

Pathways from Agriculture to Nutrition: Implications of the Occupation Structure in Rural India

S Chandrasekhar, S Mahendra Dev, Vijay Laxmi Pandey

Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai

1. Introduction

The theme of the report on The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012 is that: *'economic growth is necessary but not sufficient to accelerate reduction of hunger and malnutrition'*. The Report makes an unequivocal point that "Agricultural growth involving smallholders, especially women, will be most effective in reducing extreme poverty and hunger when it increases returns to labour and generates employment for the poor (FAO, WFP and IFAD 2012 p.28)". From a macro perspective, the report categorically states that "In order for economic growth to enhance the nutrition of the neediest, the poor must participate in the growth process and its benefits: (i) growth needs to involve and reach the poor; (ii) the poor need to use the additional income for improving the quantity and quality of their diets and for improved health services; and (iii) governments need to use additional public resources for public goods and services to benefit the poor and hungry (p.2)." However, in the Indian context, the moot question is whether agricultural growth and overall economic growth benefits small land holders and increases returns to labourers. While India has grown to become a trillion dollar economy and made significant progress in reducing hunger, the growth process itself has not necessarily proved to be inclusive. Motiram and Naraparaju (2013) find no evidence for pro-poor growth for the lower classes in rural areas, viz. laborers, marginal farmers and small farmers.

One question posed as a puzzle in the literature on under nutrition in India is why the country's growth process and in particular agricultural growth has not translated into lower levels of malnutrition (Headey, Chiu and Kadiyala 2011). Not only does the occupation structure have

implications for poverty reduction it also provides a useful starting point to address this puzzle. Among the pathways from agriculture to nutrition, two pathways that are identified are the following: agriculture as source of food and agriculture as a source of income. The strength of these two pathways is not obvious given the recent changes in the occupation structure. Firstly, the proportion of cultivators in India's workforce declined by 7.1 percentage points over the period 2001-11. Secondly, the proportion of agricultural laborers in the workforce increased by 3.5 percent in this period (Census of India 2013). Based on current evidence from National Sample Survey Organisation's (NSSO) survey of consumption expenditure poverty is concentrated among rural labour households (Government of India 2008). In 2009-10, 29 percent of rural households can be classified as rural labour households based on their major source of income. The reduction in proportion of cultivator households coupled with the fact that a large proportion of rural households do not benefit from the growth process has implications for consumption patterns and hence the pace of improvement in nutrition indicators. If one were to paraphrase International Labour Organisation's mantra that 'development happens through jobs', one would say that 'improvements in nutrition happens through jobs'.

However, not only is India witness to jobless growth but there is little evidence of workers transitioning from low productive jobs to jobs with higher productivity. In the current ecosystem, small and marginal farmers, and agricultural labourers are neither likely to be engines of growth nor are they like to directly benefit from overall economic growth given the low share of agriculture in overall gross domestic product (GDP). Consequently, the consumption basket of the households, not benefitting from the overall growth process, is likely to be cereal centric and not necessarily nutritious. It is a stylized fact that poorer households get their calories from rice and wheat and not necessarily from nutritious food groups like dairy products, pulses, fruits, vegetables, egg fish and meat etc. In light of the above discussion, the focus of this paper is on dietary diversity which is an

intermediate outcome in the pathway to improved nutritional intake. Using a nationally representative household level data set we focus on whether there are differences in dietary diversity across rural households classified by their major source of income. The analysis presented in this paper is based on two different datasets. The first data set is based on information available as part of Census of India 2001 and 2011. This helps shed light on what the changing occupation structure could imply for reductions in under nutrition. The second data set is the National Sample Survey Organisation's nationally representative survey of employment and unemployment conducted in 2009-10 which has detailed information on the consumption basket of each household.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we examine how in the absence of productive jobs certain weak links might emerge in the pathways from agriculture to nutrition. In Section 3 we undertake a multivariate analysis in order to identify differences in dietary diversity of households in rural India. Section 4 concludes with a discussion on potential entry points for addressing some of the weaknesses in the agriculture-nutrition pathway.

2. Weak Links in the Agriculture-Nutrition Pathway

Gillespie et al. (2012) have identified the following seven pathways from agriculture to nutrition.

1. Agriculture as a source of food, the most direct pathway by which household agricultural production translates into consumption (via crops cultivated by the household)
2. Agriculture as a source of income, either through wages earned by agricultural workers or through the marketed sales of food produced
3. The link between agricultural policy and food prices, involving a range of supply-and-demand factors that affect the prices of various marketed food and nonfood crops, which, in turn, affect

the incomes of net sellers and the ability to ensure household food security (including diet quality) of net buyers

4. Income derived from agriculture and how it is actually spent, especially the degree to which nonfood expenditures are allocated to nutrition-relevant activities (for example, expenditures for health, education, and social welfare)
5. Women's socioeconomic status and their ability to influence household decision making and intra household allocations of food, health, and care
6. Women's ability to manage the care, feeding, and health of young children
7. Women's own nutritional status, when their work-related energy expenditure exceeds their intakes, their dietary diversity is compromised, or their agricultural practices are hazardous to their health (which, in turn, may affect their nutritional status)

In the context of this paper we primarily focus on the first four pathways. First, a reduction in number of cultivator households implies that the proportion of households for whom agriculture is the source of food has declined. Further, there is evidence to support the conjecture that the growth process has not been inclusive for marginal farmers and small farmers. Second, agriculture has not been a viable source of income for either small and marginal farmers or agricultural labourers. One reason for this could be that "... land distribution is more unequal, and yield growth has not sparked as much reduction in poverty and undernourishment" (FAO, WFP and IFAD 2012 p.30). A survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation in 2003 revealed that while 27 percent of the farmers did not like farming because it was not profitable, if the opportunity arose 40 percent of farmers were open to taking up another career option (Government of India 2005). Reviewing India's economic growth, Kotwal et al. (2011) point out that, "An important component of growth — moving labor from low to high productivity activities — has been conspicuous by its absence in India. Also, as the labor to land ratio grows, it becomes that much more difficult to increase

agricultural wages and reduce poverty (p.1195)". Third, increases in the minimum support price for rice and wheat has helped shield income of farmers (net sellers of food) and improvements in the public distribution system has helped in protecting the agricultural labourers (net buyers of food) from food price inflation. Fourth, there are large differences across rural households in terms of share of food and non-food expenditure and the extent to which non-food expenditures are allocated to health, education etc.

The above discussion raises valid concerns over the emerging weak links that might appear in the first four pathways from agriculture to nutrition. While it is unrealistic to expect farming to be an effective strategy for exiting poverty, the reality is that small and marginal farmers and rural labourers will continue to be part Indian agricultural in the next decade. In the discussion that follows, in addition to describing the occupation pattern across the states of India we also provide evidence on the extent of association between occupation patterns and incidence of poverty and nutrition indicators.

2.1 Evidence from Census of India

In 2011, the size of India's workforce stood at 481.7 million of whom 118.7 million were cultivators, 144.3 million were agricultural labourers, 18.3 million were household industries workers and the remaining 200.4 million were other workers. A person is classified as cultivator if he or she is "*engaged in cultivation of land owned or held from Government or held from private persons or institutions for payment in money, kind or share*"¹. An agricultural labourer is a "*person who works on another person's land for*

¹Cultivation includes effective supervision or direction in cultivation. A person who has given out her/his land to another person or persons or institution(s) for cultivation for money, kind or share of crop and who does not even supervise or direct cultivation of land, is not treated as cultivator. Similarly, a person working on another person's land for wages in cash or kind or a combination of both (agricultural labourer) is not treated as cultivator. Cultivation involves ploughing, sowing, harvesting and production of cereals and millet crops such as wheat, paddy, jowar, bajra, ragi, etc., and other crops such as sugarcane, tobacco, ground-nuts, tapioca, etc., and pulses, raw jute and kindred fibre

wages in money or kind or share is regarded as an agricultural labourer. She or he has no risk in the cultivation, but merely works on another person's land for wages. An agricultural labourer has no right of lease or contract on land on which she/he works”.

The workforce participation rate has barely changed from 41.7 percent to 41.8 percent in the intercensal period 2001-11 (Table 1). However, the proportion of main workers declined from 73.9 percent to 70.5 percent and there was a corresponding increase in the proportion of marginal workers in the workforce. Main workers are individuals who worked for 6 months or more while marginal workers are individuals who worked less than 6 months. There is a marked decline in the proportion of main male workers to the total male workers. Even among the marginal workers, 19.3 percent of them worked for less than three months a year. This increase in the proportion of marginal workers brings forth the possibility of the weakness of the income pathway from agriculture to nutrition.

Over the intercensal period 2001-2011, the share of cultivators in the total workforce declined from 31.7 percent to 24.6 percent while the share of agricultural labourers increased from 26.5 to 30 percent. Focusing only on rural India, the proportion of cultivators declined from 42 to 35.2 percent and the proportion of agricultural labourers increased from 27.5 percent to 34.4 percent (Table 2). Across the states of India there are sizable variations in the proportion of cultivators and agricultural labourers in the workforce. The twin problems of poverty and under nutrition are concentrated in eastern and central India and the proportion of agricultural labourers in these states is as follows: Bihar 56.9 percent, Chhattisgarh 48.6 percent, Jharkhand 40.3 percent, Madhya Pradesh 40.7 percent, Odisha 43.8 percent, Uttar Pradesh 36.4 percent, and West Bengal 40.9 percent. It should also be noted that in these states female literacy is lower. In addition the age of marriage of women

crop, cotton, cinchona and other medicinal plants, fruit growing, vegetable growing or keeping orchards or groves, etc. Cultivation does not include the following plantation crops - tea, coffee, rubber, coconut and betel-nuts (areca).

too is low and early marriage has implications for reproductive and child health outcomes. While the proportion of agricultural labourers in Maharashtra is relatively high at 41.5 percent, the state government has sought to tackle the issue of under nutrition in a Mission mode (Gillespie et al 2013).

The natural follow up question that arises is whether there is any association between proportion of agricultural labourers in a state, the head count ratio of poverty and indicators of nutrition. The most recent data on nutrition indicators at the state level comes from the National Family Health Survey 2004-05 while poverty estimates are available for 2004-05 and 2009-10.

The correlation between the proportion of agricultural labourers in a state in 2001 (2011) and the head count ratio of poverty in 2004-05 (2009-10) is 0.70 (0.64). One advantage of the NSSO data is that it classifies a household into one of the following types: Self-employed in Non-agriculture, Agricultural Labour, Other Labour, Self-Employed in Agriculture, and Others. The household type is determined on the basis of the source accounting for at least 50 percent of a household's income. In 2009-10, in rural India, 15 percent of households are classified as Self-employed in Non-agriculture, 26 percent Agricultural Labour, 15percent Other Labour, 32 percent Self-Employed in Agriculture, and 12 percent Others. India's Eleventh Five Year Plan document summarizes the situation as follows: "The composition of the poor has been changing and rural poverty is getting concentrated in agricultural labour and artisanal households. Agricultural labour households accounted for 41% of rural poor in 1993-94 as well as in 2004-05. The share of self employed in agriculture among the rural poor had fallen from 32% to 21.6%. The occupational composition of rural poor varied across the States. In general, in developed states poverty was highly concentrated among agricultural labour households and in contrast, among the backward states poverty extended

to other occupational groups including self-employed in agriculture.” (p.80, Government of India 2008).

The correlation between the proportion of agricultural labourers in a state in 2001 and the proportion of women aged 15-49 years classified as thin (obese) is 0.7 (-0.22). Finally, the correlation between the proportion of agricultural labourers in a state in 2001 and the proportion of children with a weight for age below 2 standard deviations is 0.61. What these statistics establish is a pattern where poverty is higher and women and child health outcomes are worse in states with higher proportion of agricultural labourers.

These correlations are further substantiated by findings from analysis of data from India’s National Nutrition Monitoring Bureau survey. The proportion of men and women who are chronically energy deficient is highest among landless agricultural labourers (Table 3). The studies have established that the proportion of underweight children is highest among households whose occupation is classified as landless agricultural labourers or other labourers. Stunting and wasting is also higher in these rural households as compared to those whose occupation is service, business or others (Table 4).

2.2 Evidence from NSSO Data

While data from Census of India provides an aggregate snapshot, a more granular picture is available from NSSO’s survey of employment and unemployment in 2009-10. Due to differences in the way the occupation structure is classified, the statistics from NSSO data and Census of India data are not strictly comparable. For every individual who is part of the workforce, based on National Classification of Occupation (NCO) 2004 his or her occupation can be classified into one of the following divisions: Division 1: Legislators, senior officials and managers, Division 2: Professionals, Division 3: Technicians and associate professionals, Division 4: Clerks, Division 5: Service workers and shop & market sales workers, Division 6: Skilled agricultural and fishery workers, Division 7:

Craft and related trades workers, Division 8: Plant and machine operators and assemblers, Division 9: Elementary occupations and Division X: Workers not classified by occupations. The distribution of workers across the various Divisions is given in Table 5. As is evident from the table, Division 6² and Division 9 account for bulk of the workers. Within Division 6³ workers can be classified into two groups, viz. market- oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers and subsistence agricultural and fishery workers. Market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers are those “*carry out the necessary operations to grow and harvest field or tree and shrub crops, gather wild fruits and plants, breed, tend or haunt animals, produce a variety of animal husbandry products, cultivate, conserve and exploit forests, breed or catch fish and cultivate or gather other forms of aquatic life, for sale or delivery on a regular basis to wholesale buyers, marketing organisations or at markets?*”. Subsistence agricultural and fishery workers are those who “*grow and harvest field or tree and shrub crops, grow vegetables and fruit, gather wild fruits and plants, tend or hunt animals, catch fish and gather other forms of aquatic life in order to provide food, shelter and a minimum of cash income for themselves and their households?*”. This information can be used in order to understand their extent of participation in agriculture. The breakup of Division 6 male workers is as follows: 35.5 percent are market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers and 2.5 percent are subsistence agricultural and fishery workers. The corresponding breakup for Division 6 female workers is 38 percent and 3.4 percent respectively. Notice that a greater proportion of women rather than men are working as market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers. Recognizing this, Dev and

² Those classified as market- oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers can be further classified into one of the following groups: market gardeners and crop growers (NCO 3 digit code 611), market- oriented animal producers and related workers (NCO 3 digit code 612), market oriented crop and animal producers (NCO 3 digit code 613), forestry and related workers (NCO 3 digit code 614), fishery workers, hunters and trappers (NCO 3 digit code 615). At the other end of the spectrum, subsistence agricultural and fishery workers (NCO 3 digit code 620) are those who “grow and harvest field or tree and shrub crops, grow vegetables and fruit, gather wild fruits and plants, tend or hunt animals, catch fish and gather other forms of aquatic life in order to provide food, shelter and a minimum of cash income for themselves and their households”.

³ These workers “grow and harvest field or tree and shrub crops, gather wild fruits and plants, breed, tend or haunt animals, produce a variety of animal husbandry products, cultivate, conserve and exploit forests, breed or catch fish and cultivate or gather other forms of aquatic life in order to provide food, shelter and income for themselves and their households”.

Kadiyala (2011) have rightly argued that “realigning agriculture policy to empower women in agriculture is essential for accelerating reduction in under nutrition in India”.

While 45.6 percent of workers engaged as market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers are without any education or not completed primary education, the corresponding proportion for individuals engaged as subsistence agricultural and fishery workers is 54.8 percent. The proportion of individuals without education among those engaged in elementary occupation is highest at 47.3 percent (Table 6). These averages clearly bring out the low level of human capital among workers in Division 6 and 9.

When we examine the sub-national picture, there are interesting patterns that emerge. We find that while Uttar Pradesh accounts for 72 percent, Gujarat (the next highest) accounts for 9 percent of individuals working as subsistence agricultural and fishery workers. Within Uttar Pradesh, these workers are concentrated in Eastern Uttar Pradesh while in Gujarat they are concentrated in South Eastern Gujarat. In contrast, individuals engaged as market gardeners and crop growers are distributed evenly across the National Sample Survey Regions of India. In line with expectation we find a concentration of workers engaged as market-oriented animal producers and related workers in Northern Plains of Gujarat. This National Sample Survey Region which includes the districts of Anand and Mahesana accounts for 10.15 percent of such workers. Finally, the elephant in room in any discussion of occupation structure in rural India and inclusive growth is the 104 million individuals engaged in elementary occupations in rural India. Elementary occupations consist of simple and routine tasks which mainly require the use of handheld tools and often some physical effort. Most occupations in this division require skill at the first skill level. Over 59 percent of these individuals reside in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, and West

Bengal. As is well established among these states Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal are part of the eastern poverty corridor.

Barring the state of Maharashtra, due to absence of nutrition indicators at the sub-state level we are unable to examine how they vary depending on occupation structure. In the case of Maharashtra when we examine the correlation between proportion of agricultural labourers in the districts and the proportion of moderately underweight and severely underweight children we get a statistically significant correlation of 0.32.

3. Determinants of Dietary Diversity

In the Indian context there is a large literature that focuses on understanding differences in consumption expenditure across households in rural and urban India. However, the literature that focuses on understanding the determinants of dietary diversity is fairly limited. An ideal data set would have information on the form and extent of participation in agriculture, anthropometric measures and detailed information on consumption expenditure. However, such a nationally representative data set does not exist in India. While the surveys conducted by India's NSSO do not have anthropometric data they have enough information based on which we can construct measures of dietary diversity of the household. While such a measure does have its own limitations there is still merit in going down this road since it is an important intermediate outcome in the pathway to consumption of a nutritious food basket.

3.1 Data

We use a nationally representative survey on employment and unemployment conducted by National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) in 2009-10. The survey covered a sample of 59,129

rural households collecting information on a total of 281,327 rural individuals. In addition to household characteristics, detailed information on demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the members was also collected. Information is collected on the expenditure incurred in the last 30 days preceding the survey on following items: cereals & cereal products, pulses & pulse products, milk, milk products, edible oil and vanaspati, vegetables, fruits & nuts, egg, fish & meat, sugar, salt & spices, other food items, pan, tobacco & intoxicants, fuel & light, entertainment, personal care and effects, toilet articles, sundry articles, consumer services excluding conveyance, conveyance, rent/house rent, consumer taxes and cesses, and medical expenses (non-institutional). Information is collected on the expenditure incurred in the last 365 days preceding the survey on following items with infrequent expenditure: medical (institutional), tuition fees & other fees, school books & other educational articles, clothing and bedding, footwear, durable goods, furniture and fixtures, crockery & utensils, cooking and household appliances, goods for recreation, jewelry& ornaments, personal transport equipment, therapeutic appliances, other personal goods, and repair and maintenance. Since expenditure on infrequently consumed items like durables etc is collected with a 365 day recall period, this information is converted to 30 day expenditure by multiplying the same by the factor (30/365). The monthly per capita expenditure of a household is the ratio of total monthly consumption expenditure and size of the household.

3.2 Empirical Model and Results

Our approach to measuring dietary diversity is in line with the extant literature (Ruel 2002). For example, Karamba et al. (2011) and Nguyen and Winters (2011) construct an index of food diversity by aggregating the share of expenditure on different food sub groups for each household. Two standard measures used are the following: Shannon Index which is represented as $-\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \ln(w_i)$ and the Simpson Index $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2$ where w_i is the share of expenditure on each food sub group and

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are the n food sub groups. In the literature there is also the tradition of standardizing the index as follows $\ln\left(\frac{I_i}{\max I_i - I_i}\right)$, where I_i is the value of index for household, i .

Our unit of observation for analysis is the household and the dependent variable Y_i is the Shannon Index. X_i is a vector of household variables.

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

We include the following explanatory variables: social group (scheduled tribe, scheduled caste, other backward class and others), religion (Hindu, Muslim, Christian, others), household type (self-employed in non-agriculture, rural labour, self-employed in agriculture, others), household size, dummies for size of land possessed by the household. The rationale for the variables that we included as explanatory variables can be explained by the three stylized facts that emerge from the literature on poverty. First, poverty is concentrated among scheduled tribe and scheduled caste households. Second, on the average Muslim households are poorer. So there are differences in incidence of poverty across social groups and religious groups. Third, as mentioned earlier bulk of the rural poor are from rural labour households. In addition, we include the proportion of household workers engaged in Division 1 (Unspecified), Division 2 (4), Division 3 (3), Divisions 4,5,7 and 8 (2), Division 61 (2), Division 62 (2), Division 9 (1) and Division X (Identification of skill level not possible). In the parenthesis we have mentioned the skill levels corresponding to each of the Divisions with level 4 being the highest. In order to control for seasonality, we include dummies to reflect the sub round in which the household was surveyed. Recognizing the differences in occupation structure across India we include National Sample Survey Region dummies.

In the discussion that follows we begin by focusing on the variables of interest: household type and proportion of household workers engaged in various occupational divisions. We find that compared

to rural labour households, those classified as self-employed in non-agriculture, self-employed in agriculture, or others have higher dietary diversity. This result should be seen in conjunction with two facts mentioned earlier. First, poverty is concentrated among rural labour households. Second, the proportion of men and women who are chronically energy deficient, proportion of underweight children, stunting and wasting are higher among rural labour households.

The results related to share of workers in the household working in various occupational divisions are to be interpreted considering the following base category - proportion of workers in the household with highest skill level (Division 2). We find that higher the proportion of market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers (Division 61) lower is the dietary diversity. We also find that higher the proportion of subsistence agricultural and fishery workers (Division 62) lower is the dietary diversity. We also find that households with higher proportion of workers in Division 62 have lower diversity compared to households with higher proportion of workers in Division 61. What this result implies is that the nature and extent of participation in agriculture as a cultivator matters for dietary diversity. In the context of pathways from agriculture to nutrition, workers in Division 61 are not only producers of food but also sourcing their income from cultivation while those in Division 62 are subsistence farmers who rely on agriculture as the source of food.

Similarly, we find that households with higher proportion of workers engaged in elementary occupation (Division 9) have lower dietary diversity. This is not surprising since these workers have the lowest skill levels which translate into lower wages. It should be noted that Division 9 includes agricultural, fishery and related labourers. If 'improvements in nutrition needs to happen through jobs' then skilling those workers in Division 9 and thereby contributing to higher wages becomes important.

The coefficient on the land dummies is positive. Interestingly, the coefficients increase and then decrease suggesting that dietary diversity declines in households with very large land holdings. Instead of land dummies, when we include size of land possessed and the square of size of land possessed as explanatory variables we find that the coefficient on the former is positive and on the latter is negative. This is consistent with the findings on the coefficient on land dummies.

The result pertaining to social group mirrors the findings in the literature on poverty. Compared to scheduled tribe households, scheduled caste, other backward class and other households have higher diversity.

4. Discussion

There are discipline specific differences in the literature on how to address the problem of under nutrition. Based on analysis of demographic and health survey there is a body of literature that establishes the importance of reducing disease prevalence attributable to inadequate access to water and sanitation. The other strand that has gained currency is the one on agriculture-nutrition pathways and the focus of this paper is on understanding the emerging strength or weakness of some of the pathways. Today, India has a larger proportion of workers engaged in agriculture than other countries at a similar stage of development or level of gross domestic product. In 2012-13, the share of agriculture in GDP stood at 13.7 percent while in 2011, 54.6 percent of the total workers were engaged in agriculture sector. Given this skewed structure of the economy, measures in addition to boosting non-agricultural growth become important. The basic premise of this paper is that while food security at the macro level is of paramount importance, from a micro (household) perspective there cannot be an excessive reliance on agriculture as a source of food and income to facilitate improvements in dietary diversity and nutritional intake of rural households. The paper

establishes that there is large heterogeneity in rural livelihoods since the form and extent of participation in agriculture varies greatly across households.

Recognizing this, Dev (2012) has identified three key entry points for agriculture-nutrition linkages: inclusive agriculture growth, women in agriculture and food prices.

Inclusiveness and equity in agriculture are important in the context of the first two pathways. He suggests that this “can be achieved by having policies for increasing agricultural productivity in lagging areas like rain fed areas and raising productivity and income of small and marginal farmers” (p.v.). He also opines that “ ... numerous institutional and policy reforms are needed to increase production and improve food security and nutrition of small farmers, underlining the differences between the earlier Green Revolution and the necessary second Green Revolution. It is known that these farmers find it difficult to access input, credit, extension, and marketing opportunities for their output. Policies and programs that focus on reducing poverty and increasing food security need to take a broad-based approach to agricultural development by focusing on smallholder agriculture. For example, the National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganized Sector suggested special programs for small and marginal farmers. Principal activities proposed include the promotion of marginal and small farmers’ groups; enabling greater access to institutional credit, training, and capacity building; support for strengthening nonfarm activities; gender-focused activities; and planning for the development of marginal and small farmers” (p.5).

In the context of women, the question is how one can engage women as agents of change. In rural India, 33 percent of rural women engaged in domestic duties said they are willing to accept additional work in one of the following areas: dairy, poultry, other animal husbandry, food processing, spinning and weaving, manufacturing wood and cane products, tailoring, leather goods manufacturing, others. While 23 percent of these women are willing to accept regular full time work,

70 percent are willing to accept regular part-time work. The remaining 7 percent are willing to work occasionally. While over 57 percent of the women reported needing either initial finance on easy terms or working finance facilities, nearly 17 percent reported a need for training in their preferred choice of activity.

The National Food Security Act 2013 seeks to ‘provide for food and nutritional security in human life cycle approach, by ensuring access to adequate quantity of quality food at affordable prices to people to live a life with dignity and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto’. The Act is expected to tackle the problem of hunger and also protect poorer households from food price inflation.

Finally, in the context of overall development, there is recognition that productive and decent employment is a necessary condition for growth to be inclusive. In this regard it is necessary to consider seriously the stance advocated by International Labour Organisation that there is a need to *‘upgrade the objective of full and productive employment and decent work as a central (development) goal of the post-2015 development agenda’*.

Reference

- Census of India (2013): "Primary Census Abstract- chapter 4 on main and marginal workers", Registrar General and Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi. url: <http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011census/PCA/PCA_Highlights/pca_highlights_file/India/Chapter-4.pdf>
- Dev, M. S. (2012) Agriculture-Nutrition Linkages and Policies in India , Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division - IFPRI Discussion Paper 01184, May 2012
- Dev, M. S., and S. Kadiyala. 2011. "Pro-Nutrition Agriculture in India: Entry Points and Policy Options." *India, Health Beat* 5(8): 1-4.
- FAO, WFP and IFAD. 2012. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012. Economic growth is necessary but not sufficient to accelerate reduction of hunger and malnutrition. Rome, FAO.
- Gillespie S, L Haddad, V. Mannar, P. Menon, N. Nisbett, Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group (2013) The Politics of Reducing Malnutrition: Building Commitment and Accelerating Progress, *Lancet*, August 10; 382(9891): 552-69
- Gillespie S, Jody Harris and Suneetha Kadiyala (2012) The Agriculture-Nutrition Disconnect in India - What Do We Know?, IFPRI Discussion Paper 01187, June 2012
- Government of India (2005): Situation Assessment Survey of Farmers: Some Aspects of Farming, Report No. 496, National Sample Survey Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.
- Government of India (2008): "Rapid poverty reduction", chapter 4 in Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007–2012) Agriculture, Rural Development, Industry, Services and Physical Infrastructure, volume 3, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Headey, D. and Chiu, A. and Kadiyala, S. (2011): "Agriculture's role in the Indian enigma: Help or hindrance to the under nutrition crisis?", IFPRI Discussion Paper 01085, International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Karamba W. R., Quiñones, E. J. and Winters, P. (2011): Migration and food consumption patterns in Ghana, *Food Policy*, 36, 41-53.
- Kotwal, A., Ramaswami, B., and Wadhwa, W. (2011): "Economic liberalization and Indian economic growth: What's the evidence?" *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(4), 1152-1199.
- Motiram, S. and Naraparaju, K. (2013): "Growth and deprivation in India: What does recent data say?", IGIDR working paper 2013-005, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, India.
- National Institute of Nutrition (2012) Diet and Nutritional Status of Rural Population, Prevalence of Hypertension & Diabetes among Adults and Infant & Young Child Feeding Practices-Report of

Third Repeat Survey Available:

http://www.nnmbindia.org/1_NNMB_Third_Repeat_Rural_Survey_Technical_Report_26.pdf

Nguyen, M. C., and Winters, P. (2011): "The impact of migration on food consumption patterns: The case of Vietnam", *Food Policy*, 36, 71-87.

Ruel, M. T. (2002): "Is dietary diversity an indicator of food security or dietary quality? A review of measurement issues and research needs", FCND Discussion Paper No. 140, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC.

Table 1: Intercensal Change in Workforce Participation Rate in Rural India

	<i>Workforce Participation Rate</i>		<i>Proportion of Main Workers to Total Workers</i>		<i>Proportion of Marginal Workers to Total Workers</i>	
	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011
Male	52.1	53.0	85.0	78.5	15.0	21.5
Female	30.8	30.0	54.1	55.6	45.9	44.4
Total	41.7	41.8	73.9	70.5	26.1	29.5

Source: Authors' Calculations

Table 2: Intercensal Change in Occupation Structure in Rural India

	<i>Percentage of Cultivators to Total Workers</i>		<i>Percentage of Agricultural Labourers to Total Workers</i>		<i>Percentage of Household Industry and Other Workers to Total Workers</i>	
	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011
Male	42.0	35.2	27.5	34.4		
Female	37.1	28.8	43.0	48.5		
Total	40.2	33.0	33.0	39.3		

Source: Authors' Calculations

Table 3: Distribution (%) of Adult Men and Women according to BMI Grades

Occupation of Household Head	Chronic Energy Deficiency	Men			Women		
		Normal	Overweight	Chronic Energy Deficiency	Normal	Overweight	
Landless Agricultural Labourer	43.3	43.7	13	40.2	43	16.8	
Other Labourer	37.1	48.1	14.8	40.6	43.3	16.2	
Owner Cultivator	35.7	45	19.3	38.9	43.3	17.8	
Landlord	23.3	38.8	38	17.6	41.2	41.2	
Tenant Cultivator	36.2	51	12.8	27.7	58	14.3	
Artisans	27.2	45.7	27.1	30.8	43.5	25.7	
Service	19.1	43.2	37.7	24.9	41.9	33.2	
Business	16.8	43.3	39.8	22.1	38.7	39.2	
Others	33	41.2	25.9	29.7	40.7	29.7	

Note: Chronic Energy Deficiency(<18.5), Normal(18.5 – 23), Overweight (≥ 23)

Source: National Institute of Nutrition (2012)

Table 4: Distribution(%) of <5 year Children according to Nutritional Status

Occupation of Household Head	Wt. For Age		Ht. For Age		Wt. For Ht.	
	Underweight	Normal	Stunting	Normal	Wasting	Normal
Landless Agricultural Labourer	44.5	55.5	42.9	57.1	24.4	75.6
Other Labourer	46.8	53.2	47.4	52.6	24.1	75.9
Agriculture	42.6	57.4	45.1	54.9	22.5	77.5
Artisans	42.0	58.0	41.8	58.2	19.5	80.5
Service	33.4	66.6	35.5	64.5	18.0	82.0
Business	29.0	71.0	34.3	65.7	17.4	82.6
Others	27.7	72.3	31.6	68.4	15.4	84.6

Source: National Institute of Nutrition (2012)

Table 5 : Distribution of Rural Workers by Division of Work

	Male	Female	Total
Division 1	3.41	1.94	3.02
Division 2	1.86	1.13	1.67
Division 3	1.6	1.95	1.69
Division 4	0.9	0.29	0.74
Division 5	5.47	2.47	4.68
Division 6	37.9	41.39	38.82
Division 7	9.73	6.45	8.86
Division 8	3.3	0.6	2.59
Division 9	35.27	43.56	37.45
Division X	0.22	0.06	0.18
Not Reported	0.35	0.16	0.3
Total	100	100	100

Division 1: Legislators, senior officials and managers, Division 2: Professionals, Division 3: Technicians and associate professionals, Division 4: Clerks, Division 5: Service workers and shop & market sales workers, Division 6: Skilled agricultural and fishery workers, Division 7: Craft and related trades workers, Division 8: Plant and machine operators and assemblers, Division 9: Elementary occupations and Division X: Workers not classified by occupations.

Source: Calculations from NSSO Employment and Unemployment Survey Unit Level Data for the year 2009-10

Table 6: Educational Attainment of Agricultural and Fishery Workers and those in Elementary Occupations

	Market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers	Subsistence agricultural and fishery workers	Elementary occupations	All Divisions
Uneducated	35.0	48.4	47.3	36.1
Below Primary	10.6	6.4	13.7	11.4
Primary	15.8	11.1	15.8	15.7
Middle	17.8	15.6	14.4	17.2
Secondary	11.9	8.2	6.2	10.4
Higher Secondary / Diploma	6.3	5.3	2.1	5.7
Graduate and Above	2.6	5.0	0.5	3.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Calculations from NSSO Employment and Unemployment Survey Unit Level Data for the year 2009-10

Table 7: Determinants of Dietary Diversity in Rural India

	Coefficient	Robust Standard Error
Household Type: Rural Labour		
Self-employed in non-agriculture	0.0411***	0.00827
Self-employed in agriculture	0.0552***	0.0118
Others	0.128***	0.0106
Proportion of Workers in the Households in: Division 2 (Skill Level 4)		
Division 1 (Unspecified)	0.00858	0.0187
Division 3 (Skill Level 3)	0.0246	0.0208
Divisions 4,5,7,8 (Skill Level 2)	-0.0606***	0.0162
Division 61 (Skill Level 2)	-0.139***	0.0189
Division 62 (Skill Level 2)	-0.224***	0.0308
Division 9 (Skill Level 1)	-0.149***	0.0173
Division X (Skill Level Not Classifiable)	-0.112**	0.0507
Land Possessed: Less than 0.01 hectares		
0.01-0.04	0.0176*	0.0100
0.04-0.4	0.0208**	0.00977
0.4-1	0.0227**	0.00996
1-2	0.0773***	0.0116
2-4	0.0696***	0.0134
More than 4	0.0380**	0.0157
Social Group: Scheduled Tribe		
Scheduled Caste	0.126***	0.0143
Other Backward Class	0.124***	0.0138
Others	0.111***	0.0147
Religion: Hindu		
Muslim	0.0519***	0.0128
Christian	-0.0191	0.0207
Others	-0.0386*	0.0229
Household Size	-0.0179***	0.00126

We also included sub round dummies and NSS region dummies.

Number of Observations: 55,728

R-squared: 0.308

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1