.29	-	-	9.14
All households						
8-14	14.86	16.51	31.37	18.54	16.90	35.44
15-68	31.84	29.95	61.79	29.48	29.11	58.69
Above 60	5.19	1.65	6.84	3.29	2.58	5.87
All	51.89	48.11	100.00	51.41	48.59	100.00
Male-female ratio	-	-	1.08	-	-	1.06
Average family size	-	-	6.79	-	-	6.79

Source: Field Survey, 1995

double the amount of total assets than their counterparts in non-transformed areas. The greater amount of physical assets owned by households in the transformed areas makes them more resilient to shocks and stresses. The differences in composition of assets are, however, not so striking; residential buildings in both types of area account for more than three-fourths of the total assets. The notable difference is in the total non-farm assets, which account for 10.62 per cent in the transformed areas and 3.66 per cent in non-transformed areas. The pattern is almost similar among small, medium, and large households in both types of area.

Livestock Inventory

The temporal changes in livestock inventory between 1975 and 1995 are given in Table 7. The data depict a sharp decline in the number of animals per household during the last twenty years; in the two types of area, the magnitude of decline is much higher in the transformed areas; the number of animals per household de-

Table 5: Educational Status of Sample Population (per cent)

Particulars	Transformed Areas			Non-transformed Areas		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Small						
Illiterate	9.74	26.83	17.33	20.56	52.27	34.88
School going	31.82	30.08	31.05	34.58	23.86	29.74
Literate	58.44	43.09	51.62	44.86	23.86	35.38
Levels of education						
Primary	18.89	49.06	30.07	45.83	66.67	52.17
Middle	31.11	24.53	28.67	20.83	33.33	24.64
Secondary	40.00	22.64	33.57	25.00	0.00	17.39
Above	10.00	3.77	7.69	8.34	0.00	5.80
Medium						
Illiterate	6.90	27.59	17.24	4.00	26.67	16.36
School going	37.93	31.03	34.48	32.00	40.00	50.91
Literate	55.17	41.38	48.28	64.00	33.33	32.73
Levels of education						
Primary	18.75	16.67	17.86	25.00	33.33	28.57
Middle	-	-	-	31.25	33.33	32.14
Secondary	43.75	83.33	60.71	37.50	33.33	35.71
Above	37.50	-	21.43	6.25	0.00	3.57
Large						
Illiterate	10.00	25.00	16.67	10.91	40.00	24.76
School going	16.67	33.33	24.07	23.64	42.00	54.29
Literate	73.33	41.67	59.26	65.45	18.00	20.95
Levels of education						
Primary	22.73	-	15.63	30.56	61.90	42.10
Middle	40.91	30.00	37.50	36.11	23.81	31.58
Secondary	22.73	40.00	28.12	22.22	14.29	19.30
Above	13.63	30.00	18.75	11.11	0.00	7.02
All households						
Illiterate	9.39	26.70	17.22	15.51	46.84	29.86
School going	30.52	30.68	30.59	31.02	18.98	25.51
Literate	60.09	42.62	52.19	53.48	34.18	44.64
Levels of education						
Primary	19.53	37.33	26.11	37.00	57.41	44.16
Middle	28.90	21.33	26.11	28.00	10.31	28.57
Secondary	37.50	34.67	36.45	26.00	12.96	21.43
Above	14.07	6.67	11.33	9.00	0.00	5.84

Source: Field Survey, 1995

declined from 13.07 to 3.48. Insofar as the changes in different categories of animal are concerned, sheep and goats recorded a steep decline, followed by local cows and bullocks. Over the period, there was also a substitution of local animals with improved breeds. The number of animals per household was, however, nearly double in the non-transformed areas than in the transformed areas. Among different categories of household (Table 8), whereas in the transformed areas small and medium households own the same number of animals, in non-transformed areas the number of animals per household increases with an increase in land owned.

Table 6: Inventory of Physical Assets (IRs¹ per household)

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed-Areas			
	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Residential buildings	100178 (74.75)	112588 (63.59)	207143 (68.62)	113839 (75.44)	41150 (83.40)	72500 (77.48)	11000 (75.02)	56762 (79.52)
Cattleshed	4698 (3.51)	9500 (5.37)	3571 (1.18)	5190 (3.43)	2575 (5.22)	8000 (8.55)	13286 (9.06)	5143 (7.20)
Traditional Implements	657 (0.49)	513 (0.29)	1407 (0.46)	723 (0.48)	703 (1.42)	1084 (1.16)	1936 (1.32)	937 (1.31)
Modern Implements	3117 (2.33)	11900 (6.73)	16214 (5.37)	5729 (3.80)	503 (1.02)	2044 (2.18)	5871 (4.00)	1490 (2.09)
Dairy Animals	6670 (4.98)	10938 (16.18)	13993 (4.64)	8048 (5.33)	1723 (3.49)	4491 (4.80)	5664 (3.86)	2863 (4.01)
Draught Animals	1180 (0.88)	1888 (1.07)	2029 (0.67)	1367 (0.91)	1163 (2.36)	2338 (2.50)	2221 (1.52)	1579 (2.21)
Non-farm assets	17522 (13.06)	29663 (16.77)	57500 (19.06)	16022 (10.61)	1525 (3.09)	3113 (3.33)	7657 (5.22)	2610 (3.66)
Total assets	134014 (100.88)	176900 (100.00)	301853 (100.00)	158497 (100.00)	49341 (100.00)	93569 (100.00)	146636 (100.00)	71384 (100.00)

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Note: HHs = Household

**Table 7: Temporal Changes in Livestock Inventory: 1975 to 1995
(Number/Household)**

Particulars	Transformed Areas		Non-transformed Areas	
	1975	1995	1975	1995
Cows				
Local	2.5	0.02	3.00	1.05
Improved	-	1.35	-	0.22
Bullocks	2.2	0.65	3.00	1.59
Sheep	4.00	1.24	15.00	2.38
Goats	2.00	0.02	10.00	1.44
Poultry	-	0.06	-	1.27
Mules	3.00	0.20	2.00	0.60
Total	13.07	3.48	33	7.28
Milk yield (litres)				
Local (cow)	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.52
Improved (cow)	-	5.96	-	4.75

Source: Field Survey, 1995

1 There are 35.00 IRs to the U.S\$

**Table 8: Livestock Inventory by Categories of Household
(Number of Animals per Household)**

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Milch cows								
Local	-	0.13	-	0.02	0.82	1.31	1.57	1.05
Improved	1.19	1.63	2.14	1.35	0.08	0.38	0.71	0.22
Non-milch cows								
Local								
Improved	0.15	0.13	0.29	0.16	0.75	0.81	1.14	0.81
	0.36	0.38	1.14	0.45	0.05	0.25	-	0.10
Young stock								
Male	0.74	1.13	1.29	0.85	0.43	0.31	1.29	0.48
Female	0.53	0.13	0.71	0.48	0.55	1.00	1.57	0.78
Bullocks	0.51	1.00	1.14	0.65	1.28	2.00	2.43	1.59
Sheep	1.00	-	4.29	1.24	1.30	2.19	9.00	2.38
Goats	0.02	-	-	0.02	0.00	0.44	12.00	1.44
Poultry	-	-	0.57	0.06	0.78	1.81	2.86	1.27
Total Livestock	4.49	4.53	11.57	5.29	6.02	10.50	32.57	10.11
Average milk yield (per cow kg/day)								
Local								
Improved	-	2.00		2.00	1.17	1.46	3.00	1.52
	4.70	5.46		5.96	4.00	5.38	4.67	4.75

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Note: HHs = Households

Land Use and Cropping Patterns

The land-use patterns given in Table 9 show that three-fourths of the total land in the transformed areas is under fruit crops, followed by the area under agricultural crops. Comparatively, nearly half the area is under agricultural crops, followed by fruit crops and pastures, in non-transformed areas. The area under pastures and grasslands is the potential area available for expanding the cultivation of fruit crops. The households are, however, reluctant to bring more land under these crops. This is mainly because of instability in fruit production and lack of infrastructural facilities. Among different categories of household, it is interesting to note that small farmers in the transformed areas have devoted a higher percentage of their land to fruit crops than medium and large households. In the non-transformed areas, the area under orchards was lower for small households than for medium and large households. From the ecology and sustainability perspectives, the land-use patterns in both areas have some positive features. For example, while a much higher percentage of land under fruit crops in the transformed areas is in conformity with the mountain specificities and niche of the area, in the non-transformed areas nearly half the area is under fruit crops, grasslands, and pastures, and this also entails positive and favourable ecological and environmental implications.

Table 9: Land Use Patterns by Categories of Household

Particulars	Unit	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
		Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Land owned		100.00 (27.24)	100.00 (12.96)	100.00 (22.00)	100.00 (62.20)	100.00 (24.54)	100.00 (24.68)	100.00 (27.92)	100.00 (77.14)
Orchards	%	80.32	68.21	72.73	75.11	19.48	25.93	26.65	24.14
Pastures/ grassland	%	1.47	-	4.00	2.06	16.30	25.12	23.78	21.83
Wasteland cultivable	%	-	-	1.82	0.64	3.67	1.62	3.72	3.03
Area under forests	%	0.15	-	0.73	0.32	0.33	-	7.74	2.90
Operated land (crops)	%	14.02	25.62	19.45	18.36	60.23	47.33	38.11	48.09
Area under vegetables	%	4.04	6.17	1.27	3.51	-	-	-	-
Average No. of fragments	no	3.32	4.00	5	3.60	3.25	5.38	9.00	4.42
Average size of owned arable land	ha	0.58	1.62	3.14	1.00	0.61	1.54	3.99	1.22
Average size of owned support land	ha	0.57	1.62	2.94	0.97	0.49	1.13	2.58	0.88
Average size of fragments	ha	0.17	0.41	0.88	0.28	0.19	0.29	0.44	0.27
Sample households	no.	47	8	7	62	40	16	7	63

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Note: Figures in parentheses pertain to the total land owned (hectares) by different categories of household.

The cropping patterns have also shown perceptible changes over the last two decades (Table 10), both in the transformed and non-transformed areas. In the former areas, millet is no longer cultivated, and the area under cereals, such as wheat, maize, and paddy, has declined by varying degrees. These changes have been accompanied by a near doubling of the area under fruit crops, from 28.33 per cent to 59.87 per cent. The only notable exception is the area under vegetables which recorded no change. In the latter areas, on the other hand, the decline in the area under millet is accompanied by a significant increase in the areas under corn and wheat. The area under fruit crops has also recorded a three-fold increase, from 7.25 per cent to 20.82 per cent. Across different categories of household and different crops (Table 11), while large households in the transformed areas devote more land to paddy, small and medium households grow more corn and wheat. In the non-transformed areas, small and medium households devote larger amounts of land to cereal crops, notably wheat and corn, in comparison to large households who have more land under orchards.

Table 10: Temporal Changes in Cropping Patterns: 1975 to 1995 (per cent)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Transformed Areas		Non-transformed Areas	
		1975	1995	1975	1995
i)	Corn-Black Local Gram HYV (high- yielding variety)	15.25 4.20	10.51 4.87	20.55 -	30.08 5.59
ii)	Paddy Local HYV	12.12 2.30	0.51 3.69	4.21 -	0.09 -
iii)	<i>Setaria italica</i>	1.75	-	4.17	0.22
iv)	Millet	1.50	-	4.71	-
v)	Grain Chenopod	1.00	-	2.60	-
vi)	Amaranth	1.50	-	5.50	-
vii)	Kidney bean	-	4.02	-	2.55
viii)	Wheat Local HYV	12.00 6.25	- 12.55	17.58 -	- -
ix)	Barley	7.25	1.08	25.75	35.78
x)	Oilseeds	1.50	0.31	1.04	4.29
xi)	Vegetables	2.75	2.79	-	0.18
xii)	Potatoes	2.00	-	6.75	0.40
xiii)	Orchards	28.33	59.87	7.25	20.82
xiv)	All crops	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Table 11: Cropping Patterns by Categories of Household (per cent)

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Corn-black Local gram HYV	12.80 4.85	8.03 8.29	8.39 2.68	10.51 4.87	36.06 4.55	28.07 7.57	25.00 4.57	30.00 5.59
Paddy Local HYV	1.03 1.44	- -	- 9.73	0.51 3.69	- -	- -	0.30 -	0.09 -
Wheat	15.69	14.25	5.70	12.35	40.53	34.20	31.72	35.78
Barley	-	3.37	1.34	1.08	2.58	6.14	4.27	4.29
<i>Setaria italica</i>	-	-	-	-	0.12	-	0.62	0.22
Kidney bean	4.90	3.63	2.85	4.02	0.98	2.48	4.57	2.55
Oilseeds	-	-	1.01	0.31	0.25	-	0.30	0.10
Vegetables	2.84	5.18	1.18	2.79	-	-	-	-
Orchards	56.45	57.25	67.12	59.87	14.68	20.89	28.35	20.82
Potatoes	-	-	-	-	8.25	0.65	0.30	0.40
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Cropping Intensity	146.92	122.84	109.82	128.65	176.57	167.60	159.94	167.36

Source: Field Survey, 1995

The households in these areas, particularly small and medium, keep a minimum area under cereal crops to meet their subsistence requirements, while growing high-value crops such as apples. This behaviour reflects the risk minimisation strategy of households in the process of option enhancement and lends credence to the hypothesis that households focus on a minimum range of livelihood options to meet their subsistence needs while adopting high-value cash crops. Consequent to a much higher percentage of area under fruit crops, the cropping intensity in the transformed areas is much lower (128.65) than in non-transformed areas (167.36).

Crop Yields

As a departure from the mounting evidence of declining yields in most of the Hindu Kush-Himalayan region, as documented by the MFS division of ICIMOD, the yields of practically all crops in the study areas have increased by varying degrees over the last two decades since 1975 (Table 12). It, however, needs to be underlined that the yields of all the crops are very low in the non-transformed areas compared to those in the transformed areas. Across different farm categories (Table 13), while yields are comparatively higher on the small farms in the transformed areas, no neat pattern is discernible in the non-transformed areas. The low yields in the latter areas can primarily be attributed to the low use of modern inputs. As may be seen from Table 14, the consumption of fertilizers and the areas under high-yielding varieties are very low. The main reasons for the low use of these inputs are the low purchasing power of the people, lack of timely availability of inputs, lack of knowledge, and so on (Table 15). To ensure timely availability of these inputs is, therefore, very essential for raising the yields of various crops.

Table 12: Temporal Changes in Crop Yields: 1975 to 1995 (MT/ha)

S. No	Particulars	Transformed Areas		Non-transformed Areas	
		1975	1995	1975	1995
i)	Corn				
	Local	1.6	2.1	0.9	1.3
	HYV	1.7	2.6	-	2.0
ii)	Paddy				
	Local	1.7	2.0	0.6	0.9
	HYV	2.0	2.7	-	-
iii)	<i>Setaria italica</i>	1.3	-	0.8	0.2
iv)	Millet	1.4	-	0.8	-
v)	Grain chenopad	0.7	-	0.5	-
vi)	Amarnath	0.9	0.5	0.8	-
vii)	Kidney bean	1.6	-	-	-
viii)	Wheat				
	Local	1.3	2.2	0.7	1.1
	HYV	1.5			
ix)	Barley	1.6	1.5	0.9	1.0
x)	Oilseeds	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6
xi)	Peas	2.5	-	-	-
xii)	Potatoes	3.0	-	2.5	3.5
xiii)	Cabbage	-	5.6	-	-
xiv)	Cauliflower	-	6.3	-	-
xv)	Radish	-	2.5	-	-
xvi)	Tomatoes	-	8.3	-	-

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Table 13: Cropping Patterns by Categories of Household (per cent)

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Corn-Local	12.50	8.00	8.39	10.51	16.76	28.00	25.00	16.00
Corn-HYV	1.55	5.29	2.68	1.87	1.75	7.37	4.57	6.39
Paddy-Local	1.08	-	-	0.51	-	-	0.30	0.04
Paddy-HYV	1.41	-	9.73	3.69	-	-	-	-
Wheat	15.69	14.75	5.70	12.35	40.55	34.20	31.72	35.75
Barley	-	3.37	1.34	1.30	2.58	6.14	4.27	4.29
<i>Setaria italica</i>	-	-	-	-	0.12	-	0.62	0.22
Kidney bean	4.90	2.65	2.85	4.02	0.98	2.48	4.57	2.50
Oilseeds	-	-	1.01	0.31	0.25	-	0.30	0.10
Vegetables	2.84	5.18	1.18	2.79	-	-	-	-
Grainseeds	56.45	57.25	67.12	59.87	14.68	30.89	28.05	21.00
Potatoes	-	-	-	-	8.25	0.65	0.30	0.10
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Cropping Intensity	146.92	121.84	109.82	128.65	176.57	107.60	104.94	167.40

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Table 14: Use of Modern Inputs by Categories of Household

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs	Small	Medium	Large	All HHs
Area under HYV (per cent)								
Corn	43.05	50.79	21.74	41.15	11.20	21.25	15.46	18.58
Wheat	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Paddy	58.33	-	100.00	88.10	-	-	-	-
Fertilizers (kg/ha)								
Corn								
N	59.15	42.66	47.55	53.10	26.89	27.45	32.73	28.50
P	1.96	0.00	0.00	1.15	0.00	1.47	6.19	2.01
K	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	3.09	1.00
% of HHs	65.96	87.50	57.14	67.74	55.00	75.00	85.71	63.49
Wheat								
N	54.69	46.59	45.46	51.29	19.99	23.91	19.53	21.16
P	2.50	-	0.00	1.53	1.25	8.55	11.53	6.30
K	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	0.61	4.27	5.77	3.15
% of HHs	68.09	87.50	71.43	70.97	45.00	56.25	71.43	65.08
All crops								
N	56.70	44.49	46.30	52.13	23.44	25.72	25.90	24.83
P	2.87	0.00	0.00	1.35	0.04	4.93	8.96	4.16
K	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.05	4.48	2.08
%age of HHs	67.02	87.50	64.29	69.35	46.25	65.63	78.57	56.35
Farmyard Manure (FYM) (Q/ha)								
Rabi crops	85.19	73.64	47.18	75.25	99.89	85.68	52.01	82.75
Kharif crops	114.14	90.08	50.47	90.12	101.40	96.70	77.96	94.09
All crops	111.80	82.42	49.25	83.18	100.65	911.30	64.54	88.43
Fruit crops								
N	51.49	38.18	85.17	56.01	51.98	73.68	97.98	77.82
P	28.41	32.96	119.33	50.74	10.04	72.98	39.92	43.60
K	67.99	57.33	150.30	84.49	5.02	45.61	39.92	32.92
FYM	62.37	65.12	92.55	70.08	73.33	65.50	75.31	72.72

Source: Field Survey, 1995

Table 15: Reasons for Non-Adoption of Modern Inputs by Categories of Household (Per Cent of Households)

Particulars	Transformed Areas				Non-transformed Areas			
	Marginal	Small	Large	All HHs	Marginal	Small	Large	All HHs
Per cent of Non-adopters	-	-	-	-	57.50	31.25	14.28	41.27
Lack of Finance	-	-	-	-	70.00	50.00	42.86	61.90
Lack of timely availability	0.02	-	-	0.16	47.50	43.75	42.80	46.03
Harmful to soils	-	-	-	-	10.00	43.75	14.28	19.05

Source: Field Survey, 1995