

Sociological Analysis Of Family Farming As A Sustainable Developmental Approach In District Sheikhpura, Pakistan

*Hira Murtaza*¹, Zakir Hussain*², Muhammad Naeem*³, Sobia Gulshan*⁴ & Javaria Khan*⁵

¹Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan.

²Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan.

³Department of Sociology, GC University Faisalabad Layyah Campus, Pakistan.

⁴Department of Sociology, Bahauddin Zakriya University Multan,, Pakistan.

⁵Department of Sociolog Bahauddin Zakriya University Multan, Pakistan.

Citation: Muratza, H., Hussain, Z., Naeem, M., Gulshan, S & Khan, J. (2023). *Sociological Analysis of Family Farming as a Sustainable Developmental Approach in District Sheikhpura, Pakistan*

Abstract

Family farming is represented by a family group of producers who produce for their own livelihood. From a sociological perspective; the family farm is associated with family values such as solidarity, unity, and dedication. From an economic perspective, the family farm is associated with entrepreneurial skills, choice, risk, and individual achievement. In Punjab, Pakistan, where agriculture is the lifeline of the country's economy, family collaboration in farming and family farming are associated with traditional social organizations. The current research was conducted on the socioeconomic status of family farmers and the issues they faced. Farmers in the district of Sheikhpura was make up the universe of the present study. The respondents were selected by using simple random sampling technique. At the first stage one tehsil (Sheikhpura) out of four Tehsils were selected by using simple random sampling technique. At the second stage three villages Dera Fakhurdin Kharianwala, Chicho Ki Malyan, Nawan Kot Bhikhi were selected randomly from selected tehsil. The study was conducted in rural areas of district Sheikhpura. The sample size of one hundred and eighty was selected by using simple random technique. The women were interviewed by taking women from each selected household, 60 women from each selected villages. Interviewing schedule was designed as a data collection tool and collected data were analyzed by using chi-square test and Gamma statistical techniques, statistical package for social sciences SPSS. The major findings of the study are following: The findings regarding the tenancy status of the respondents showed that a good percentage (46.1%) of the respondents were cultivating their own land. Most of the respondents 64.8 percent admit that family farmers help to establish a better supply chain for their products With the statement of family help or not, a great majority (70%) of the respondents agree that they share different ideas.48.9% of the respondents were agreed with the statement they provide unpaid labour. The study reveals that family farming facilitate in social activities. Main findings shows that majority (64.4%) of the respondents were agree that family help to Biraderi by taking proposal. Majority 63.9% of the respondents were agreed with the statement they share their dairy products.

Introduction

The family farm is identified with family values such as unity, consistency, and dedication from a sociological perspective; from an economic

perspective, the family farm is connected with employability skills, selection, hazard, and individual performance. Family farming is more than a professional occupation as a result of the

relationship between these two viewpoints. It represents a way of life focused on values and customs about how to live and work. The family can be viewed as a conduit between the farm and the non-farm world, transporting energy, materials, and thoughts. Family farms are a pillar of the European agricultural system on which the prevailing Farming System is centered, but they also play a significant role in the agricultural environment of the United States of America Calus and Huylensbroeck (2010).

Family farming has a number of definitions but the main point of all definition is the labour force of family and the involvement of the family in managing the farm-related activities. The family farmers are the part of rural culture. The major concept of family farming is the dependence of the family on agricultural products (FAO, 2014).

Family farming and smallholders play an essential role in food production, sustaining rural economies and maintain of biodiversity. Conservation of natural resources and the diversity of agricultural activities are at the heart of family farming. For small farmers, land, water, biodiversity and soil inputs are viewed as a long term investment that must be preserved. By managing natural resources and landscape, these farmers are able to improve agro ecosystems to adapt to climate change today. This supports the idea that these family farms aimed at sustainable productivity growth of agricultural production and natural resource protection (Toader and Roman, 2015).

Family farming can be seen almost all over the world but it is more common practice in developing countries. It is very beneficial for developing nations. It fulfill different function which are essentials for living of the developing nations. Family farmers are performing a duty to produce food which is essentials for the well-being of humanity in the world (Di and Miller, 2012).

The fact that agricultural activities totally depend upon the structure of family farming shows its linkages to the development of rural areas. The basic meaning of family farming is to organize the production in the field of agriculture, forestry and all the fields are managed and developed by family farming which is mainly dependent on family labour. Family farming have a great part in the field of food production in developing and developed countries (IYFF, 2014).

For sustainable rural development, adequate conditions for family farming necessary. It is considered that labour, land and financial capitals are essential for family farming. These characters can clearly define the fate of family farming. The other fundamental characters for family farmers are land tenure ship, ownership and distribution of land on the next generation. The land owner family farm are playing their great role in sustainable development of rural communities (Brandao, 2007).

Family farming is providing many forms of skill development and employment to the family farmers. It is way to teach the farmers regarding different social needs. They are learning about decision making and problem-solving techniques. In this way, the farmers can adopt modern agricultural practices to enhance their financial capacity. Family farmers are getting funds to invest on hired labour, poultry and livestock feed (Oni et al., 2010).

All the members of farm-families are working at their farm and getting a large amount from agriculture for their living. The output which is derived by the farm families may be in the form of goods and money. The farmers are working at the farm and they are doing a number of farm related task including producing crops, rearing animals and raising forestry. These tasks are driven by the family labour but a large portion of these tasks are being completed by the female member in the family labour. The female family

member are playing their role in farm related activities including working for production, also for protection and working for selling goods and marketing of agricultural products (Saito, 2000).

There is a large majority (61%) of small and family farmers in the developing countries. The conventional system of agriculture cannot meet the basic needs of the farmers in developing countries. The farmers in these countries cannot afford expensive agriculture machinery and other inputs including extra labour for modern agricultural practices. In-fact, in developing nations farmers are facing challenges regarding farming including low production and high inputs cost (Reganold and wachter, 2016).

The main challenges which are being faced by the family farmers includes difference in actual and potential yield, difficulties to manage major soil nutrients like nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, supply of certified seeds and barriers related to market like poor access to due to oil transport facilities and negative role of middleman. Further challenges being faced by family farmers and small land holders, are the lack of education and research. There is need to solve these challenges so that there will be significant means of income for small land holders (Zeynab et al., 2017).

Objectives

- To investigate the socio-economic status of respondents.
- To study the importance of the family farming in rural social organization.
- To study the role of family farming in food production and agricultural functions.
- To study the relationship between the socio-economic status of the respondents and role of family farming in sustainable development.
- To study the role of family farming in family economics.

Review of literature

Sofer (2001) stated that the concept of family farming can be clear and understood as it is economy and social formation. It can be defined by three main characteristics. Firstly, the family farming is the land owner farming and operated by different family units. In this way, family farming is different from other cropping patterns like corporate agriculture and share cropping system in which there may a person who is the land owner and the other group of people or individual is working on his land. Secondly, each type of agriculture activity is undertaken by family labour force. It is done according to the controlled condition undertaken by the family labour and family units. The important thing is different type of labour require at different time e.g., at harvesting and other critical time at that time the labour can be hired on wages. But family farming mostly depends on the family labour. The third one and most Important is that farm families depend and get income from selling the agriculture products. The agriculture is not a hobby for family farmers, but it's a major means of their livelihoods.

FAO (2013) reported that family farming is very significant for the sustainable progress of agriculture. Family farming is also important for making the decision regarding management of natural resources. Family farming is essential key to achieve food security not only for themselves, but also for increasing population. Their family member are also responsible for providing food to non-farming population. Their effort also support and respond to the economic pressures regarding sustain rural development. They are providing the opportunities for the daily wages workers to survive and taking part in the betterment of their country.

Master et al., (2013) found that most of labour is working at their farm. Farm related task are done by family labour. They are a number of reason for using the family labour as it is a difficult task to watch the paid labour. It is not economically suitable for the farming families to

use paid labour. Moreover, the work ratio is also very high in the family labour as compared to the paid labour. The family labour is more skilled and experienced and most of activities can be done more efficiently and at lower cost with help of family labour. The member of family farming are highly motivated, knowledgeable and well informed by the local condition. They are also willing to work for more hours at the crucial time.

Shafique and Azam (2017) stated that the goal of this study is to look at Pakistan's agriculture and how it affects the economy. The agricultural issues and their solutions are also highlighted in this paper. This research study examines the agriculture sectors, including major and minor crops, fruits, animals, and forestry. Water pollution, poor management, natural disasters, and other difficulties in agriculture have a negative impact on Pakistan's economy. According to the findings, there are oscillations in Pakistan's economic growth (GDP) as a result of agriculture challenges, and as a result, Pakistan's economic growth would decelerate. Due to these instabilities, total factor of production will also slow.

Rasheed and Mahmood (2018) stated that Agriculture is the most important component of rural areas of Pakistan is socioeconomic structure and the primary source of income for the rural people. This research report was taken from the research's doctoral dissertation. The third is the subject of this investigation. This research looks at how modernization of agriculture is modifying farming-related socio-cultural local cooperative networks, labour exchange among farming families, indigenous knowledge sharing, seed, dairy products, animals, and vegetables, among other things. The article's main finding was that only 10% of respondents donated milk to their relatives, whereas 80.2 percent did not give milk to their relatives and 9.8% did not have animals. Only 4.7 percent of respondents gave milk to their Biraderi family, while 85.6 percent did not; 11.8 percent of respondents gave

"Makhan" to their relatives, while 78.7% did not. Seasonally and infrequently, farming families collaborate in this way. The major purpose of this research is to increase production among rural people in Punjab, Pakistan, through examining cooperative networks. The research was carried out in Pakistan's rural Punjab for a PhD dissertation in 2018.

Rahman et al. (2014) concluded that farm size, home income, education, agricultural credits, long-term and short-term loans all have significant effects on per acre yield and sustainable rural development in Pakistan. The family based farming is also supporting the family farmers to live in a better way. Family peasant are often jointly shared with different type of business strategies to access the land and the capital to increase their family participation. Therefore, it is sure that the family of the family farmers, in fact, is extremely effective.

Sabir et al. (2012) stated that for this purpose in the years 2008-09, a survey of central Punjab was carried out. The study used two types of samples. The results of statistical analysis demonstrated that cooperative farmers' per-acre use of agri-inputs and outputs for all cash crops was considerably different and higher than non-cooperative farmers'. The benefit cost ratio for cooperatives was 38 percent greater than for non-cooperatives, with 1.98 and 1.43 for the two categories, respectively. However, due to a lack of education and conflicts among the members, these cooperative farming operations were unable to continue for an extended period of time. These cooperative agricultural techniques, however, were unable to continue for a lengthy period of time due to a lack of understanding and disagreements among the members. Cooperative agriculture, according to the data, is more advantageous and cost-effective than private agribusiness. However, a lack of qualifications, an honorable boss, and participant disagreements exposed their brief unity.

Methodology

The study is designed to determine the sociological analysis of family farming as a sustainable developmental approach in district Sheikhpura. Simple random sampling technique was used for the selection of respondents. A questionnaire tool was used for data collection. Study were conducted in rural areas of Sheikhpura. At the first stage one tehsil (Sheikhpura) out of four Tehsils were selected by using simple random sampling technique. At the second stage three villages Dera Fakhurdin Kharianwala, Chicho Ki Malyan, Nawan Kot

Bhikhi were selected randomly from selected tehsil. The study was conducted in rural areas of district Sheikhpura. The sample size of one hundred and eighty was selected by using simple random technique. The women were interviewed by taking women from each selected household, 60 women from each selected villages. Interviewing schedule was designed as a data collection tool and collected data were analyzed by using chi-square test and Gamma statistical techniques, statistical package for social sciences SPSS.

Results and discussion

Table 1: Percentage distribution of the respondents according to their family contribution in satisfying socio economic needs

Socio-economic needs	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Percent
Providing food to the whole family	48.3	48.9	2.8	100
Providing employment to each adult	34.4	61.7	3.9	100
Transport facilities	43.9	50.6	5.8	100
Social network	35.0	53.9	11.1	100

In table 1 results shows that 2.8 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family providing food to the whole family. 48.9 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement that family providing food to whole family. 48.3 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement that family providing food to the whole family. The main findings shows that majority 48.9 percent of the respondents are neutral. 3.9 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family farming providing employment to each adult. 61.7 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 34.4 percent of the respondents are agree with statement. So the major findings shows that majority 61.7 percent of the respondents are

neutral. Results shows that 5.8 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family farming provide transport facility. 50.6 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 43.9 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement.so the main findings shows that majority 50.6 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement. 11.1 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family farming help to enhance the social network among the people. 53.9 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 35.0 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement. The major findings shows that 53.9 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement.

Table 24: Percentage distribution of the respondents according to the opinion about family economics

Family economics	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not at all	Percent
Are you satisfied with your current financial condition	47.8	44.4	7.8	100
Farming providing of better status of living	56.7	39.4	3.9	100
Fulfilment of household expenditure	50.6	44.4	5.0	100
Help to improving living standard	54.4	39.4	6.1	100
Help to improving house condition	56.7	36.6	6.7	100
Facilitate to providing education	48.9	38.3	12.8	100
Facilitate to availing health facilities	57.2	32.2	10.6	100

Table 24 shows that 7.8 percent of the respondents are not satisfied with the current financial condition, 44.4 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the financial condition. While 47.8 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the financial condition. The major findings shows that majority 47.8 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the financial condition. 3.9 percent of the respondents are not satisfied with the statement that family farming providing better status of living, 56.7 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 39.4 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the statement. The findings shows that majority 56.7 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement that family farming providing better status of living. 5.0 percent of the respondents are not agree with statement of family farming fulfill the household expenditures 50.6 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 44.4 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the statement of family farming fulfill the household expenditures. So the main findings show that 50.6 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement. 6.1 percent of the respondents are not agree with the statement that family farming help to improving living standard, 54.4 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 44.4 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied. The

findings shows that majority 54.4 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement that family farming help to improving living standard. 6.7 percent of the respondents are not agree with the statement that family farming does not help to improving the house condition, 56.7 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 36.6 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the statement that family farming helps to improve the house condition. Major findings shows that majority 56.7 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied. 12.8 percent of the respondents are not agree with the statement, 48.9 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 38.3 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the statement that family help to provide education. The major findings shows that majority 48.9 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement that family helps to provide education. 10.6 percent are not agree with the statement about family farming facilitate to availing health facilities, 57.2 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the statement and 32.2 percent of the respondents are somewhat satisfied with the statement that family farming facilitate to availing health facilities. Main findings shows that majority 57.2 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement that family farming provide health facility.

Table 21: percentage distribution of the respondents according to family farming facilitate in social activities

Social activities	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Percent
Help to Biraderi by taking proposal	64.4	32.8	2.8	100
Share dairy products	63.9	35.0	1.1	100
Storage of seed	46.7	46.1	7.2	100
Participation in occasional activities	53.3	38.9	7.8	100

Table 21 shows that 2.8 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that help to Biraderi by taking proposal. 33.8 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 64.4 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement that help to Biraderi by taking proposal. The major findings shows that majority 64.4 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement. 1.1 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family share dairy products with others. 35.0 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement that family share dairy products with others and 63.9 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement. Main findings shows that majority 63.9 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement. 7.2 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family help in storing food. 46.1 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 46.7 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement. So the main findings shows that majority 46.7 percent of the respondents are agree with statement that family help in storing food. 7.8 percent of the respondents are disagree with the statement that family participate in occasional activities, 38.9 percent of the respondents are neutral with the statement and 53.3 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement that family participate in occasional activities. so the major findings shows that majority 53.3 percent of the respondents are agree with the statement.

Conclusions

Following conclusions were drawn on the basis of data analysis and interpretation: It was depicted that the family farmers were doing crop and livestock farming in the study area. Fellow farmers were the major source of agricultural information for family farmers. Male family members were responsible for decision making, cultivation and preparation of land, sowing, irrigation, hoeing, and harvesting. However, female family members were also taking part in family farming like they were doing activities including picking up fruits and vegetables, fodder cutting and harvesting of crops. They were also responsible for livestock related activities. It appeared from the findings that the family farmers were facing some major challenges including poverty, food insecurity, inflation, small landholding, poor agricultural return due to the use of conventional methods of farming and low yield, shortage and poor-quality water for agriculture, and the lack of basic agricultural facilities. The future challenges predicted by the family farmers included land division as future generations will get small piece of land for family farming and, high rates of fuels and agricultural inputs. There will also be some other challenges in the future like shortage of canal water, climate change, poor access to modern agricultural inputs, and shortage of labour and poor sustainability of family farming. It was also found

that family provide different opportunities like owning their own land, family labour, increasing livestock, and rented land and farm machinery for the family farmers for better farming. The findings revealed that the young generations were not interested to work at the farms due to various hampering factors including small landholding, high production cost, poor agricultural marketing, demotivation, inflation, unwillingness of youth to sacrifice their wishes, social injustice, busy in studies (studentship) and lack of success stories of young family farmers. The family farmers were satisfied regarding their household needs. They were also satisfied regarding the educational and health related needs but they were not satisfied regarding the ability to have savings.

References

- Azam, A. and M. Shafique. 2017. Agriculture in Pakistan and its Impact on Economy. A Review. *Inter. J. Adv. Sci. Technol.* 103: 47-60.
- Brandao, C. 2007. Alternatives of research and analytical methods. *J. Rural Stud.* 1:37-64.
- Calus, M. and G.H. Van 2010. The persistence of family farming: A review of explanatory socio-economic and historical factors. *J. Rural Stud.* 41:639-660.
- Di, D.M. and G. Miller. 2012. Farming and tourism enterprise: Experiential authenticity in the diversification of independent small-scale family farming. *Tourism Management.* 33:285-294.
- FAO.2013. Smallholder integration in changing food markets. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization. Available at: www.fao.org access on 13-5-2022
- IYFF (International Year of Family Farming). 2014. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome Italy Family-Farming-2014@fao.org.
- Master, W.A., A.D. JURFELD, C.D. Haan, P. Hazell, Jayne and M. Reardon. 2013. Urbanization and farm size in Asia and Africa: Implications for food security and agriculture research. *Glob. Food Sec.* 2:156-165.
- Oni, S.A., L.L. Maliwichi and O.S. Obadire.2010. Socio-economics factors affecting family farming and household food security: A case of Thulamela local municipality in Vhembe District of Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Afr. J. Agri. Res.* 17:2289-2296.
- Rahman, S., A. Hussain and M. Taqi. 2014. Impact of agricultural credit on agricultural productivity in Pakistan: An empirical analysis. *Inte. J. Adv. Res. Manag. Soc.* 3:125-135.
- Rasheed, A and B.Mahmood. 2018. Modern farming and cooperation: A sociological analysis of farming families in rural Punjab, Pakistan. *J. WALIA.*34:198-203.
- Regonald, J.P. and J.M. Wachter. 2016. Organic agriculture in the twenty first century. *Nature Plants.* 2:152-161.
- Sabir, M.H., S.H. Tahir, S. Arshad and S.B. Nasir. 2012. Future of cooperative farming in Pakistan. *J. Biol. Agric. Health.* 2:42-47.
- Saito, O. 2000. Marriage, family labour and the stem family household: Traditional Japan in a comparative perspective. *Continuity and Change.* 15:17-45.
- Sofer, M. 2001. Pluriactivity in the Moshav: Family farming in Israel. *J. Rural Stud.* 7:363-375.
- Toader, M. and G.V. Roman. 2015. Family farming—examples for rural community's development. *Agri. Sci. Procedia eng.* 6:89-94.
- Zeynab, J., A. Hossein, T. Fatemah, Z. Kumars, G., P.V. Steven and L. Philippe. 2017. Organic

farming and small scale-farmers: Main opportunity and challenges. J. Ecol. Econ. 132:144-154.