



## International Journal of Financial Management and Economics

P-ISSN: 2617-9210  
E-ISSN: 2617-9229  
IJFME 2021; 4(1): 92-98  
Received: 10-01-2021  
Accepted: 15-02-2021

**Dr. Archi Bhatia**  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Economics,  
Ramjas College, University of  
Delhi, New Delhi, India

**Shakir Hussain Malik**  
Assistant Professor, Amity  
School of Liberal Arts, Amity  
University, Jaipur, Rajasthan,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. Archi Bhatia**  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Economics,  
Ramjas College, University of  
Delhi, New Delhi, India

### Land relations in Jammu and Kashmir: An empirical study based on NSS unit level data

**Dr. Archi Bhatia and Shakir Hussain Malik**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26179210.2021.v4.i1.247>

#### Abstract

Based on the NSSO unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds (2003 and 2013), this paper tries to analyse the pattern of ownership and operational holdings, and the extent of tenancy across different size classes in Jammu & Kashmir. The paper finds a marginal increase in the percentage of landless households from 2003 to 2013, majority of the households are concentrated in sub-marginal category of ownership holdings. The proportion of households across different social categories have declined except ST households and the percentage of area owned have increased across STs and OBCs between 2003 and 2013. The households belonged to ST categories have highest inequality in ownership holdings in 2003, and SCs have highest in 2013. Majority of the lessees are landless and sub-marginal farmers, and highest proportion of lessees belongs to other caste households. Most of the lessors are marginal farmers and there are few lessors present in higher size classes. Though the percentage of operational holdings have declined in all size classes except for 0.002 to 0.500 hectares of holdings, proportion of area operated increased upto size class of one hectare while in the subsequent higher size classes, it has continuously decreased between 2003 and 2013. Fixed money remains as dominant form of tenancy contract in 2003 and relatives under no specific terms in 2013.

**Keywords:** Ownership, tenancy, operational holdings, inequality, Gini coefficient

#### 1. Introduction

In Jammu and Kashmir, 70 per cent of the population resides in rural areas and are directly or indirectly dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood and employability (Economic Survey, 2017) [3]. Before the land reforms, agrarian structure in the state was characterised by absentee landlordism, unprotected tenancy rights, underutilisation of cultivable land and increasing exploitation of peasantry through high rents. In 1931 a movement of peasants began under the leadership of Sheikh Abdullah whose main demand was the transfer of ownership rights of land from the Maharaja to the peasant (Aslam, 1977) [1]. In 1944, with the coming of the New Kashmir Manifesto, the land reform became an integral part of the practice. The New Kashmir promised the abolition of landlordism, land to the tiller and cooperative association of tillers to regulate production and sale of crops and agricultural goods (Thorner, 1953; Mathew, 2011; Hamdani, 2016) [8, 4, 5]. With the enforcement of the Big Landed Estates Abolition Act, 1950 that was a landmark in agrarian reforms, J&K has achieved the unique distinction among all states by introducing the land reforms of considerable magnitude, including the remission of land revenue on small holdings (Aslam, 1977; Prasad, 2014) [1, 6]. The Big Landed Estates Abolition Act, 1950 has completely abolished the absentee landlordism and a ceiling of 22.75 acres was imposed on ownership of land. As a result of the enactment of the Big Landed Estates Abolition Act, 1950, 45 lakh kanals of land were transferred with ownership rights to cultivating peasants. After the introduction of land reforms, the state of Jammu and Kashmir underwent a great transformation as it freed the economy of state from the shackles of the stagnation of the pre-reform period and made a remarkable contribution as far as land to the tiller is concerned (Hamdani, 2016) [4]. After thoroughly reviewing the literature on land relations of Jammu and Kashmir, we have not come across studies that have analysed the land relations in Jammu and Kashmir based on unit-level data especially National Sample Survey (NSS). Therefore, in the context of above-mentioned gap, the present study is purely based on NSS unit-level data of different rounds of Land and Livestock Holdings.

## Objectives of the Study

### Following are the objectives of the study

1. To analyse the household ownership of land among different social categories and across different size classes of land;
2. To understand the incidence and extent of tenancy among different categories of landownership holdings; and
3. To examine the distribution of operational holdings and area operated across different size classes of landholdings.

## Methodology

Among the two major sources of data on land relations, i.e., National Sample Survey (NSS) and Agricultural Census, it has been argued that NSS follows the scientific methodology besides including the data on tenancy which are not available in Agricultural Census reports (Chadha and Sharma, 1992; Sharma and Malik, 2021) [2, 7]. The present study is based on National Sample Survey (NSS) unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> (2002-03) and 70<sup>th</sup> round (2012-13) of Land and Livestock Holdings in India. The sample area in the present study will be Jammu and Kashmir which has been selected purposively. The unit-level data that was initially in raw form was accessed from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implantation (MOSPI), New Delhi. Stata software have been used to retrieve the data on different items of sample area. For the distribution of ownership and operational holdings, both area owned and area operated has been divided into six size classes, viz., less than 0.002 ha, 0.002 to 0.500 ha, 0.500 to 1.00 ha, 1.00 to 2.00 ha, 2.00 to 4.00 ha, and above 4.00 ha, respectively. Tabular analysis has been used to meet the objectives of the study. Similarly, Gini coefficient has been used to find out the inequality in the distribution of area owned and area operated across different size classes of land.

## Results and Discussion

### Household Ownership of Land

Table 1 presents the distribution of households and area owned among different size-class of ownership holdings for each social group. In the table, households coming under the size class of less than 0.002 hectares are termed as landless categories. The table shows that in 2003 percentage of landless households varied over a range with highest percentage in OBC category (3.10 per cent) and lowest in ST category (0.15 per cent). In 2013, it is found other caste category reported the highest percentage of landless households followed by STs.

It is evident from the table that the highest percentage of households are seen in the size-class categories of 0.002-0.500 hectares and 0.500-1.00 hectares for each social group in both years. However, the percentage of households in size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares shows an increasing trend from 51 percent in 2003 to 71 percent in 2013. While the proportion of households continuously decreased for other size-class categories. Similarly, the percentage of area owned continuously decreased for all the class-size holders except 0.002-0.500 and 0.500-1.00 hectares of households from 2003 to 2013. The maximum percentage of area is reflected for the size-classes of 0.002-0.500 to 1.00-2.00 hectares. The percentage of owned area increased in the size-classes of 0.002-0.500 hectares from 12.19 percent in 2003 to 36.29 percent in 2013 and 18 percent in 2003 to 33 percent in 2013 for the size-class of 0.500-1.00 hectares.

Among social groups, ST formed the highest percentage of households (65 percent) followed by OBCs in 2003 while as in 2013 the highest percent of households are seen in SC category (83.45 percent) followed by OBCs in the size-class ownership category of 0.002 to 0.500 hectares.

**Table 1:** Percentage distribution of households and area owned by size class of ownership holdings for each social group

Size class (ha)	Year	Households					Area owned				
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	All	ST	SC	OBC	Others	All
Less than 0.002	2003	0.15	1.15	3.10	1.03	1.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.33	0.04	0.00	2.23	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	2003	64.58	48.57	60.79	48.42	50.53	17.90	8.82	28.79	10.94	12.19
	2013	63.08	83.45	77.02	70.11	71.48	29.90	50.23	37.71	35.75	36.29
0.500 - 1.00	2003	3.19	20.69	23.56	26.29	24.90	3.66	18.83	29.21	16.80	18.00
	2013	29.97	8.96	16.74	20.42	19.96	46.83	17.35	37.34	32.00	33.41
1.00 – 2.00	2003	32.09	17.59	10.70	15.83	15.37	78.44	31.63	29.41	19.47	21.94
	2013	4.94	6.24	5.63	4.87	5.12	14.45	23.77	20.57	14.96	16.17
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	11.90	1.52	5.79	5.93	0.00	40.04	7.06	14.60	16.89
	2013	1.68	1.31	0.57	1.86	1.62	8.83	8.65	3.59	10.03	9.06
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.11	0.33	2.64	1.89	0.00	0.68	5.52	38.20	30.98
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.51	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.80	7.26	5.07

**Source:** Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

**Table 2:** Size category-wise distribution of households and area owned across different social groups (%)

Size class (ha)	Year	Households				Area owned			
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
Less than 0.002	2003	0.00	11.79	36.01	52.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	2.77	0.30	0.00	96.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	2003	0.90	13.57	19.17	66.37	0.58	8.47	19.44	71.51
	2013	10.96	12.19	13.23	63.62	10.64	10.32	11.46	67.57
0.500 - 1.00	2003	0.09	11.73	15.07	73.11	0.08	12.23	13.35	74.34
	2013	18.65	4.69	10.30	66.37	18.10	3.87	12.33	65.70
1.00 – 2.00	2003	1.46	16.15	11.09	71.30	1.41	16.85	11.03	70.70
	2013	11.99	12.74	13.51	61.76	11.54	10.96	14.04	63.46
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	28.31	4.09	67.60	0.00	27.71	3.44	68.86
	2013	12.91	8.43	4.31	74.34	12.58	7.12	4.37	75.93
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.80	2.77	96.43	0.00	0.26	1.47	98.28
	2013	0.00	0.00	1.53	98.47	0.00	0.00	1.73	98.27

All sizes	2003	0.70	14.12	15.93	69.25	0.40	11.69	8.23	79.68
	2013	12.42	10.44	12.28	64.86	12.92	7.46	11.03	68.60

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

In the size-class category of 0.500 to 1.00 hectares, STs formed the lowest percentage of households in 2003 but it had significantly increased in 2013 to 29.97 percent whereas the proportion of households progressively declined for other social categories from 2003 to 2013. It is shown from the table that percentage distribution of households of all social groups declined between 2003 and 2013 in the size-class of 1.00 to 2.00 hectares and above.

Table 2 shows size-wise category distribution of households and area owned across different social groups. The table shows that around 69.25 percent households of the total rural households belonged to other caste group and owning about 80 percent of the total land holdings, the highest among all social groups in 2003. In 2013, Other caste group of households still comprises the highest percentage of households but declines from 69.25% in 2003 to 64.86% in 2013. It has been observed from the table that out of total households, proportion of ST households was lowest in 2003, i.e. 0.70 percent which increased to 12.42 percent in 2013 whereas other categories of households have declined. Similarly, the percentage of area owned was lowest for ST (0.40 percent). The percentage of area owned for ST and OBC categories have increased while it declined in other categories between 2003 and 2013. In 2003, the share of ST, SC and OBC households in total area owned was low as

compared to their percent share in total households, whereas for others caste share of area owned was higher than their share in households. The area owned for by households of SC and OBC was low in comparison to their percent share in households in 2013.

It may be noted from the table that in 2003, about 52 percent of households belonged to the size-class of less than 0.002 hectares which are landless households followed by OBC. Similarly, in 2013, 97 percent of the landless households belonged to other caste groups followed by STs. In the size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares, around 66 percent of households belonged to other castes followed by OBC in 2003. It may be seen from the table that the share of ST households in all size-class ownership holding categories has been increased from 2003 to 2013, whereas the proportion of other social group of households declined except in few cases like in the size-class of 1.00-2.00 hectares, the share of OBC households have increased from 11 percent in 2003 to 14 percent in 2013 and from 4.09 percent in 2003 to 4.31 percent in 2013 in the size-class of 2.00-4.00 hectares. Similarly, the percentage of households belonged to other caste households increased from 96.43 percent in 2003 to 98.47 percent in 2013. And same is the case with the percentage of area owned.

**Table 3:** Inequality in the distribution of area owned among each of the social groups: Gini's coefficient

Social groups	Gini's coefficient	
	2003	2013
Scheduled tribe (ST)	0.6782	0.5925
Scheduled caste (SC)	0.5736	0.5937
Other backward class (OBC)	0.5285	0.5822
Others	0.5134	0.5414
All	0.4895	0.5526

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

Table 3 shows the inequality in the distribution of area owned measured by Gini's coefficient in 2003 and 2013. It is seen from the table that the lowest disparity was among others (0.5134), whereas the highest was for the scheduled tribe (0.6782) in 2003. Similarly, in 2013 the table shows that the lowest disparity was among others (0.5414) whereas it was highest among scheduled caste (0.5937).

**Incidence and Extent of Tenancy**

Table 4 presents the distribution of households reporting leasing-in land and area leased-in by size-class of ownership holding for each social group. The table shows that majority of the lessee households belongs to landless and sub-marginal category of ownership holdings (i.e., size-class of less than 0.002 hectares and 0.002-0.500 hectares) while as in medium/large categories of size-class holdings, there are no lessee households except in the size-class of 2.00-4.00 hectares where about 0.31 percent of households leased-in land in 2013. The percentage of lessee households increased from around 52 percent in 2003 to 85 percent in 2013 in size-class of less than 0.002 hectares, whereas it has decreased in the size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares from 44 percent in 2003 to 10 percent in 2013. Further in the size-class of 1.00-2.00 hectares, there is marginal decrease of

lessee households from 3.80 percent in 2003 to 3.58 percent in 2013. Similarly, the percentage of area leased-in increased in the landless category whereas it decreased from 50.21 percent in 2003 to 32.93 percent in 2013 for sub-marginal category of ownership holdings. The percentage of area leased-in increased from nil to 12 percent for marginal holdings, whereas it decreased in the size-class of 1.00-2.00 hectares between 2003 and 2013. For the size-class of 2.00-4.00 hectares, there was no lessee household in 2003 while in 2013, a small proportion of OBC (4%) and other caste (0.25%) lessee households have leased-in around 30 percent and 9 percent of area.

Table 5 presents the category-wise distribution of households leasing-in land and area leased-in across different social groups. The table shows that in 2003, about 78 percent of total lessee households belonged to others which decreased to 76 percent in 2013. The lessee household of SCs and OBCs increased from 2003 to 2013, while for ST lessee households has decreased. The distribution of area leased-in shows that around 50 percent and 47 percent of the leased-in area was accounted for others and SCs in 2003 and 49 percent and 44 percent in 2013. In the size-class of landless ownership category, about 75 percent lessee households belong to others followed by

SCs (18 percent) in 2003 whereas in 2013, 80 percent of lessee households belonged to other castes followed by SCs. The distribution of leased-in area across social groups states

that around 68.37 percent belongs to SCs followed by other castes in 2003 among landless lessees.

**Table 4:** Percentage distribution of households reporting leasing-in of land and area leased-in by size class of ownership holding for each social group

Size class (ha)	Year	Households leased-in					Area leased-in				
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	All	ST	SC	OBC	Others	All
Less than 0.002	2003	100.00	53.40	0.00	49.75	51.95	100.0	19.90	0.00	5.56	5.56
	2013	0.00	81.21	11.81	89.36	84.99	0.00	5.79	2.83	10.85	7.99
0.002 – 0.500	2003	0.00	40.90	0.00	46.35	43.56	0.00	61.62	0.00	50.21	50.21
	2013	100.0	7.61	70.47	8.26	10.35	100.0	13.55	56.22	46.58	32.93
0.500 - 1.00	2003	0.00	1.60	100.00	0.00	0.70	0.00	8.42	100.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.10	12.10
1.00 – 2.00	2003	0.00	4.10	0.00	3.90	3.80	0.00	10.06	0.00	44.23	44.23
	2013	0.00	11.18	14.01	1.12	3.58	0.00	80.66	11.40	8.68	40.43
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.25	0.31	0.00	0.00	29.55	8.80	6.54
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

**Table 5:** Category-wise distribution of households leasing-in land and area leased-in across different social groups (%)

Size class (ha)	Year	Households leased-in				Area leased-in			
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
Less than 0.002	2003	6.51	18.33	0.00	75.14	12.52	68.37	0.00	20.23
	2013	0.00	19.42	0.45	80.13	0.00	31.75	2.75	65.50
0.002 – 0.500	2003	0.00	16.74	0.00	83.50	0.00	54.06	0.00	46.64
	2013	2.23	14.95	22.00	60.82	0.46	18.04	13.28	68.22
0.500 - 1.00	2003	0.00	40.79	43.96	0.00	0.00	75.62	16.65	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
1.00 – 2.00	2003	0.00	19.26	0.00	80.53	0.00	17.65	0.00	82.14
	2013	0.00	63.55	12.66	23.79	0.00	87.46	2.19	10.35
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	38.90	61.10	0.00	0.00	35.12	64.88
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All sizes	2003	3.38	17.83	0.31	78.46	1.72	47.34	0.88	50.12
	2013	0.23	20.32	3.23	76.21	0.15	43.84	7.78	48.23

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

In 2013, other caste category of landless lessees leased-in area of about 66 percent followed by SCs (32 percent). Among size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares, around 54 percent of area leased-in belongs to SCs in 2003 which decreased to 18 percent in 2013. Similarly, the percentage of area leased-in for OBCs increased among the size-class of landless and sub-marginal category; declined for the 0.500-1.00 hectares of holdings and further increased for 1.00 hectares to 4.00 hectares of ownership holdings. In short, percentage of area leased-in increased for OBC households and decreased for other social groups from 2003 to 2013.

Table 6 presents the distribution of households reporting leasing-out of land and area leased-out by size class of ownership holding for each social group. It is evident from the table that a majority of lessor households are in the size-class of 0.002 to 1.00 hectare of ownership holdings. However, small proportion of lessor households are present

in the higher size classes. The table also reveals that the lessor households have continuously increased in all size classes except in the size class of 0.002 to 0.500 hectares of ownership holdings from 2003 to 2013. Similarly, the percentage of area leased out increases in all size classes except in the size class of 0.002 to 0.500 hectares of ownership holdings where it decreased from 41 percent in 2003 to 1 percent in 2013. In the size class of 2 to 4 hectares of holdings, a significant proportion of area leased-out from 9 percent in 2003 to 31 percent in 2013.

Category-wise distribution of households leasing-out land and area leased-out across different social groups are presented in table 7. The table shows that SC and OBC lessor households have increased from 15 percent to 40 percent and nil to 12 percent between 2003 to 2013, whereas the lessor households belonged to other caste category decreased from 85 percent in 2003 to 48 percent in 2013.

**Table 6:** Percentage distribution of households reporting leasing-out of land and area leased-out by size class of ownership holding for each social group

Size class (ha)	Year	Households leased-out					Area leased-out				
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	All	ST	SC	OBC	Others	All
Less than 0.002	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	2003	0.00	100.00	0.00	90.20	91.68	0.00	100.00	0.00	36.81	40.62
	2013	0.00	0.00	41.04	0.00	4.75	0.00	0.00	56.58	0.00	1.39
0.500 - 1.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.89	7.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.66	50.43
	2013	0.00	90.90	55.54	79.35	81.25	0.00	96.16	21.88	49.74	64.07
1.00 – 2.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	9.10	0.00	0.20	3.76	0.00	3.84	0.00	0.32	1.45
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.52	8.95
	2013	0.00	0.00	3.42	13.50	6.89	0.00	0.00	21.54	46.46	30.82
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.95	3.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.48	2.27

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

Similarly, the percentage of area leased out increases from 6 percent to 32 percent for SCs and nil to 2 percent for OBCs; decreased from 94 percent to 65 percent between 2003 and 2013. Further the table shows that in the size class of 0.002 to 0.500 hectares of holding, the lessor households belong to SCs and Others comprises of about 16 percent and 84

percent, leased-out area of around 15 percent and 85 percent in 2003; while only OBC lessor households are present in the same size class in 2013. It is seen from the table from the size class of 0.500 to 4.00 hectares of ownership holdings, there is an increase in the lessor households across all social groups except other castes from 2003 to 2013.

**Table 7:** Category-wise distribution of households leasing-out land and area leased-out across different social groups

Size class (ha)	Year	Households leased-out				Area leased-out			
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
Less than 0.002	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	2003	0.00	16.46	0.00	83.54	0.00	14.83	0.00	85.17
	2013	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
0.500 - 1.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	2013	0.00	45.08	7.91	47.01	0.00	48.54	0.84	50.61
1.00 – 2.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	97.42	0.00	2.58	0.00	85.79	0.00	14.21
2.00 – 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	5.74	94.26	0.00	0.00	1.72	98.28
Above 4.00	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
All sizes	2003	0.00	15.09	0.00	84.91	0.00	6.03	0.00	93.97
	2013	0.00	40.29	11.58	48.13	0.00	32.34	2.47	65.19

Source: Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

### Distribution of Operational Holdings

Table 8 presents the distribution of operational holdings and area operated across the different size-classes. The table shows that as the size-class increases, percentage of operational holdings decreases in both time period. In the size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares, percentage of operational holdings increases from 54.10 percent in 2003 to 70.71 percent in 2013, percentage of area operated also increases from 14.61 percent to 36.56 percent. Similarly, the share of area operated for the size-class holding of 0.500-1.00 hectares increased from 16.30 percent in 2003 to 33.11 percent in 2013; while the share of holdings other than marginal (i.e., from the size-class of 1.00-2.00 hectares) has been declined. It is seen from the table that in 2003 about 2 percent of holdings operated about 31 percent of area, while

0.38 percent of holdings operated about 5 percent area in 2013.

The distribution of operational holdings and area leased-in by terms of tenancy across different size-classes are presented in table 9. The table shows that about 19 percent of holdings lease-in land under fixed money form of tenancy followed by share of produce. However, in 2013, about 24 percent of holdings belongs to relatives under no specific terms followed by other terms and share of produce. The percentage share of leased-in area was higher under share of produce in 2003, about 39 percent of area leased-in under other terms followed by relatives under no specific terms (14 percent) in 2013. Across different size-class of holdings, about 27 percent of holdings leased-in land under fixed money for the

**Table 8:** Distribution of operational holdings and area operated across different size classes

Size class (ha)	2003		2013	
	Holdings	Area	Holdings	Area
Less than 0.002	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	54.10	14.61	70.71	36.56
0.500 – 1.00	22.27	16.30	21.58	33.11
1.00 – 2.00	15.58	21.52	5.62	16.22
2.00 – 4.00	6.10	16.95	1.72	8.78
Above 4.00	1.93	30.62	0.38	5.33
All sizes	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

**Source:** Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

size-class of 0.002-0.500 hectares in 2003; about 30 percent of holding leased-in area under the form of relatives under no specific terms followed by share of produce (15 percent) in 2013. In the size-class of 1.00-2.00 hectares, about 15 percent of holdings leased-in area under share of produce in 2003 which increased to 28 percent in 2013; about 42 percent of holdings leased-in area under other terms and leased-in area of about 53 percent in 2013. Similarly, the share of produce was dominant form of tenancy in 2003

across the size-class of 2.00-4.00 hectares followed by fixed money, while 82 percent of holdings leased-in area under other terms followed by relatives under no specific terms.

Table 10 presents the distribution of area leased-in by period of lease for different size-class of operational holdings. The table shows that about 3.26 percent of leased-in area was for the period of less than one agricultural season in 2003 which decreased to 0.07 percent in 2013.

**Table 9:** Distribution of Operational Holdings and Area Leased-in by Terms of Tenancy across Different Size Classes

Size class (ha.)	Terms of tenancy	Holdings		Area Leased-in	
		2003	2013	2003	2013
less than 0.002	Fixed money	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fixed produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Share of produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Relatives under no specific terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Other terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.50	Fixed money	26.92	0.00	0.12	0.00
	Fixed produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Share of produce	2.25	15.00	0.29	18.11
	Relatives under no specific terms	2.60	30.15	0.22	17.22
	Other terms	2.60	2.81	0.31	0.29
0.500 - 1.00	Fixed money	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fixed produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Share of produce	19.59	0.00	0.23	0.00
	Relatives under no specific terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Other terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00-2.00	Fixed money	2.34	0.00	0.01	0.62
	Fixed produce	0.19	0.00	0.07	0.00
	Share of produce	15.07	28.17	0.34	11.11
	Relatives under no specific terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Other terms	0.00	42.41	0.00	52.70
2.00 - 4.00	Fixed money	6.98	0.00	0.06	0.00
	Fixed produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Share of produce	16.83	0.00	0.47	0.00
	Relatives under no specific terms	0.00	22.92	0.00	29.19
	Other terms	0.00	82.19	0.00	70.95
Above 4.00	Fixed money	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fixed produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Share of produce	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Relatives under no specific terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Other terms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
all sizes	Fixed money	19.02	0.00	0.03	0.23
	Fixed produce	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00
	Share of produce	7.10	16.09	0.21	10.58
	Relatives under no specific terms	1.71	23.66	0.03	14.09
	Other terms	1.71	18.03	0.04	38.96

**Source:** Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

In 2003, the highest percentage of area leased-in was for the period of two years or more, i.e., 55.39 percent which increased to 70 percent in 2013. It has been shown from the table that the concentration of area leased-in was for the

period of two or more years for all size-classes in both years.

Table 11 presents the distribution of operational holdings by type of holding for different size classes. The table shows

that the proportion of entirely owned holdings increased from 97.80 percent in 2003 to 99.74 percent in 2013, while the percentage of entirely leased in holdings declined from 0.63 percent in 2003 to 0.00 percent in 2013. Similarly, the

percentage of mixed holdings and neither owned nor leased-in holdings declined from 1.44 percent in 2003 to 0.26 percent in 2013 and 0.13 percent in 2003 to 0.00 percent in 2013.

**Table 10:** Percentage distribution of area leased in by period of lease for broad size class of operational holdings

Size class (ha)	2003				2013			
	Less than one agricultural season	One agricultural season but less than one agricultural year	One to less than two agricultural years	Two years or more	Less than one agricultural season	One agricultural season but less than one agricultural year	One to less than two agricultural years	Two years or more
less than 0.002	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.50	7.91	35.11	0.00	56.98	0.20	18.11	0.00	81.69
0.500 - 1.00	0.00	33.86	39.81	26.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00 - 2.00	0.00	23.02	1.99	75.00	0.00	52.06	11.10	36.84
2.00 - 4.00	0.00	0.00	60.50	39.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Above 4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All sizes	3.26	24.83	16.52	55.39	0.07	25.77	4.12	70.04

**Source:** Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

**Table 11:** Percentage distribution of operational holdings by type of holdings for different size classes

Size class (ha)	Year	Entirely Owned	Entirely Leased-in	Mixed	Neither Owned Nor Leased-in
Less than 0.002	2003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.002 – 0.500	2003	97.55	1.00	1.18	0.27
	2013	99.84	0.00	0.16	0.00
0.500 – 1.00	2003	97.63	0.55	1.82	0.00
	2013	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00 – 2.00	2003	98.79	0.00	1.21	0.00
	2013	98.99	0.00	1.01	0.00
2.00 – 4.00	2003	97.05	0.00	2.95	0.00
	2013	94.75	0.00	5.25	0.00
Above 4.00	2003	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All sizes	2003	97.80	0.63	1.44	0.13
	2013	99.74	0.00	0.26	0.00

**Source:** Computed by authors from NSS Unit-level data of 59<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds.

## Conclusion

The study shows that land reforms played a significant role in transforming Jammu and Kashmir's agrarian structure. While land ownership rights have been transferred to cultivating peasants and absentee landlordism has been abolished, the persistence of land inequality and the prevalence of tenancy among sub-marginal farmers call for targeted policy interventions. Small and marginal farmers need improved access to credit and technology, cooperative farming needs to be promoted, and land tenure security needs to be strengthened, according to the findings. In addition, data on land relations in the region should be improved to inform policymaking based on evidence.

## References

1. Aslam M. Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir. *Social Scientist*. 1977;6(4):59-64.
2. Chadha GK, Sharma HR. Agrarian Relations in India: Comments on Quality of Available Data. In: Murty GVS, Kadekodi GK, editors. *Poverty in India: DataBase Issues*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.; c1992.
3. Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir. *Economic Survey*. Directorate of Economics & Statistics. J&K; c2017.
4. Hamdani A. Marginalization of Reforms: A Historical Study of Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir (1931-1988). *Social Scientist*. 2018;44(11):37-57.
5. Mathew G. Land Reforms: Jammu and Kashmir Shows the Way. *Yojana*. 2011;55:24-26.
6. Prasad AK. Sheikh Abdullah and Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir. *Economic & Political Weekly*. 2014;49(31):130-137.
7. Sharma HR, Malik SH. Land Distribution Structure, Marginalisation of Holdings, and Dimensions of Viability Crisis in Indian Agriculture: A State-Level Analysis. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2021;76(2):207-224.
8. Thorner D. The Kashmir Land Reforms: Some Personal Impressions. *Economic & Political Weekly*; c1953. p. 999-1002.