

Quality of Life of Farming Families Engaged in Different Enterprises

Supriya P. Patil^{1*} and Shobha Nagnur²

¹Ph.D. scholar, ²Professor and Head,

Department of Extension and Communication Management, College of Community Science, UAS Dharwad

*Corresponding Author E-mail: patil-supriya815@gmail.com

Received: 22.05.2018 | Revised: 18.06.2018 | Accepted: 27.06.2018

ABSTRACT

Indian economy is predominantly rural and agriculture oriented supporting 70 per cent of its population. Increasing population and declining trend in the average size of land holding poses a serious problem to the Indian farmers for maintaining a decent quality of life. Quality of life has been defined as the standard of health, comfort and happiness experienced by an individual or group. Quality of life can be maintained when the family possess the financial ability to purchase the basic necessities. In pursuit of this farming families involve themselves in allied agricultural activities. The present paper deals with the quality of life of farming families involved in various allied activities. This study was conducted in Dharwad, Belagavi, Gadag, Bagalkote, Vijayapura, Haveri and Uttar Kannada districts of Karnataka. Snowball sampling method was used to select the respondents who were engaged in different enterprises like Crop only, Crop + Dairy, Crop + Vegetable cultivation and Crop + Poultry. Eighty farming families were selected from each enterprise making a sample size of 320. Personal interview method was used for data collection and suitable statistical tools like frequency, percentage and indices were used for analysis of the data. The study revealed that, quality of life index was found to be high in Crop + Poultry (67.20 %) enterprise, followed by Crop + Dairy (67.00 %), Crop + Vegetable (65.97 %) and Crop only (64.24 %) enterprises. However when subjected to statistical analysis there was no significant difference between all the four enterprises. This calls for social education and extension intervention for better production of the allied activities improving the quality of life which hovered around 65 per cent.

Key words: Quality of life, Farming families

INTRODUCTION

India is a land of small farming families with nearly 80 per cent holding less than 5 acres. Farming is increasingly becoming a challenging issue for their sustainability. For subsistence and maintaining a good quality of life they have to look out for other avenues.

They need to earn money to tide over their problems during droughts as well as slack periods. The best enterprises for such families are allied agriculture activities, which complement rather than compete with agriculture.

Cite this article: Patil, S.P. and Nagnur, S., Quality of Life of Farming Families Engaged in Different Enterprises, *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 6(3): 357-365 (2018). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.6645>

Quality of life of farming families is both subjective & objective. While subjective quality of life is about feeling good and being satisfied with things in general, objective quality of life is about fulfilling the societal and cultural demands for material wealth, social status and physical well-being (QOLRC, Denmark). For leading a good quality of life income on a regular basis is important. This is possible when crop production is combined with other income generating activities. Hence this study was taken up to know the quality of life of farming families involved in different enterprises.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study was conducted in Dharwad, Belagavi, Bagalkote, Vijayapura, Gadag,

Haveri and Uttar Kannada districts of Karnataka. Snowball sampling method was used to select the respondents who were engaged in different enterprises like Crop only, Crop + Dairy, Crop + Vegetable cultivation and Crop + Poultry. Eighty farming families were selected from each enterprise making a sample size of 320. A scale was developed for measuring quality of life. The scale consisted of 10 parameters with items within the parameters. The parameters were nutrition, health, education, social participation, outings, housing and physical facilities, relationship, employment & income, environment and financial position. The Quality of Life (QOL) index was calculated to measure the same using the formula

Score related to of nutrition + health + education+ social participation+
outings+ housing and physical facilities+ relationship+ employment and
income+ environment+ financial position

$$\text{Quality of life Index} = \frac{\text{-----} \times 100}{\text{Maximum possible score for quality of life}}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quality of life of farming families engaged in different enterprises is presented in Table 1 under different aspects

Nutrition

Table 1a indicates the nutrition aspects of farming families. The nutrition index was found to be high in Crop + Poultry (76.17 %) enterprise, followed by Crop + Dairy (72.00 %), Crop + Vegetable (68.46 %) and Crop only (64.57 %). It was seen that in all the enterprises all farming families consuming cereals/pulses, milk and milk products and fats, oils, sugar and jiggery. While consumption of egg, meat and meat products was low in Crop only enterprise (14.00%), it was relatively high in Crop + Poultry enterprise i.e. 48 per cent. Consumption of dry fruits and nuts (20 – 32 %) were comparatively low. There was significant difference between the families of different enterprises with Crop +Poultry being highest and Crop only families are lowest.

The cent per cent consumption of cereals and pulses is because all the

respondents families are landed who grow their own food grains. Cereals like jowar, wheat, maize and rice are staple foods in rural India so their consumption is high. Since all the respondent families also maintain a few milch animals for home consumption, they also consume milk and milk products. They eat well and have good nutrition index. Shortage of food is no longer a problem with country which has reached self-sufficiency in food production. A higher nutrition index in the Crop + Poultry is because poultry as an enterprise taken up by communities who are non- vegetarians. The consumption of chicken and eggs from their own farms as well as other non- vegetarian foods has increased their nutrition index. The results are findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴ Karigar².

Health

Data presented in Table 1b reveals the health aspects of farming families engaged in different enterprises. The health index was high in Crop + Dairy (60.00 %) enterprise followed by Crop only (56.56 %), Crop + Poultry (50.62 %) and Crop + Vegetable

(43.00 %). It was seen that 75-96 per cent of the families have access to health care facilities like Primary Health Centre's (PHC'S) and doctor, 32 – 60 per cent of the families go for regular health check-up, in 38 – 50 per cent of the families no family members has lifestyle diseases like diabetes, high BP and high cholesterol. Regular exercise / yoga was highest in Crop + Dairy (51.00%), followed by Crop only (43.75%), Crop + Poultry (31.25%) and Crop + Vegetable (16.30%). A positive and highly significant difference was found between the four categories.

Since the families under the study had good nutrition index they also had a good health index. The other reason is that most of the villages now have the minimum medical facilities like primary health centres and doctors. Under the National Rural Health Mission many health care facilities are available to rural people. Increasing awareness creation through mass media has made people conscious of their health. They have begun to go for regular health check up's and some exercises apart from being active in their routine life at home and on the farm. However families from Crop + Dairy enterprise had a better index probably because some families do yoga and exercise. The results are findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴ and Karigar².

Education

Table 1c shows the education index of farming families engaged in different enterprises. Education index was found to be high in Crop + Poultry enterprise (93.75 %), followed by Crop + Vegetable (89.80 %), Crop + Dairy (88.00 %) and Crop only (75.25 %). It was observed that 88 -100 per cent of the families were sending their children to school, 82-100 per cent of the families provide equal opportunities to education of boys and girls, 80-98 per cent of the families sending their children to nearby town for high school education, 66-78 per cent of the families made transport arrangement for their children to travel to school and while cent per cent of Crop only enterprise families were ready to

give higher education i.e., graduation, PG & PhD for their children, 80 -100 per cent of the other categories were ready to do the same. The table also shows that there was a highly significant difference between the families of the four selected enterprises.

A high educational index is because; education is increasingly being recognized as a path to better employment opportunities and better quality of life. Farm women are now insisting an education of children as they do not want their children to face the uncertainty that they themselves are facing. Nor do they want their children to do the drudgerous work of farming. They want their children to become doctors & engineers or hold some white collar jobs. Moreover there are many government programmes like “Nali Kali”, “CoolieeindaShalege” to encourage children to go to school and get the dropouts back to school. It is also heartening that nearly 75 per cent of the families do not discriminate between boys and girls while providing education. The results are findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴ and Karigar².

Social Participation

A look at Table 1d indicates the social participation of farming families engaged in different enterprises. The table revealed that, social participation index was high in Crop + Dairy (61.00 %), followed by Crop + Vegetable (54.80 %), Crop only (54.62 %) and Crop + Poultry (49.75 %) enterprises. It was also clear from the table that 57 – 69 per cent of the farming families were SHG members, 53-64 per cent of the families actively participated in fairs, field days and festivals at village. In 45-66 per cent of the families one or other member attended the meeting conducted by Gram Panchayat and 35-40 per cent of the families involved themselves in village development activities. There was highly significant difference among families of different enterprises.

The area in which most women were participating was in Self Help Groups. In rural India and more so in South India, the SHG movement is very strong with the government of Karnataka also starting StreeShakthi

programme where in SHG are formed in all the village. So most women are members of one or the other SHG groups in the village. This movement has given a platform to women to express their views and participate in groups to attend social gatherings like krishimelas, field days etc. The high social participation can be solely attributed to the self-help group movement.

Outings/Holidays

It was clear from the table that the holidays index was found to be high in Crop + Dairy (61.00 %) enterprise, followed by crop only (59.37 %), Crop + Poultry (58.15 %) and Crop + Vegetable (42.00 %). It was seen that 58-71 per cent of the families visit nearby cities for shopping and 53-54 per cent of the families go on tours yearly. It was also seen that there was a significant difference between the families of the four categories.

With better transport facilities many rural peoples go to the cities for shopping as well as viewing cinemas in the theatres. Though women go less frequently, men go to cities atleast once a month to get medicine for children, animals and other inputs needed for crop production. In India tourism is a fast growing sector which has made roots into rural areas. With more cash on hand farming families have also begun to travel. They travel mainly to pilgrimage places through organised tours. Here again it is the members of SHG's who get together and go in groups. Women travel more than men to religious sites. Crop + Dairy families travelled more than others followed by Crop only and Crop + Poultry. The least travellers were vegetable cultivators.

Housing & Physical facilities

The results presented in Table 1f reveal that, families involved in Crop only enterprise were having a high housing and physical index (54.90 %), followed by Crop + Dairy (53.88 %), Crop + Vegetable (52.90 %) and Crop + Poultry (50.76 %) enterprise. However there was no significant difference between families of different enterprises.

The average living conditions of rural families are the same for all respondents. Since all respondents are in agriculture, they possess the

equipment and tools needed for agriculture. Mode of transport like bicycle and two wheelers are owned by many families. The large land holders own tractors and cars. All houses are pucca with minimum facilities to lead a decent life. However facilities like air cooler, refrigerator, washing machine and such others, which are considered as luxurious are lacking in these families. Hence the index is only to the extent of 50 per cent with no significant difference between the categories of farming families. The results are findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴.

Relationship

Table 1g shows the relationship index of farming families engaged in different enterprises. In all the enterprises the relationship index was almost same ranging from 84-88 per cent i.e 88.10 per cent in Crop + Vegetable farming families, followed by Crop + Poultry (86.19 %), Crop only (85.00 %) and Crop + Dairy (84.20 %) enterprises. It was also seen that there was no significant difference between families of different enterprises.

In India agriculture is a family enterprise and all the members in the family work together. This leads to good relationship between the family members and also increases the co-ordination among the members of the family contributing to greater satisfaction in all aspects. The prevalence of joint family system, the tradition and culture of respect to elders and maintaining the honour of the family in the society contribute to harmonious relationship within the family members. Rural families are more homogeneous, stable, integrated and organically functioning than the urban family. The bonds that binds the members of a rural family are stronger and a last longer than those in case of the urban family.

Employment and Income

Table 1h indicates the employment and income of farming families engaged in different enterprises. It was clear from the table that the employment and income index was high in Crop + Poultry (69.16 %) enterprise, followed by Crop + Vegetable,

Crop + Dairy (58.00 % each) and Crop only (50.83%) enterprise. In all the enterprises, 72-90 per cent of the families hire labours for farm and homework, 47-66 per cent of the families are satisfied with income to meet the expenditure. Regarding other employment like jobs it was highest in Crop + Poultry (51.25%), followed by Crop only (32.50%), Crop + Dairy (30.00%) and Crop + Vegetable (26.25 %) enterprises. Among all the four categories there was a highly significant difference.

For crop only families, their source of income depends only on the crops grown. The crop yields are dependent on monsoon and other natural vagaries. Only two crops per year are grown. The income in such cases is not assured hence the index was only to the extent of 50 per cent. In the other two enterprises of Crop + Dairy and Crop + Vegetable the indices are about 58 per cent each. These are slightly better than Crop only because of the flow of money from sale of milk and vegetables. However the index for Crop + Poultry was about 69 per cent. This is because Crop + Poultry gives more income per acre. In less than half an acre land, a farmer can rear nearly 7000 birds for a period of 45 days with a net income of about Rs. 80000/ batch. The income for four batches per year works out to as high as Rs. 3-3.5 lakhs. With a little care and extra labour poultry enterprise definitely has an edge over other enterprises in terms of income. The above mentioned results are in findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴ and Desai¹.

Environment

Results represented in 1i indicate the environment condition of farming families engaged in different enterprises. The Environment index was found to be high in Crop + Dairy (91.90 %), followed by Crop + Poultry (91.25 %), Crop + Vegetable (85.00 %) and Crop only (83.75 %). It was also seen that, 88-100 per cent of the families had drinking water facility and 71-84 per cent of the families had toilet facilities in their home. It was seen that there was a significant difference between the groups.

In recent times most villages have access to clean and filtered water due to installation of water purification plants at the community level. These are either installed by the government or the Non-Government Organisations (NGOs). Under the cleanliness drive (Swachh Bharat Abhiyan) the government has provided financial assistance for toilet construct within the homes. This has helped the families to keep their environment clean and also maintain good health. Due to mass media exposure village people have become conscious about the cleanliness and its importance for good health. Families from Crop +Dairy and Crop + Poultry are on par with another and better than other two enterprises.

Financial Position

Table 1j shows the financial position of farming families engaged in different enterprises. It was clear from the table that, financial position was high in Crop + Poultry (89.50%), followed by Crop + Vegetable (80.75%), Crop + Dairy (80.00) and Crop only (60.75%) enterprises. It was also seen that cent per cent of the families in all the enterprises possessed a gold/silver. Cent per cent of families in Crop + Dairy , Crop + Poultry and Crop + Vegetable took loans from money lenders, banks and family members, while 58.75 per cent of Crop only families took loans. Eighty one per cent of the families from Crop + Poultry had taken insurance policies, 45-63 per cent of the families from other enterprises had insurance policies. Savings was found to be high in Crop + Vegetable enterprise (97.50%), followed by Crop + Dairy (88.00%), Crop + Poultry (85.00%) and Crop only (65.00%) enterprises. Deposits to face uncertainties ranged from 35-58 per cent in all the enterprises. Among all the four categories there was a highly significant difference.

Financial position index included items like possession of gold, bank deposits and loans. Since Crop + Poultry enterprise had more income and the financial index is also high. The financial index is a reflection of the income index and so the similar trends in the results. Crop + Poultry enterprise was the best

with Crop only being the least. The above mentioned results are in findings with the results of Yadav and Grover⁴ and Desai¹.

Overall quality of life of farming families engaged in different enterprises

Table 2 shows overall quality of life index of farming families engaged in different enterprises. The quality of life index was found to be high in Crop + Poultry (67.20 %), followed by Crop + Dairy (67.00 %), Crop + Vegetable (65.97 %) and Crop only (64.24 %) enterprises. It was also seen that there was no significant difference between all the four enterprises.

Although there were differences in various parameters of quality of life showed no significant difference in the overall scores. It could be concluded that the living conditions of most of the rural families are the same and so there is no much differences among the families of different enterprises.

Categorization of farming families on their quality of life

Table 3 indicates categorization of respondents based on their quality of life. It was seen that

in Crop only enterprise 35 per cent of the farming families belonged to high and low category. While remaining 30 per cent of the respondents belonged to medium category.

In Crop + Dairy enterprise, 36.25 per cent of the families belonged to high category, 35 per cent of the families belonged to low and 28.75 per cent of the families belonged to medium category of quality of life.

In Crop + Vegetable enterprise, 35 per cent of the families belonged to medium and high category each and 30 per cent of the families belong to low category of quality of life.

In Crop + Poultry enterprises half of the respondents belonged to high category of quality of life followed by low (40.00 %) and medium (10.00 %) category.

When the families were categorised as low, medium and high levels of quality of life, with almost similar percentages were observed in all three categories except for higher percentage of Crop + Poultry farming families in the high category.

Table 1: Quality of life of farming families engaged in different enterprises

1a. Nutrition

| Sl. No | Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Consumption of cereals/pulses | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 62.36 ** |
| 2 | Consumption of fruits | 55.00 | 55.00 | 50.00 | 57.25 | |
| 3 | Consumption of GLV's and other vegetables | 63.00 | 96.50 | 80.50 | 95.00 | |
| 4 | Consumption of milk and milk products | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | |
| 5 | Consumption of dry fruits and nuts | 20.00 | 35.50 | 31.30 | 32.50 | |
| 6 | Consumption of egg, meat and meat products | 14.00 | 20.30 | 17.50 | 48.50 | |
| 7 | Consumption of fats, oils, sugar and jaggery | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | |
| | Nutrition index | 64.57 | 72.00 | 68.46 | 76.17 | |

1b. Health

| Sl. No | Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Access to health care facilities like PHC's and doctors | 75.00 | 90.00 | 82.50 | 96.25 | 5.242 ** |
| 2 | Regular health check up | 57.50 | 60.00 | 32.50 | 32.50 | |
| 3 | No lifestyle diseases like diabetes, high BP and high cholesterol among the family members | 50.00 | 40.00 | 38.80 | 42.50 | |
| 4 | Regular exercise/ yoga | 43.75 | 51.00 | 16.30 | 31.25 | |
| | Health index | 56.56 | 60.00 | 43.00 | 50.62 | |

1c. Education

| Sl. No | Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Sending children to school | 88.75 | 100.00 | 96.30 | 98.75 | 15.600 ** |
| 2 | Equal opportunities to education of boys and girls | 82.50 | 86.00 | 100.00 | 93.75 | |
| 3 | Sending children to nearby town for high school | 80.00 | 81.00 | 98.80 | 92.50 | |
| 4 | Transport arrangement for children to travel to school | 66.25 | 73.00 | 76.30 | 78.75 | |
| 5 | Facilitating children to acquire higher education- graduation, PG & Ph.D. | 58.75 | 100.00 | 80.00 | 93.75 | |
| | Education index | 75.25 | 88.00 | 89.80 | 93.75 | |

1d. Social participation

| Sl. No. | Statements/Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Attending meetings conducted by Gram Panchayat | 45.37 | 66.00 | 66.90 | 54.37 | 6.276 ** |
| 2 | Attending the national festivals like independence day, republic day etc. | 60.62 | 60.00 | 52.50 | 48.12 | |
| 3 | Active participation in fairs, field days and festivals at village. | 59.37 | 64.00 | 58.80 | 53.75 | |
| 4 | Involving in village development activities | 39.37 | 40.00 | 36.90 | 35.00 | |
| 5 | Active participation in SHG activities | 59.37 | 69.00 | 58.80 | 57.50 | |
| | Social participation index | 54.62 | 59.60 | 54.80 | 49.75 | |

1e. Outings/ Holidays

| Sl. No. | Statements/Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Visit to nearby cities for shopping | 61.25 | 59.00 | 55.60 | 58.12 | 2.993* |
| 2 | Going on tours | 54.37 | 54.40 | 53.13 | 53.75 | |
| 3 | Visiting relatives | 62.50 | 71.30 | 58.13 | 62.50 | |
| | Outing index | 59.37 | 61.00 | 42.00 | 58.15 | |

1f. Housing and physical facilities

| Sl.No. | Statements/Items | Croponly (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1. | Type of house | | | | | |
| a. | Kaccha | 16.25 | 26.00 | 35.00 | 37.50 | |
| b. | Pucca | 77.50 | 68.00 | 61.00 | 56.25 | |
| c. | Tiles | 57.5 | 60.00 | 50.00 | 47.50 | |
| d. | Concrete building | 37.50 | 48.00 | 23.00 | 42.50 | |
| 2. | Cooking facilities in home | | | | | |
| a. | Fire wood | 93.75 | 90.00 | 95.00 | 93.75 | |
| b. | Kerosene | 0.00 | 8.80 | 5.00 | 8.75 | |
| c. | LPG | 95.00 | 86.00 | 100.00 | 73.75 | |
| d. | Biogas/ Solar | 5.00 | 14.00 | 15.00 | 21.25 | |
| e. | Electricity | 0.00 | 1.30 | 2.50 | 0.00 | |
| 3. | Lighting system in house | | | | | |
| a. | Kerosene/candle | 26.25 | 59.00 | 6.30 | 37.50 | |
| b. | Electricity | 97.5 | 99.00 | 98.00 | 77.50 | |
| c. | Solar | 5.00 | 1.80 | 18.00 | 36.25 | |

1f. Contd....

| Sl.No. | Statements/Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 4. | Means of transport | | | | | 1.996 NS |
| a. | Bullock | 67.50 | 63.00 | 54.00 | 52.50 | |
| b. | Motor cycle | 96.25 | 79.00 | 100.00 | 72.50 | |
| c. | Tactor | 40.00 | 46.00 | 53.00 | 46.25 | |
| d. | Jeep/Tempo | 23.75 | 18.00 | 24.00 | 13.75 | |
| e. | Bicycle | 7.50 | 69.00 | 61.00 | 75.00 | |
| 5. | Electronic items in home | | | | | |
| a. | Radio | 5.00 | 41.00 | 19.00 | 56.25 | |
| b. | TV | 98.75 | 99.00 | 98.00 | 100.00 | |
| c. | Mobile | 97.50 | 91.00 | 99.00 | 82.50 | |
| d. | Air cooler | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 | |
| 6. | Household gadgets at home | | | | | |
| a. | Grinder | 3.75 | 6.00 | 9.00 | 7.50 | |
| b. | Mixer | 90.00 | 8.50 | 91.00 | 78.75 | |
| c. | Refrigerator | 50.00 | 48.00 | 51.00 | 51.25 | |
| 7. | Furniture at home | | | | | |
| a. | Chair | 96.25 | 83.00 | 100.00 | 72.50 | |
| b. | Table | 56.25 | 63.00 | 80.00 | 56.25 | |
| c. | Cot | 67.50 | 81.00 | 89.00 | 82.50 | |
| d. | Sopa | 20.00 | 31.00 | 33.00 | 28.75 | |
| e. | Caboard | 75.00 | 78.00 | 80.00 | 65.75 | |
| 8 | Farm implements | | | | | |
| a. | Wooden plough | 90.00 | 68.00 | 69.00 | 61.25 | |
| b. | Iron plough | 83.75 | 61.00 | 61.00 | 58.75 | |
| c. | Harrow | 90 | 63.00 | 69.00 | 55.00 | |
| d. | Sickle/ Spade | 32.50 | 86.00 | 91.00 | 90.00 | |
| e. | Seed drill | 86.25 | 60.00 | 61.00 | 57.50 | |
| f. | Cultivation | 77.50 | 50.00 | 55.00 | 48.75 | |
| g. | Hand Sprayer | 75.00 | 48.00 | 54.00 | 41.25 | |
| 9. | Farm Machineries | | | | | |
| a. | Tactor | 75.00 | 50.00 | 53.00 | 46.25 | |
| b. | Pumpset | 91.25 | 78.00 | 74.00 | 73.75 | |
| c. | Power sprayer | 80.00 | 58.00 | 56.00 | 52.50 | |
| d. | Power tiller | 56.25 | 33.00 | 36.00 | 18.75 | |
| e. | Bund Former | 51.25 | 26.00 | 39.00 | 18.75 | |
| f. | Chaff cutter | 80.00 | 53.00 | 58.00 | 51.25 | |
| | Housing Index | 54.90 | 53.88 | 52.90 | 50.76 | |

1g. Relationship

| Sl.No. | Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Husband & Wife | 99.16 | 99.00 | 98.80 | 95.83 | 1.586 NS |
| 2 | Father & Children | 87.08 | 88.00 | 93.30 | 87.08 | |
| 3 | Mother & Children | 91.66 | 90.40 | 91.70 | 87.08 | |
| 4 | Between siblings | 90.00 | 90.00 | 87.50 | 84.58 | |
| 5 | Relationship with in laws | 80.00 | 76.00 | 80.40 | 84.58 | |
| 6 | Grandparents and Grandchildren | 79.166 | 79.00 | 86.30 | 89.58 | |
| 7 | Neighbors | 67.91 | 67.00 | 78.80 | 74.58 | |
| | Relationship Index | 85.00 | 84.20 | 88.10 | 86.19 | |

1h. Employment and income

| Sl. No. | Statements/ Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Everyone in the family has employment | 32.50 | 30.00 | 26.25 | 51.25 | 6.083 ** |
| 2 | Labours are hired for farm and home work | 72.50 | 85.00 | 93.75 | 90.00 | |
| 3 | Income is sufficient to meet the expenditure | 47.50 | 58.00 | 55.00 | 66.25 | |
| | Employment and Income index | 50.83 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 69.16 | |

1i. Environment

| Sl. No. | Statements/ Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Drinking water facility | 88.75 | 100.00 | 98.75 | 100.00 | 2.198 * |
| 2 | Toilet facilities | 78.75 | 84.00 | 71.25 | 82.50 | |
| | Environment index | 83.75 | 91.90 | 85.00 | 91.25 | |

1j. Financial position

| Sl. No. | Statements/ Items | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Indices | | | | | | |
| 1 | Insurance | 45.00 | 63.00 | 51.25 | 81.25 | 40.315** |
| 2 | Loans | 58.75 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | |
| 3 | Possession of gold/ silver | 0.00 | 22.50 | 18.75 | 30.00 | |
| 4 | Savings | 65.00 | 88.00 | 97.50 | 85.00 | |
| 5 | Deposit to face uncertainties | 35.00 | 50.00 | 55.00 | 58.75 | |
| | Financial position index | 60.75 | 80.00 | 80.75 | 89.50 | |

Table 2. Overall quality of life index farming families engaged in different enterprises

| | Crop only (n = 80) | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | F Value |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Nutrition | 64.57 | 72.00 | 68.46 | 76.17 | 2.594 ^{NS} |
| Health | 56.56 | 60.00 | 43.00 | 50.62 | |
| Education | 75.20 | 88.00 | 89.80 | 93.75 | |
| Social participation | 54.62 | 59.60 | 54.80 | 49.75 | |
| Outings | 59.37 | 61.00 | 42.00 | 58.12 | |
| Housing | 54.90 | 53.90 | 52.90 | 50.76 | |
| Relationship | 85.00 | 84.20 | 88.10 | 86.19 | |
| Employment and income | 50.86 | 58.00 | 58.00 | 69.16 | |
| Environment | 83.75 | 91.90 | 85.00 | 91.25 | |
| Financial position | 60.75 | 80.00 | 80.75 | 89.50 | |
| Overall quality of life index | 64.24 | 67.00 | 65.97 | 67.20 | |

Table 3: Categorization of respondents based on their quality of life

| Sl. No. | Category | Crop only (n = 80) | | Crop + Dairy (n = 80) | | Crop + Vegetable (n = 80) | | Crop + Poultry (n = 80) | |
|---------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| 1. | Low | 28 | 35.00 | 28 | 35.00 | 24 | 30.00 | 32 | 40.00 |
| 2. | Medium | 24 | 30.00 | 23 | 28.75 | 28 | 35.00 | 8 | 10.00 |
| 3. | High | 28 | 35.00 | 29 | 36.25 | 28 | 35.00 | 40 | 50.00 |

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from the study that, even though the indices of quality of life of farming families engaged in different enterprises were almost the same, aslightly higher indices were seen for Crop + Poultry and Crop +Dairyon the dimensions of nutrition, health, education and environment indices. Since the quality of life ranges between 64-67 per cent, the indices need to be upped by social, educational and extension interventions.

REFERENCES

1. Desai, R., Role of women in organic farming and their family quality index in the selected Agro-Climatic Zones of northern Karnataka. *Ph.D. Thesis. Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India) (2013).*
2. Karigar, G., Rural women entrepreneurship in allied agricultural activities. *M.HSc. Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India) (2017).*
3. Quality of Life Research Centre, Denmark. (<https://www.gdrc.org/uem/qol-define.html>).
4. Yadav, P. and Grover, I., Impact of dairy cooperatives on quality of life parameters: gender analysis. *Indian J. Extn.Edu., 46(3&4): 15-20 (2010).*