CHAPTER VII
NATURE OF TENANCY AND FACTORS AFFECTING
THE TENURIAL CHOICE

The main purpose of this chapter is to analyse the contractual arrangement between the landlord and the tenant as is prevailing in rural Haryana in recent years. In the First section we provide a brief review of theoretical and empirical contribution relating to tenancy. In the second section a brief introduction of the tenancy situation prevailing in contemporary Haryana has been discussed. The third section analysis the terms and conditions of different types of tenancy contract prevailing in the study area. The last section provides a brief summary of the chapter.

SECTION-I

Agricultural tenancy in general has attracted a great deal of attention of economists and other social scientist since the publication of famous Marshallian contribution (Marshall, 1890). The prevalence of tenancy has been noticed since early times in different societies including in some pre capitalist, pre socialist as well as many third world countries, (Byres, 1983), Adam Smith (1776) and Marshall (1890) have argued that in the absence of supervision the tenant will apply labour upto a point where returns to labour would be above the wage rate.
in order to maximise his income. This implies that production would not be carried to a point where labour could be rewarded its marginal productivity. In view of this Marshall regarded share tenancy inefficient.

In recent years many authors have questioned the empirical relevance of Marshallian argument (Johnson, 1950; Cheung, 1968-69) according to them the tenant can be induced to apply the efficient level of inputs through the monitoring of landlords. A tenant who is not efficient even after the monitoring by the landlord can be discarded by the landlord. After the publication of Cheung (1968-69) contribution, a number of authors have participated in the debate relating to different aspects of tenancy and its implication on production and resource allocation.¹ In recent years the terms and conditions of leasing-in and leasing-out by the tenant and landlord, respectively, have been highlighted by Binswanger and Rosenzweig (1986), Bhardwaj and Das (1975), K. Basu (1990), to mention a few. Several other explanations have also been offered Reid (1973, 1977) believes that the rationale for share cropping lies in its incentives for co-operation between the landlord and the tenant to maximise the efficiency of

agricultural production. Newbery (1977) argues that as rural labour markets often fail to guarantee full employment at a constant wage level, share cropping contracts are devised to mitigate the effects of labour market uncertainty. Bell (1977) and Bliss and Stern (1982), hold the view that share cropping exists because of the indivisibility and imperfect marketability of some factors of production (drought animals, family labour etc.). The present study will discuss the terms and conditions of contract between the landlords and tenants prevailing in agricultural sector of Haryana, based on field survey data. Before that the tenurial conditions that have undergone changes in the study area are discussed below.

SECTION-II

Haryana was part of the erstwhile Punjab, before 1966. Most of the tenancy laws passed by the Punjab state, before and after independence of the country are the guiding principle for implementing tenancy laws. Prior to independence tenancy arrangements in general were a matter of mutual agreement between the landlords and tenants which were governed mainly by the ordinary law of contract. These contracts had no provision for either security of tenure or regulation of rent. The terms and conditions were basically informal and influenced by the personal relationship. It has been pointed out in the famine
Enquiry Commission, New Delhi (1944), that even in the ryowtwari area, where peasant proprietorship should have been prevailed, unprotected tenancy grew on a large scale. The tenants generally had no permanent interest in land as they were not sure about the duration of tenancy contract. Share cropping was the dominant mode of tenancy, in which the tenant has to share 50% of his output to the landlord. As a result the tenant was not interested in the investment in the land by putting modern inputs or devoting more time to the tenanted land because he couldn’t get proper return for his labour and entrepreneurship. On the other hand the landlord especially the absentee ones was more interested to collect rent from the tenant rather than improving the land. In view of this, the tenancy situation was not conducive for raising the productivity of land and labour.

After independence the central and state governments have taken several measures to improve the conditions of the tenant and reduce the unfavourable terms and conditions of leasing-in and leasing-out with a view to improve the productivity of land and ameliorate the economic condition of tenant. In the first phase of post independence land reforms, some measures were taken to modify the existing tenancy law with a view to provide security to tenants. But the landlords, either, resorted to eviction of tenant, and/or legal action against the legislation. To counter the moves of the landlords several state governments
enacted the tenancy laws further, so that effective security can be provided to the tenants. Further, landlords could be prevented from evicting the tenants. We discuss below the measures taken by Punjab and Haryana in the earlier periods and later by the state of Haryana, with a view to improve the economic conditions of tenants. In the earlier period of independence the Punjab security of land tenures act (1953) and the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Land Act (1955) were the guiding legislations relating to tenancy in the study area of Haryana. Under the acts tenants were given security of tenure in respect of land. This was applicable to the land of the landlord which was above the permissible limit of 30 standard acres of ownership of land by the landlord. After the formation of Haryana state, the state conferred complete security of tenure for tenants who had continuous possession of land for 12 years in an area upto 15 standard acres. In other situation the above act provided different guidelines for the possession of land which were beyond the permissible limit. Under such situation a tenant can be removed by the landlord on the ground of personal cultivation, provided a minimum area of 5 acre is left to the tenant. There was also provision for the purchase of tenanted land by the tenant in respect of the land which has not taken over by the landlord under these legislations.
The adoption of new technology in Haryana since the formation of the state has been spectacular and the progress of adoption of new technology has been continuous since the mid sixties. This has changed the tenurial relation in rural Haryana. The share tenancy has given rise to fixed tenancy because the prosperous tenants will not be interested to cultivate the land on share crop basis, as he has to share 50% of the return, modern inputs and labour. In view of the rising productivity of new technology the landlord would be interested to cultivate the land himself rather than leasing out the land to the tenant. The available statistical evidence for the year 1970-71 and 76-77 suggest that both the number of holding and area under tenancy in the state have declined from 10187 and 38500 (00’ hectare) to 9987 and 35788 (00’ hectare) respectively. The latest available statistics suggest further decline in the area under tenancy to 10,116 nos. and 35617 (00’ hect.) in 1980-81. It is interesting to note that about 52% of the leased-in area in the state, cultivated by those having land above 10 acres. In such a situation eviction of tenants may be mostly fall on small and marginal owners who may have leased-in land to the big landlords on the ground of personal

cultivation, about 143.9 thousand hectare of land were resumed from 77,806 tenants upto end of March 1973 (National Commission on Agriculture, 1976). Similarly, 64.6 thousand hectare of land was purchased by 25,781 tenants.

On the whole it appears that tenancy both in terms of area and number of holding has been falling in Haryana. Moreover, there has been changes in terms of tenurial contracts especially from share cropping to fixed tenancy, both in cash and kind, in areas experiencing rapid diffusion of new technology. The changing terms and conditions of tenancy will be analysed in the next section on the basis of cross-section field survey data.

SECTION-III

Before analysing the terms and conditions of tenancy contract in the sample villages a brief description of the prevalence of various types of tenancy in each village is given below. As discussed in chapter third, we have collected data from three different set of villages: namely, one village from developed area of Karnal, one from the under developed areas of Mahendergarh and the last one from the medium-developed areas of Rohtak. In the advanced village the dominant kharif crop is rice and the Rabi crop is wheat. In the Mahendergarh area

the major kharif crops are *jawar* and *bajra* and wheat and Gram in the Rabi season. In the Rohtak village the major kharif crops are *jawar* and *bajra* while the major Rabi crops are wheat and mustard.

It is noteworthy that risk and uncertainty associated with rice and wheat are less as compared to the cultivation of Gram and mustard. In the case of gram the field of crop may go down substantially due to adverse weather conditions. On the other hand as far as the productivity of mustard crop is concerned the cultivators are sure to get a minimum amount. However in a favourable weather condition the productivity of mustard rises substantially. Given such behaviour of crop yield pattern, a risk averse landlord may like to lease out his land on a fixed term for those crops, if he is unsure about the upper limit of productivity. In other words he will prefer a fixed sum for leasing out the land. This is the situation in the case of gram which is grown in Mahendergarh village. In the case of mustard crop the landlords as well as tenants may prefer share tenancy because in case of higher yield it will be shared by both the parties. On the other hand if there is a fall in yield, the loss will be equally shared by these parties. As such the prevalence of share tenancy has been found in the mustard grown area. Lastly, in dynamic agricultural region like Karnal given the choice, a resource rich tenant will prefer to lease in land on fixed term basis, because after paying the rent, the
increase of output due to investment, in modern puts will exclusively go to tenant.

It is to be noted that the choice of contract between the parties depends on a variety of factors such as: resource endowment of tenant, preference of a landlord, type of crop grown and on some other factors. As such we have found a variety of contract in all villages of our study. Simultaneously there is prevalence of fixed tenancy as well as share cropping in all the villages, with a dominant form of contract prevailing in one particular socio-economic and agro-climatic region. We discuss the different contractual arrangement prevailing in our study area below.

Composition of tenants

In our study area there were 51 tenants in all. Of these 10 were found in the least developed area, 21 in most developed area, and the rest 20 tenants in the mediumly developed village. It is desirable to know the characteristics of the tenant, those who have participated in the lease-in market. We have classified the tenancy on the basis of their operated area; into marginal, i.e. upto 2.5 acres, the small tenants with land holding from 2.51 to 5.0 acres, the semi-medium from 5.01 to 10.0 acres, medium from 10.01 to 20.0 acres and large farmers are 20.01 acres and above.
We have classified these tenants into five groups and tabulated the data for tenancy for each village separating and then aggregated all the tenants. First the composition of tenants in each area is discussed. It is followed by the analysis of tenants for the whole sample.

The background of tenants for the relatively under developed village has been shown in table 7.1.a. Out of the 10 tenants 40% (4) tenant were small, 50% (5) were semi-medium and the rest 10% (1) belonged to the medium size group. It is noteworthy that there were no marginal tenant and large size tenant in the village. Another important feature is that all the tenants had certain amount of land owned by them. The percentage of area lease-in to total operated area varied from 66.66% in the case of small tenants to 16.66% in the case of medium tenant. Thus the percentage of area lease-in to total operated area decreases with the rise in the status of tenant household.

In the case of mediumly developed village the composition of tenant was as follows; (see table 7.1.b). There were 20 tenant households in all. Out of these 5% (1) tenants were marginal, 20.0% (4) were small, 40.0% (8) were

4. There is only one marginal tenant, who leased panchayat land and was belonged to S. caste.
semi-medium, 25.0% (5) were medium and 10.0% (2) were large tenants. The number of tenants in the size group increases up to semi-medium category and showed a decreasing trend after that. The percentage of area leased-in to total operated land varied from 100.0% in the case of marginal farmer to 44.53% in the case of small farmers. It was 35.25% in the case of medium tenant. But it is exceptionally high i.e. 49.0% in the case of large tenants. Thus the area lease-in to total operated area decreased with the increase in the status of farmer except in the case of large tenants.

The composition of tenants in the developed area has been shown in table 7.1.c. In all these were 21 numbers of tenants in the sample. Out of these 19.04% (4) were marginal tenants, 9.53% (2) were small tenants, 23.81% (5) were semi-medium tenants, 19.04% (4) were medium and 28.57% (6) were large tenants. In this area the marginal farmers are having more lease-in contracts as compared to that marginal farmers in the relatively developed area and mediumly developed area. In this area agriculture is mechanised. So the large tenants do want to have optimal utilization of their machine powers, so they are going for lease-in contracts, which is clear from the above table. The percentage of area leased-in to total operated area is showing no trend, it is 40.00% in the case of marginal tenants and 53.33% in the case of small tenants. If increased to 63.88%
Table 7.1.a
Some characteristics of tenants in the sample villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres) (Operational holding)</th>
<th>No. of tenants (Percentage)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Leased-in (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area owned (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Operated (Acres)</th>
<th>%age of Area Leased-in to total operated area</th>
<th>%age of Area leased-in to total area owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>103.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
### Table 7.1.b
Some characteristics of tenants in the sample villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres) (Operational holding)</th>
<th>No. of tenants (Percentage)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Leased-in (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area owned (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Operated (Acres)</th>
<th>%age of Area Leased-in to total operated area</th>
<th>%age of Area leased-in to total area owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>80.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>55.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>5 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>54.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>2 (10.0%)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>96.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Note: (1) In Row 1st, there was a S.C. tenant, who leased in Panchayat land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of tenants (Percentage)</th>
<th>Avg. Area leased-in (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Operated (Acres)</th>
<th>%age of Area leased-in to total area owned</th>
<th>%age of Area leased-in to total area operated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>2 (19.04%)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>3 (23.81%)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>533.3</td>
<td>533.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>4 (19.04%)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>638.8</td>
<td>638.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>5 (28.57%)</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>14.875</td>
<td>108.77</td>
<td>108.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>6 (28.57%)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>59.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Field Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1.d
Some characteristics of tenants in the sample villages (Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of tenants (Percentage)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Leased-in (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area owned (Acres)</th>
<th>Avg. Area Operated (Acres)</th>
<th>%age of Area Leased-in to total operated area</th>
<th>%age of Area leased-in to total area owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>88.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>54.97</td>
<td>121.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>90.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>68.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>134.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
in case of semi-medium tenants but decreased to 52.10% for medium tenants and again increased to 59.66% for large tenants. This showed that tenancy contracts are preferred by farmers of all size groups.

The comparison of the overall sample of tenant has been shown in table 7.1.d. Of the total tenant household (51), 9.80% belong to marginal tenants and 19.60% (10) belong to small tenants. On the contrary 15.68% (8) were large tenants. Semi-medium tenant households consist of 35.29% (18) of the total tenant. This is the largest percentage among the group of tenants. Thus the percentage of marginal tenant is small in the study area. Farmers with some amount of land have prefer to lease-in land and enlarged their operational holdings. The reason for leasing-in land by different categories of tenant household will be discussed in detail below. The study area is basically dominated by small, semi-medium and medium tenant household. This finding is contrary to the finding of Bhardwaj and Das (1975), who have found that in backward agriculture area such as Orissa, a majority of the tenant household belong to poor and marginal tenants. The situation in our study area can be termed as 'reverse tenancy'. In such a situation the terms and conditions of lease in and lease out will be different as compared to the terms and conditions of tenancy prevalent in backward agricultural area. Now we discuss the actual terms and conditions of
tenancy in the sample village.

**SECTION-IV**

Terms and conditions of tenancy

We describe below the actual terms and conditions of contractual arrangement between the landlords and the tenant. First we discuss the types of tenurial contract in the study area. Table 7.2. depict the types of tenancy as prevalent in different areas of the study. Table 7.2.d. discusses the overall situation in relation to the type of tenancy. As can be seen from table 7.2.a, fixed tenancy with cash is the dominating form of tenurial contract prevalent in the under developed village. On the other hand the fixed tenancy as well as share cropping are prevalent in the case of medium developed village in all the size group except the marginal tenant category. It is noteworthy that in the developed village (Table 7.2.c) while fixed tenancy is dominant form of tenancy among the semi-medium, medium and large tenant, share tenancy is dominant in the case of marginal and small tenant. On the whole it appears that the dominance of fixed tenancy is more among the richer farmers. The prevalence of share tenancy is more among the marginal and small farmers. We will discuss the reasons for the prevalence of such tenurial arrangement in terms of resource endowment of the household and crop grown in the area. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the
choice of crop grown in a particular area is also an important factor for the prevalence of a type of tenancy in a particular village. Further, a resource poor household may not be in a position to invest adequate working capital for cultivation. In such a situation he will be interested in share tenancy, because, in the case of share tenancy there is a possibility of sharing of inputs as well as risk by both the parties. It is important to note that in all the three regions of our study area the landlord has also provided inputs in equal proportion with the tenant. This is true even for different crops grown by the tenants in different regions. It is even in the interest of the landlord that a minimum amount of output can be produced from the tenanted land and this is why he is providing inputs partly, during the time of cultivation. It is significant to note that the provision of inputs by the landlords in tenancy arrangement in our study area is different from that of the situation prevailing in western U.P. as noted by Bliss and Stern (1982). In their study these authors have found that there is a provision of input sharing by the landlord but the tenant arrange all the inputs during the cultivation but the landlord's share is deducted from the crop output after the cultivation.

In comparison with the marginal and small tenant it has been found that the medium, semi-medium and large household generally prefer fixed tenancy. In the case of fixed tenancy the tenant household pays the amount of rent in
### Table 7.2.a  
**Nature of Contracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with fixed Money Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Kind Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with Crop sharing</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid at the time of lease-in</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid after the crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey  

**Note:** One tenant (S.C.) in Row 2, lease-in land on a fixed kind basis at a rate of 3 quintals/acre/year.
### Table 7.2.b
**Nature of Contracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Money Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Kind Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with Crop sharing</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid at the time of lease-in</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid after the crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Note:  
1. In Row I, the only tenant is a S.C. household, who leased in 1 acre of Panchayat land.  
2. In Row 3, only one case of fixed kind rent at a rate of 6 quintals/acre/year. The tenant and landlord belong to the same family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Money Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Kind Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with Crop sharing</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid at the time of lease-in</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid after the crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
### Table 7.2.d
Nature of Contracts (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with fixed Money Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with fixed Kind Contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with Crop sharing</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid at the time of lease-in</th>
<th>%age of Trans. in which rent is paid after the crop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>84.61</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
These tenant households, because of their credit worthiness are in a position to not only pay the rent in advance but also invest in working capital for cultivation. In such tenurial arrangement the disincentive effect on production as noted by Marshall is low, because, the tenants are sure to reap the benefit of investment after paying the fixed amount. This is in contrast to the finding of Bhardwaj and Das (1975); who have found that even in the case of fixed tenancy the tenant generally pay the rent after the harvest of the crop and the payment of rent in most of cases was in kind.

The composition of the landlord may be an important factor, why the landlord prefers the payment of rent in advance and that too in cash. This will be discussed in detail later when we analyse the characteristics of the landlord.

**Duration of Contract**

The duration of tenurial contract by the tenant household in different region of our study have been shown in Table 7.3. It has been found that in the case of under developed area out of 10, nine contracts were of one year duration

5. The fixed amount of rent is mostly paid in cash. Hardly, in 2 cases, one in relatively underdeveloped village, one in mediumly developed village, the tenant have paid rent in kind after the harvest. Clearly, that the mode of payment of rent in terms of cash is mostly before taking possession of land by the tenant.
and one contract was for more than one year. In the mediumly developed village out of 26 transactions about 88.46% (23) contract were for one year only and 7.7% (2) contract were for more than one year. Hardly 3.8% (1) contract was for one crop. On the other hand in case of developed village out of 26 tenancy transactions 69.23% (18) contract were for one year duration and 27% (7) were for more than one year duration. In this village 3.8% (1) contract was for one crop. It appear that duration of contract for one crop is minimal in the study area and that too was confined to only marginal holding. Perhaps, the landlords leasing-out land on such terms and conditions to marginal tenant because the land is inferior or not suitably located and as such not preferred by richer tenant household. Further it is clear that about two thirds of the contracts are for about one year. Clearly, the tenurial contract prevalent in the study area are of set duration. Perhaps, the landlords do not want to lease-out their land for a long period for fear of the tenancy laws. Second, the landlords may be enforcing their ownership right on the land by cultivating themselves with hired labour and leasing-out land to the tenants. By frequently changing the tenants they are not only in a position to raise the amount of rent but also make sure of keeping the tenant out from potential litigation as far as their enforcement right is concerned.
Table 7.3.a  
Duration of Contract in the sample villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with one year contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with one crop contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with more than one year contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.3.b
Duration of Contract in the sample villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acre)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with one year contract</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with one crop contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with more than one year contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>%age of Tran. with one year contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with one crop contract</th>
<th>%age of Trans. with more than one year contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
### Table 7.3.d
Duration of Contract in the sample village (Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Field Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
<th>% age of Trans. with more than one year contract</th>
<th>% age of Trans. with one crop contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total 30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80.64</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition of Landlords

We now proceed to find out who the lessors are in our study area. One way of examining this question could have been to establish contact with the lessor household specific to our tenant households and then obtained information on their socio-economic status, motivation and preference for leasing out, etc.

On this basis, we present the area owned by the landlords in table 7.4. In the least developed area table 7.4.a, there were 7 landlords, out of this 14.29% (1) belonged to marginal size category (i.e. upto 2.5 acres), 71.42% (5) belonged to small farmers (i.e. 2.51-5.0 acres) and the rest 14.29% (1) belonged to semi-medium size (i.e. 5.01-10.0 acre). The percentage of area leased out to owned was 100.0% in all size groups.

In the mediumly developed village (see table 7.4.b.), there were 9 landlords, out of this 22.22% (2) were marginal lessors, 44.45% (4) were small lessors, 22.22% (2) were semi-medium and 11.11% (1) belonged to medium size group. The percentage of area leased out to total area owned was 100.0%, 93.75%, 70.00% and 16.66% respectively for marginal, small, semi-medium and medium landlords. This showed that with the increase in size group, the land leased-out decreased.
In the developed village, table 7.4.c., there were 12 lessors in all. Out of this 7 (58.33%) were semi-medium, 1 (8.33%) was medium landlord and 4 (33.34%) were large farmers. The striking feature here is that there is no marginal or small landlords in the developed village. The percentage of area leased out to total area owned showed a decreasing trend except for the medium size group\(^6\), it was 74.56% in the case of semi-medium farmers and 41.48% for the large landlord household.

Overall there were 28 landlords in all the three villages, we have surveyed, Table 7.4.d., scattered in all the five size-groups. There were maximum 10 (35.71%) landlords in the semi-medium size group and a minimum of 2 (7.14%) in the medium size group. There were 3 (10.71%) marginal landlords, 9 (32.14%) small landlords and 4 (14.29%) large lessors in all. The percentage of area leased out to total area owned, decreased with an increase in the size group. It is 100.0% for marginal landlords. It decreased to 97.02% in the case of small landlords and further decreased to 64.20% in the semi-medium size group. It is 58.33% in medium and 41.48% in the case of large landlords. This clearly showed that the marginal and small land holders leased-out almost their whole piece of

\(^6\) In the medium size group there is only one landlord, who leased out 100% of his land.
### Table 7.4.a

**Landlords (ownership holding) in the sample villages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords (%age)</th>
<th>Average Area owned</th>
<th>Average Area Leased-out</th>
<th>%age of area leased-out to owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1 (14.29%)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>5 (71.42%)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>1 (14.29%)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Note: In Row 2, there were three widow landlady, who leased out their whole piece of land.
### Table 7.4.b

**Landlords (ownership holding) in the sample villages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords (%age)</th>
<th>Average Area owned</th>
<th>Average Area Leased-out</th>
<th>%age of area leased-out to owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>2 (22.22%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4 (44.45%)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>2 (22.22%)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.4.c
Landlords (ownership holding) in the sample villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords (%age)</th>
<th>Average Area owned</th>
<th>Average Area Leasd-out</th>
<th>%age of area leased-out to owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>7 (58.33%)</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>74.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>4 (33.34%)</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>41.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.4.d
Landlords (ownership holding) in the sample villages (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords (%age)</th>
<th>Average Area owned</th>
<th>Average Area leased-out</th>
<th>%age of area leased-out to owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>3 (10.71%)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>9 (32.14%)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>97.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>10 (35.71%)</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>64.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>2 (7.14%)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>4 (14.29%)</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>41.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
land and 80% for some occupation with the increase in size holding people prefer to keep some part of their land with themselves and cultivate it. By comparing the three villages, it was found that in the least developed village where productivity is low, the landlord belong to marginal, small or semi-medium size group, while in the advanced region the landlord belong to the semi-medium, medium and large size group. In the mediumly developed village there is no large size landlord. In a low productivity area, it is hard to survive for the small and marginal farmers, so they tried to lease-out their holding and go for service or secondary occupation. While the big farmers can manage to survive in the unirrigated land. But in the high productivity area of Karnal, the big farmers lease-out their land, due to the problems of hired labour in the peak seasons while the small and marginal farmers can easily survive in their small land holdings.

In order to see the relative economic status of the lessor and the lessee, we need a comprehensive index of the total resource position of the two households. Due to lack of comprehensive and reliable information on non-land assets, income from other sources, etc., in the study, we have provisionally taken the size of holding as representing the household's economic strength.

Now we discuss the occupational background of the landlords. In the least developed village, table 7.5.a., out of 7 lessors 57.14% (4) are in service and
42.86% (3) are widow or disabled persons. As discussed above there is no medium or large landlord in this village. In the mediumly developed village, table 7.5.b., out of 9 lessors, 88.89% (8) are in service and 11.11% (1) is a widow landlady. In this village there is no large size lessor. In the developed village, table 7.5.c., 50% (6) landlords are in service and the rest 50% are involved in different type of activities. In this village there is no marginal and small lessor.

Over all these were 28 landlords, table 7.5.d., out of this 64.28% (18) were in service and 17.86% (5) were widow landlady. 3.57% (1) involved in non-agricultural activity and one (3.57%) was doing business. The rest 10.72% (3) were in the other category (one is a vagabond, one is studying at Kurukshetra and one leased out one acre of land for one season for vegetable cultivation). As such majority of the lessors are in service, serving in government jobs or private sector jobs and having small landholding which they leased out.

**Resource endowment of tenants**

Before discussing the question of who leases from whom it would be better to discuss the resource endowments of tenants village wise. I have collected information on the total workers to total family members, machines, service, secondary occupation of tenants and total number of milch cattle per tenant, whether the tenant hire agricultural implements or not is also surveyed.
Table 7.5.a
Occupational Background of Landlord in the sample village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Widow/disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
### Table 7.5.b
**Occupational Background of Landlord in the sample village**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Widow/disabled</th>
<th>Non Agricultural</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Business/Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords</th>
<th>Business/Trade</th>
<th>Widower/disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.5.d
**Occupational Background of Landlord (Overall)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of Landlords</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Widow/ disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0-10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
In the least developed village, table 7.6.a., there were 10 tenants, 4 in the small size group, 5 in the semi-medium and 1 in the medium size group. The percentage of workers to total family members increased with a increase in the size group, it was 47.36%, 59.57% and 85.71% in the case of small, semi-medium and medium tenants respectively. In this no tenant had tractor. The small tenants did not have any oil engine, or electric motor (E.M.) for water pumping, out of 4 tenants in this group, 3 were having a camel each and one tenant hired implements at the time of crop ploughing. There was no service or secondary occupation, but each one was having a milch cattle (Buffalo). The semi-medium tenants were having oil-engines (O.E.) also, out of 5 tenants 3 were having O.E. and 4 were having camel. Here also each one had one milch cattle. The medium tenant was having the oil-engine and camel and had two milch cattle. Resource wise the tenants were not very rich.

In the mediumly developed village, table 7.6.b; there were 20 tenants, 1 marginal (S.C. tenant, who lease-in panchayat land), 4 small, 8 semi-medium, 5 medium and 2 large tenants. The percentage of workers to total family members was as follows: 66.66%, 54.54%, 50.0%, 58.78% and 66.67%, for marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large tenant respectively. The marginal tenant hire agricultural implements, is not having anything of his own, no service and
secondary occupation. Out of 4 small tenants 2 were having a pair of bullock to cultivate, 2 small tenants hire agricultural implements, no service or secondary occupation. Out of 8 semi-medium tenants, 2 were having tractors and its accessories, 6 were having O.E. and 4 were having a pair of ox, 2 hire implements at peak season hours. Out of 5 medium tenants, 3 were having tractors and 2 were having a pair of bullocks. All the 5 had oil engines. The tenants in the large size group were having tractors and oil engines. As we move from marginal to large size group, the resource endowments of tenants gets stronger. The tenants here are more resourceful in comparison to the least developed village.

In the developed village, table 7.6.c, there were 21 tenants, 4 in the marginal group, 2 small, 5 semi-medium, 4 medium and 6 large tenants. The percentage of workers to total family members was 40.0%, 36.36%, 37.77%, 31.14% and 32.04% for the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large tenants, respectively. The marginal and small tenants does not have any machinery of their own, they hire it at season hours. Out of 5 semi-medium tenants 1 was owning tractor and 4 were having a pair of bullocks. In the medium size group, out of 4 tenants 3 were having tractors and its equipments (like thresher, cultivator etc.) and 1 was having a pair of bullocks, and on an average having 3 milch cattle (buffalo). All the large tenants were having a tractor and its
Table 7.6.a
Resources (Economic Condition) of Tenants in sample village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of tenants</th>
<th>%age of workers to total family members</th>
<th>Machines</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Secondary Occupation</th>
<th>Avg. Milch cattle</th>
<th>Hire Agri. Implements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>Oil Engine</td>
<td>Electric Motor</td>
<td>Ox / Camel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.6.b
Resources (Economic Condition) of Tenants in sample village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of tenants</th>
<th>%age of workers to total family members</th>
<th>Machines</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Secondary Occupation</th>
<th>Avg. Milch cattle</th>
<th>Hire Agri. Implements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tractor &amp; Thresher</td>
<td>Oil Engine</td>
<td>Electric Motor</td>
<td>Ox / Camel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey
Table 7.6.c
Resources (Economic Condition) of Tenants in the sample village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size group (Acres)</th>
<th>No. of tenants</th>
<th>%age of workers to total family members</th>
<th>Machines</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Secondary Occupation</th>
<th>Avg. Milch cattle</th>
<th>Hire Agri. Implements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>Thresher</td>
<td>Oil Engine</td>
<td>Electric Motor</td>
<td>Ox / Camel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.77</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
equipments. Each tenant had an oil engine and an electric motor for water pumping. As we move from marginal to large tenants they become more and more resource rich.

The caste structure of the lessors and lessee is as follows:

Total No. of lessors = 28

(a) Lessors from upper caste
(Jat + Brahmin) = 26

(b) Lessors from Backward caste
(Saini + Panchal) = 2

(c) Lessors from Scheduled Caste - Nil

Total No. of Transactions = 41

In these 41 transactions the tenant involved are as follows:

(a) Tenants from upper caste - 31 (75.61%)
(b) Tenants from backward caste - 9 (21.95%)
(c) Tenants from scheduled caste - 1 (2.44%)
Majority of the tenants are from upper caste, and majority of lessors are from upper caste, but there is cross tenancy, the upper caste lessor give land to a backward caste tenant depends on his resource endowments.

**Who leases from whom**

Now we discuss the question who leases from whom? For studying the lessor-lessee pattern we divided the households into the following categories:

1. **Pure landlords**: those who only leased out.

2. **Tenant landlords**: those who leased in some land but were net lessors.

3. **Pure tenants**: those who had leased in all the land they cultivated.

4. **Owner tenants**: those who were net lessees but had some land of their own.

In our sample since there was no ‘tenant landlord’, we have dropped this category. Further since there was only one ‘pure tenant’ in the sample, we dropped this case\(^7\), so that in the following discussion the group of lessors

---

7. In the mediumly developed village there was a scheduled caste tenant, who leased in land, which we dropped; so the number of tenants in this village decreased to 19 from 20.
Table 7.7  
Frequency Distribution of Household by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-I (No.)</th>
<th>V-II (No.)</th>
<th>V-III (No.)</th>
<th>Total (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Owner-Tenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Medium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (a)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Landlords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (a+b)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There was a pure-tenant in V-II who leased-in panchayat land.

Source: Field Survey
coincides with that of 'pure landlords' and the lessee with that of 'owner-tenants'. The size of holding refers to 'operational holding' in the case of all categories excepting landlords, where it refers to the ownership holding. The frequency distribution of households is presented in table 7.7. We note from table 7.7 the category of landlords spread over all size classes and there is sizeable number of 'small' and 'semi-medium' landlord. Among tenants, the semi-medium group predominate, with a sizeable number in the small and medium groups. There are some differences among areas. Among the tenants, in least developed area, small and semi-medium owner-tenant predominate the scene, there is one medium owner-tenant and no marginal or large tenant, while in the developed area the tenants spread in all the size groups. In the mediumly developed village the semi-medium tenants predominate.

We give below the lessee-lessee matrix showing who leases from whom. Since the same landlord may lease out to more than one tenant in separate parcels and one tenant may be leasing in from more than one landlord, there are a large number of lease-units than of landlords or tenants. Table 7.8.d; gives the frequency distribution of the lease units for all the villages taken together. We
record the ownership holding of the landlords (lessor) along the columns and the operational holding of tenants along the rows. The table brings out the numerical preponderance among lessees of semi-medium size followed by medium tenants.

Considering all the villages together (Table 7.8.d), we note that (a) the lessees are clustered in size groups above 5 acres\(^8\), out of 56 transactions, the maximum (18) belonged to the semi-medium group, 14 in the medium group and 12 in the large group. Only 12 are there in the marginal and small size group. (b) A sizeable number of landlords belonged to small and semi-medium groups (owing upto 10 acres). Many of these landlords owning small holdings lease out to tenants with relatively large operational holdings. In our study area the big landlords were leasing out in most cases to tenants with medium and large operational holdings, which is in contrast to Bhardwaj & Das (1975) who have found that the big landlords were leasing out to small tenants. Tenants, with operational holdings larger than 10 acres, leased in land from small and marginal

\[\text{8. While Bhardwaj & Das (1975) noted that the lessees are clustered in size groups below 8 acres, pure tenants are concentrated in sizes upto 3 acres and owner tenants predominate upto 6 acres.}\]
landlords as also from medium and big landlords. It was also noted that the maximum number of semi-medium landlords (19) opted for semi-medium tenants, and the large landlords (4) leased-out to large tenants.

The pattern in the least developed village (Table 7.8.a) is noticeably different from that in other areas. There is a small number of tenants mainly from the small and semi-medium groups. There is no marginal and big tenant. There is no big landlords here. The landlords are mainly from small and semi-medium groups. Tenancy is least in this village, and whatever is these it is limited to a small section of landlords and tenants.

In the mediumly developed village (table 7.8.b) the situation is different. Here most of the landlords belong to small size groups and preferred big tenants (i.e. medium, semi-medium and large). There is no big landlord and no marginal tenant. The marginal tenant can not manage to pay the cash rents and the big landlords can easily manage to cultivate their whole piece of land by themselves given their resources.

In the developed village (Table 7.8.c) there is no marginal and small landlords. Mainly the landlords are from semi-medium size-group and the rest are big lessors. But what is striking here is that the tenants are from all size groups.
Table 7.8.a  
Frequency distribution of Lease Units by Lessee-Lessor groups  
(Least Developed Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acre)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding of Tenants (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.8.b
Frequency distribution of Lease Units by Lessee-Lessor groups
(Medium Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acre)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding of Tenants (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Note: In 3 transactions panchayat land was leased-in which we dropped here.
Table 7.8.c  
Frequency distribution of Lease Units by Lessee-Lessor groups  
(Developed Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding of Tenants (Acres)</th>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acre)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Note: In total 27 transactions have been accounted for. In 3 transactions panchayat land was leased-in. In one outside landlord was involved.
Table 7.8.d
Frequency distribution of Lease Units by Lessee-Lessor groups
(Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding of Tenants (Acres)</th>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acre)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Due to the nature of crops and their higher productivity even the marginal farmers are able to lease-in and can earn profit. Second in the peak seasons especially during harvesting and sowing, there is always acute labour shortage. To avoid this the big landlords prefer small tenants. In some case even the big landlords leased-out to big tenants.

To show the relative significance of the lessee-lesser groups, we supplemented our idea by working out the distribution of leased area in a similar matrix form by lessee lessor groups (table 7.9.a, b, c, d for all the three villages separately and overall, respectively). Our general remarks about the pattern of frequency distribution of lease-units hold broadly for that for leased area well. Overall (table 7.9.d) in 56 lease units 241.5 acres of area leased in or out. Most of it is leased in by the above 5 acres size group. A maximum of 115.0 acres of area leased-in by the big tenants and 56.0 acres by semi-medium tenants. The marginal and small landlords constituted 30.35% of lease units but the area leased out by them to the total area leased out is 4.033% while the number of medium and big landlords is 15 (26.78%), area leased out by them was 131.0 acres (54.24%) of the total.

The village wise study shows that in the least developed village (table 7.9.a), the small landlords dominate the scene numberwise as well as area wise,
Table 7.9.a

Distribution of Leased area by Lessee-Lessor groups
(Least Developed Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acres)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Op. Holding of Tenants (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.9.b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acres)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main holding of tenants (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.9.c
Distribution of Leased area by Lessee-Lessor groups
(Developed Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acres)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>140.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
Table 7.9.d
Distribution of Leased area by Lessee-Lessor groups
(Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership holding of Landlords (Acres)</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
<th>2.51-5.0</th>
<th>5.01-10.0</th>
<th>10.01-20.0</th>
<th>20.01 &amp; above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Op. Holding of Tenants (Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01-10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-20.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01 &amp; above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>241.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey
and the semi-medium tenants leased-in more than the others. In the mediumly developed village (table 7.9.b) most of the landlords are upto semi-medium group and most of the land was leased-out by them, the reverse is the case with lessees, most of the tenants are about 5.0 acres group and most of the land was leased-in by them. Here the landlords are from small and semi-medium group and the tenants are from semi-medium and large groups. In the developed village, (table 7.9.c), the landlords are from semi-medium groups or above it, but the land leased out by the large landlords alone was 69.28%. Same is the pattern with the tenants, the big tenants leased-in 66.42% of the total land, while their number constitute just 30.43%. In this village the lease units transacted in between the big landlord and big tenants were larger in size.

To draw up certain salient features of the lease pattern emerging from our study here: among the lessees, including the semi-medium and above it, size classes are the significant ones, both numerically as well as area wise. The big landlords lease out to big tenants, and significantly the semi-medium landlords lease-out to semi-medium tenants in all the areas. In the developed village 140.0 acres of area was transacted of this 50.00% (71.0 acres) was transacted in between the big landlords and big tenants.
Summary

The foregoing discussion revealed that there has been changes in the tenurial relation in the state of Haryana. The enactment of tenancy laws (Punjab and Pepsu) were meant to regulate the terms and conditions of tenurial arrangement for the betterment of the tenants. The coming of green revolution in the state of Haryana has significantly improved the terms and conditions of tenants in Haryana as compared to the Eastern states. The dominant mode of tenancy prevailing during the early independence period was share tenancy. The green revolution has accelerated the process of transformation of tenurial arrangements from share tenancy to fixed tenancy. The continuous increase of productivity in the wheat and rice belt has further changed the situation in the mode of payment of rent and the composition of tenant. We have found that the composition of tenant is more in favour of medium and semi-medium categories as compared to marginal and poor tenants, because of the heavy working capital requirements for cultivation, the landlords have preferred more credit worthy tenants, who have tractor power, family labour; as compared to the poor ones (Binswanter and Rosenzweig, 1986). Second, the availability of employment in the state due to the green revolution have influenced the poor household to opt for agricultural and other labourer rather than becoming tenant. Even many marginal farmers have leased out their land and became wage earners. Moreover, the mode of payment of rent has undergone changes in favour of shorter duration of
Contract and payment in cash. This arrangement is not only preferable to the landlords who is sure of rent but also preferred by richer tenants, who after paying rents in a position to invest even in the tenanted land. Thus, the gains in productivity was not only shared by the landlords, in the form of rising rents, but also by the tenant.