Livlihood Diversification and Opinion Polls' Analysis: Evidence From Tharparkar-Sindh (Pakistan)

Herani, Gobind M.

15 April 2008

Livlihood Diversification and Opinion Polls' Analysis: Evidence From Tharparkar-Sindh (Pakistan)

Gobind M. Herani*

ABSTRACT

In this paper attempt has been made: (i) to analyse the opinion poll of Thareies about livilihood and its diversifaction, (ii) to identify the livlihood available resources and attitute of Thareis to these resoures. Answers of the poll questions are analysed accordingly and coclusions are drawn from this analysis. Study reveals that Tharis like agriclture and main source of it is the livestock. It is the sustanable source of income. Agriculture is fail due to shortage of rain fall. Goats and sheep are the main much growing vareites of livestock. Every body want to rear it with intrest because, it is easily saleable and cashable. Attitude of Tharis shows that some people are ready to divert from conventional agriculture and adopt the other opportunity. Therefore awareness of new opportunity is needed .

JEL. Classification: D13;D31;D33;I31;J24
Keywords: Livlihood Diversification, Tharparkar, Agriculture, Livstock, Sustainable Source

1. INTRODUCTION

People of the developning countries are poor and presently the concept of livlihood is emerging survival strategy of rural households (Ellis, 2000; Bryceson, 2000). It is observed that rural people are looking forward for the diverse opportunities to increase stabilize their income as determined by their portfolio of assets - social, human, financial, natural and physical capital (Ellis, 1999; Sudan, 2007). In different areas of the world impact of livelihood diversification[1] is different and it varies from negative effects to positive effects like: -the 'withdrawal of critical labor from the family farm' to - the 'alleviation of credit constraints and a reduction in the risk of innovation'. The contribution made by livelihood diversification to rural livelihoods is a significant one, which has often been ignored by policy makers who have chosen to focus their activities on agriculture (Ellis, 1998; Sudan, 2007).

Livelihood litrature review suggests that though exogenous trends and shocks play a significant role in approaching rural people towards a diversified livelihood strategy. Diversification choices are also confidently embedded in the micro-economic reason of farming households (Hussein and Nelson, 1999; Ellis, 2000). The availability of key-assets (such as savings, land, labor, education and/or access to market or employment opportunities, access to Common Property Resources [CPRs] and other public goods) is an evident requisite in making rural households and individuals more or less capable to diversify (Dercon and Krishan, 1996; Abdulai and Crole Rees, 2001, Sudan, 2007). The investment of a proper mix of the above endowments is the starting move of any independent activity. Moreover, labor capability and education determine the capability of finding a job and savings are often needed to migrate. Yet diversification may also develop as a coping response to the loss of capital assets needed for undertaking conventional on-farm production. The decreased availability of arable land, increased producer/consumer ratio, credit delinquency, and environmental deterioration can be indeed important drives towards diversification (Sudan, 2007; Herani, Rajar and Khaskheli, 2007).

Pakistan is the developing country and also agricultural country. As livestock contributes 50 percent of agriculture of pakistan and 11 pecent of GDP of pakistan Economic Survey, (2005-06). It also needs to be analyzed in livelihood diversification. Agricultural land is decreasing due to high growth rate of population and land property is distributed in offspring, making small unit per head; it has played significant role in approaching rural people towards a diversified livelihood strategy.

But in Pakistan district Tharparkar is a big desert belt of Sindh Province and it is rain dependent area. Its main source of livelihood is livestock. It controbutes more than 22 percent of share of the livsestock of

* Dr. Gobind M. Herani is Senior Research Fellow at Indus Institute of Higher Education (IIHE)-Pakistan. He is Editor of Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences, ISSN: 1992-8319. email: g_m_ rathore@yahoo.com

[1] Livelihood diversification is defined as the process by which rural households construct an increasingly diverse portfolio of activities and assets in order to survive and to improve their standard of living (Ellis, 2000).

Sindh Provinece, it is calculated figure from the article of Wasim, (2007b). Mostly Tharis' livlihood is agriculture related. It is obseved that Tharis are fully engaged in work only in the season of monsoon otherwise work load is vey low and they donot utilize their time in proper diverse livlihood. As rains are not confirm source so alternate of it
should be sought (Herani, Rajar and Khaskheli, 2007). These conditions has played significant role in approaching rural Tharis towards a diversified livelihood strategy.

Numerous studies are avaliable related to this topic directly or indirectly Like: Wasim, (2007a &b), about the agriculture and livestock both the studies are related with the livelihood. There are some studies on the Thar like: TRDP Evaluation, 1993, it has evaluated the drought effects inThar since eighties to 1992. Thardeep, Ban-beli and some other NGOs are also working and its reports and leaflets are also available. Their work is mixture of varieties including agriculture and other alternate diversified livilihoods and searching of new other occupations applicable over there. These NGOs and other lots of NGOs are working in Thar and engaged in the awareness and motivation to Tharis for the prosperity. Literature like: (Herani, 2002; Herani, Rajar and Khaskheli, 2007; Herani, 2007; Rajar, Herani and Dhakan, 2007; Herani, Rajar and Dhakan, 2007).
Thar, 2000; Thar, 2001; Dawn. Local, 19; DAWNS - Local, 01; DAWN-Letters 09; TRDP an Introduction) are also avalable. For the livelihood diversification, Education, Skills and Management is impotrant, which helps in finding the alternate of livilhood.

But in these litratures data of the opinions of Tharis is not sought and analysed in detail. Failure of rainfed agriculture due to droughts, uncertain income resources, pressure on common property resource (CPR) the rangeland and searching of alternate diverted resources are the main reasons for conduction of this study.

Attempt have been made (i) to analyse the opinions poll of Thareies about livilihood and its diversifaction, (ii) to identify the livlihood available resources and attitute of Thareis to these resoures.

Organization of this paper is as under: Section 2 is about review of litrature. Section 3 is about methodology, in which data collection technique is dicussed and analysis is given. Section 4 is conclusions and finaly policy implications are given in section 5.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Livelihood resources in the developed countries are on the basis of educational knowledge, technology and services sector, as the case is of the Japan, which is poor in natural recourses. Natural resources are necessary for the development but proper exploitation through improved skills is necessary. People living in country are highly skilled can transform the available resources into something usable for consumption and investment purposes; it will lead to faster economics growth. Livelihood depends upon development, which directly or indirectly needs intervention of Government, NGOs and Community Organizations, etc.

View of Livelihood diversification is supported by a considerable literature and much empirical evidence, that livelihood diversification is generally a good thing for rural poverty reduction. It helps to lessen the vulnerability of the poor to food insecurity and livelihood collapse; it can provide the basis for building assets that permit individuals and households to construct their own exit routes out of poverty; and it can improve the quality and sustainability of natural resources that constitute key assets in rural livelihoods. These effects occur because diversification widens people's options, encourages spatially diverse transactions, increases cash in circulation in rural areas, and enhances human capital by providing those who diversify with new skills and experiences. This literature can be verified by lots of studies (Turner, Hyden and Kates, 1993; Ashley, 2000; Center for Economic and Social Studies, 2003; D'Silva, Wani, and Naganath, 2004; Sreedevi, Shiferaw and Wani, 2004; Reddy and John, 2001; Wani, Pathak, Tam, Ramakrishna, Singh, and Sreedevi, 2002; Sudan 2007; Herani, 2002; Herani, Rajar, Khaskheli, 2007; Rajar, Herani and Dhakan, 2007; Herani,2007, Herani, Rajar and Dhakan, 2007).

As we know that majority of world's poor population is living in Asia especially in south Asia. Asia especially south Asia is depending upon the natural resources, mainly agriculture and secondly upon labor work in deferent sectors. Agriculture has not got significant improvement and the mechanization. Skilled human resources are not available in abundance. Literacy ratio is low, educational; standards are comparatively low. Feudalism system is very strong and lots of natural resources are owned or controlled

by rich and forceful persons of the areas. Land is segmented in small segments and per person land is decreasing to enforce people to select the alternate livelihoods, so diversification opportunities are helping people to help them to construct their own exit routes out of poverty. It is also worth mentioning that by livelihood diversification people become able to produce more production because they become able to use more inputs for the lands. It is also found that richer get more benefits than poor. It can be verified from couple of studies from Asia, Africa, Ghana and some other countries (Sudan, 2007; Herani, 2002; Herani, Rajar, Khaskheli, 2007; Rajar, Herani and Dhakan, 2007; Herani 2007, Herani, Rajar and Dhakan, 2007); Whitehead, 2002; Slater, 2002; Oberhauser and Pratt, 2004; Oberhauser, Mandel and Hapke, 2004; Mkandawire and Soludo, 2003; Mandel, 2006; Hanson, 203; Grant and Nijman, 2004; Oberhauser and Hanson, 2007; Wong ,2006).

Numerous studies show that, while the prevalence of livelihood diversification is now well recognized (Reardon, et al., 1997; Ellis, 1998; 2000), there remains ample scope for differences in interpretation about what this signifies, especially for poverty reduction strategies and policies. Studies of rural portfolio generally converge on the once starting figure that, on average, roughly 50 percent of rural house hold incomes in low income courtiers are generated from engagement in non-farm activities and from urban areas or abroad (remittance and pension payments being the chief categories of such transfers). It is verified by recent studies in Africa (Bryceson and Jamal, 1997; Ellis and Freeman, 2004), as well as past evidence from Africa and Asia (Reardon, et al., 1997). In Latin America, average figure is significantly lower, at around 40 percent (Reardon et al., 2oo1).

Growing body of the literature argues, however, in a different way to the agriculture centered orthodoxy. In Sub-Saharan Africa, diversification can be represented as a failure of agriculture to produce a sufficient livelihood for a substantial proportion of rural dwellers (Bryceson and Bank, 2001; Bryceson, 2002). In Jammu and Kashmir diversification opportunities show that livelihood increase with the diversification (Sudan, 2007). In Nepal it is observed that people depending on farms, many of them lack chemical fertilizers to maintain it sustainable. Richer house hold may supplement farming with incomes from local business or employment (Garforth et al., 1999; Floyd et al., 2002; Springate-Bajinsky et al.,). Yet Livelihood diversification may also develop as coping response to the loss of capital assets needed for undertaking conventional on-farm production (Sudan, 2007).

Some studies show livelihood security between diverse non-farm and farm components, in which the farm component become more productive and diminishes in importance within a diverse livelihood portfolio. Better off house holds diverse to livestock ownership, engagement in non-farm self employment, and diversity of on-farm and no-farm income sources (Ellis and Freedman, 2004). Numerous studies have observed that moving poverty is a cumulative process, often achieved in tiny increments. Assets are traded up in sequence, for example, chicken to goats, to land; or cash from non-farm incomes to farm inputs to higher farm incomes to land or livestock (Ellis and Mdoe, 2003). Fundamental role played by diversification is reduction in poverty and help to overcome that constraint. As Rakodi (2002: xx) states, it is important to keep "people and house hold in which they live at the centre of the development process, starting with their capabilities and assets, rather than with their problems." Neo-liberal policies implemented in numerous developing countries across the globe are an out come of the increasing integration of economics operating on the basis of capitalist forces (Gwynne et al., 2003).

Numerous studies from Ghana examine the link between livelihood strategies and gender relation, especially at the household level (Francis, 2000; Mandel, 2006; Oberhauser and Pratt, 2004). In a study of trade activities among women in Porto Novo, Benin, (Mandel, 2006) concludes that spatial mobility is a critical aspect of access to supplies and markets for goods by women in their urban livelihoods. Some others latest studies are also available for the further going in details to related literature with helps in finding out the livelihood (Rena, 2007; Pollin, Epstein and Ndikumana, 2006; United Nations, 2007). Literature from developed to developing countries reveals that livelihood diversification is significant in the growth and development. Asian studies reveal that livelihood diversification is necessary for the developing countries to come out of poverty.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data Collection Technique

To achieve the purposes of the study both primary and secondary soureces were used. First of all review of available litrature was undertaken, which were based on published and unpublished matewrials incudindg government cencus reports, articles, research papers, thesis as a sources of information for the study. A systematic review of the electronic database references was also unertaken after that primary data was analysed. The primary data was drawn from the original un-published Ph.D thesis of Herani (2002), which is given as under:

2.1.1 Primary source

The methods for conducting inquiries, in order to collect primary data of agro-based industry, can be of three types: (i). Case Study Method, (ii). Statistical Method and (iii). Sample Survey Method. This study is based upon the random samples survey method and collected data is tabulated in tables and analyzed for the defined purpose covering the period 1988-2000 and it is described as bellow:

The Sample: The primary data, for Tharparkar, was compiled through questionnaires filled in by 1771 families from 30 villages of Thar District, which according to Thardeep consists of 2350 villages with the population of 9, 14,291 and covered area 19,638 Sq. KM (District Census).

The whole Thar is sandy with dunes, therefore, traveling for the purpose of collecting data, of any sort, is really very difficult. While selecting the villages for survey, the villages of typical nature were marked in order to get complete information about the whole District. To up date the information till 2007, informal questions were also asked from the people of Tharies and personal experience and observations of the area were used, which helped in drawing conclusion.

2.2 Data analysis

Finaly collected data were analysed and presented in the form of tables, maps, graphs and desrcription. This analysis were the base of coclusion drawn and recommendations were made keeping in view the demographic, physical, social and economic conditions; opinions of Tharis and attitutes towards thelivilihood diversification.. In the following way opinions of participants are recorded and analysis:

Regarding the dependency of employment, 81 % of the total families depend upon agro based industry that employs majority of villagers and is labor oriented and 19 % families say that they depend upon other labor oriented work not concerned to agro-based industry.

Regarding the attitude of labor towards agro-based industry[2], according to total responses, 95 % families say that to run agro-based industry for them is easy in connection of interest and labor work. Other 05 % families say that other work, which is available over there at this time is easy to do and profitable.

Regarding sustainability for meeting needs about agro-based industry; analysis shows the sustainability of agro-based industry for the purpose of meting needs, 92 % families say that livestock is more sustainable for the purpose. 25 % say that dairy products are more sustainable, 39% say that crops are more sustainable, and 82 % say that non-crops are more sustainable.

Livestock

Regarding attitude towards the livestock, analysis is about the attitude towards the livestock, which they want to keep with them for the purpose of income generating? In response the following % is in favor of livestock, for buffalos 5 %, cows 21 %, goats 95 %, sheep 91 %, camels 50 %, donkeys 50 % and horse 1 %.

Regarding Cows, analysis shows that 100 % families say that cows are useful for the purpose of milk for home use only, but not for income generation purpose especially in drought conditions. 85 % families say that cows are useful for the purpose of income generation by itself selling. 15 % say that cows are useful for the purpose of income generation by selling dairy products and 100 % families say that cows are

[2] Agro-based Industry means cultivated crops (agriculture), uncultivated crops grown by natural ways without cultivation and range land used for the purpose of fodder and other lots of uses including the entire product and by- products related to agriculture.

useful for the purpose of income generation by itself and through dairy products only in good monsoon year but not in the year of drought.

Regarding buffalos, according to analysis 95 % families say that buffalos are better for milk, for the use at home, and meet its own fodder expenditure by its production. 87 % families say that these are useful but there is no market of milk over there. 100 % families say that these are useful for only rich people but not for poor because of high cost and high fodder cost. 86 % families say these are expensive because of fodder and water drinking which is not available easily in Tharparkar. 100 % families say that it is difficult to buy for poor people, for the purpose of income generation, because of, their high cost and high fodder cost, which they cannot afford. 97 families say buffalos are income generating in all conditions in every respect

Regarding goats, 100 % families who responded, say that goats are useful for only milk to meet the needs for nutrition purpose. 100 % families say goats are useful for the purpose of income generation by it self selling, and selling its kids and dairy products. 100 % families say that goats are easy to buy and sell, thinking it the small item of production at time of urgent need. 86 % say goats are not expensive, that is why every one can have it easily and its growth rate is twice a year and can live on natural environment fodder in drought conditions too.

Aanalysis is regarding sheep. In it 84 % families say that sheep is useful for their milk for family to meet the needs for nutrition. 100 % families say that sheep is useful for the purpose of income generation by itself selling and selling its products like wool, milk and kids. 100 % families say that sheep are easy to buy and sell, thinking the small item of production at the time of urgent need. 71 % families say that sheep are not expensive, comparatively, that is why every people can have it easily and its, growth rate is twice a year and can live on natural environment fodder in famine condition too.

Rregarding to camels and in it 1- % families say camels are cheap to rear and buy for every one. 19% families say female is more income generating by giving kids. 91% families say, for the income generating purpose, it helps in, ploughing, which is not sure and it giving loss. 76% families say it wants too much fodder in drought due to this it is expensive.

Rregarding horse, no body is in favor of that, the horses are cheap to buy and rear. No body is saying that female horse is more income generating by giving kids. 100% families say it is good for income generating, it also helps in farming, which is not a confirm job/ activity in the Tharparkar area. 100 % families say they require too much fodder and are too much expensive to keep for riding and carrying loads only.

Regarding donkeys, 100 % families say donkeys are cheap to buy and rear. 95% say donkeys are income generating as they are good for the labor work, such as transportation for goods and are too cheap to look after.

Regarding livestock for better income generation, 5 % families are in favor of buffalos. 9 % are in favor of cows. 99 % are in favor of goats. 95 % are in favor of sheep. 96 % are in favor of camels. 100 are in favor of donkeys and 1 % is in favor of horse, on conditions that, if there are so many trees, and the shrubs in the area.

Rregarding loan facilities for livestock, questions asked were conditional that, if livestock of better races are given to them with complete awareness, then, which livestock will be better for them? 9 % are in favor of buffalos, 15% are in favor of cows, 35 % are in favor of goats, 21 % are in favor of sheep, 11% are in favor of camels, 9 % are in favor of donkeys and no body is in favor of horses.
Regarding loans for livestock farming with condition. The condition was, suppose, if you are given only three thousand rupees (micro credit) as loan for goats and sheep and have to buy only one of two, then, which one you will get for the more benefit. Response is 76 % for goats and 24 % for sheep.

Regarding caring of livestock with condition. The condition was that" if one family member gives full time to livestock to look after then, 15% say, can look after 50-100 goats/ Sheep and 43 % families say they can look after 10-20 goats/ Sheep.

Regarding to livestock meeting needs with the condition that, if one family consists on 5 members and has got 20 goats / sheep then 10 % families say that they can meet the needs of the family 100 %; 49 % families say 75 % and 41 % families say 50 %.

Regarding livestock in drought conditions. Here is one condition that " if there is drought and fodder is available at cheaper rates in the area and you have enough livestock to meet the needs of your family " In these conditions 88 % families say that they can save their livestock, by selling some number of it and can met the needs of the family, 12 % families say that, they will be able to save their livestock, if they are given some help of loan. And 0 % family says it does not effect.

Regarding to livestock and their lively hood, 23 % families say that they have got livestock and they can meet the needs of their family by it. 48 % families say that they have got livestock enough for only meeting needs of the nutrition. 7 % families say that they doe not have any livestock and 22 % families say that they have got livestock, which needs more than 50 %.

Dairy Products

Regarding dairy products, 29 % families say that there is market for milk, ghee and butter but not in the village, 49 % say that there is no market for dairy products and 22 % say that there is market but at cheaper rates.

Non-Crops / Rangeland

Regarding rangeland / forest (non-crops), 81 % families say that if plants are not cut to save rangeland in proper manner by local villagers then, it will fulfill the required fodder needs and 19 % families say that other fodder still will be needed at home.

Regarding storing and cutting of vegetation; they are given iron/ cemented sheets for shadow, houses and for storing fodder at cheaper rates, then in response one % say that they still need to cut plants for fuel and house building. 91 % families say that it will save 100 % fodder for future and 8 % families say that more than 50 % reduction will take place in cutting plants.

Regarding plant items of stallation with condition. The condition was that, if their field is sheltered by fencing at least two acres and they leave it for natural vegetation then 82 % families say that natural vegetation will be enough for the next one year for at least ten livestock except horse and buffalos and 18 % say that natural vegetation will be enough for the next six months, after rain, for at least ten livestock except horses and buffalos. 0 % families say fencing is not applicable.

Regarding safety of plants with condition. The condition was that, if they are given iron/cemented sheets along with timber just like bamboo/ eucalyptus at cheaper rates. In the response 86 % families say that plants will be saved about 100 % and 14 % families say that still plants will be cut for fuel at about 2 %.

Agriculture

Regarding agriculture and loans on conditions that if they are given loans for digging wells at their farms then 12 % say that they can produce fodder for the survival of livestock meeting their needs satisfactorily and in addition they can produce some crops for saving. 83 % say that they can produce only fodder for the survival of livestock meeting their needs satisfactorily and 5 % families say that it will not benefit.

Ownership of Land and Agriculture

Regarding land and agriculture, 19 % say they do agriculture on the $1/4^{th}$ share of crop produce. 31 % say that they do agriculture on the share of 1/2 and 11 % families say that they do not do agriculture.

Regarding ownership of farmlands, 58 % families say that they have got their own farmlands and 42 % say that they have not got any farmlands.

Regarding landowner and farming, 18 % families say that they have own farmland and do not do agriculture. 35 % of families have not their own farmlands and do agriculture. 8 % families have not own farmlands and do not do agriculture. 39 % families have own farmlands and do agriculture.

Choice of Work

Regarding choice of doing work on conditions, such that, if in their area labor work is available enough for meeting needs of family and there is rain/ enough water for ploughing. Then for the choice the response is that, 76 % families say that they will leave the labor work and will be prepared for farming taking risk. And 24 % families say that for few days some family members will do farming and other will do labor work.

Regarding interest for farming with conditions for those who do farming. They are asked questions on the conditions that if, they are doing farming under landlord and in the area labor work is made available to meet the needs then asked interest for work. The response in that is 62 % say that they will perform working as a labor and 23 % families say that they will do farming helplessly by the fear of landlord but not heartily. 15 % say that, no such farming is there.

Regarding the main source of income, 78 % families say that at present in drought conditions they wait for the next season for crops but do not search other permanent profession. 22 % families say that they are aware of other suitable professions and 0 % says drought does not effect.

Remittance Economy

Regarding remittance economy, in response 11 % say that any remittance economy received from outside of the area is enough for meeting needs. 38 % say along with remittance livestock and crops are necessary for meeting the needs in present conditions and 51 % say that only livestock will be better to meet the needs if fodder is available in any way.

Debt Status

Regarding debt situation, it shows that 9 % families are farm-bonded loaners. 23% families are loaners to moneylenders. 20% families are not loaners in any way. 26% families say they are loaners to shopkeepers. 22% families say that they are loaners to friends/relatives.

Regarding recovery of debt 72 % families say that if labor is available then they are able to pay within two years. 17 % families say that, if labor is available but they will be able to recover it after 4 years and 11 % families say that they will not be able to recover loan and wages will be enough for only meeting needs of the family and pay the interest.

Regarding debt recovery in small installments basis with condition. The condition is that, if they are given chance to pay their loans on very small installation basis and labor work is available in any kind. Then 69 % families say that they will be able to next three years to recover loan and can meet the nutritional needs of the family; 21% families say that they will be able to meet the needs of the family only but not able for recovery of debt in next three years; and 10 % say that they will be able to recover debt, can make saving, can meet the nutritional needs too in next three years.

Regarding poultry farming, no body has got poultry farm for income generating purpose. 1 % says that they have got it for personal nutrition purpose. 1 % says that they have got informal poultry farm and no body has got formal poultry.

Regarding the suitability of poultry on conditions that if there is market for poultry at profitable rates, then 13 % say that climate is not suitable for poultry farming. 19 % families say that if light is available then they will do it. 29 % families say that they need awareness and training and 9 % say that they do not interest to keep poultry and 30 % say instead of poultry, livestock is better.

3. CONCLUSION

Main objective of the study were: **(i) to analyse the opinions poll of Thareies about livilihood and its diversifaction.** From the detailed study of this article it is concluded that open poll questions have been asked from the farmers of Tharparkar about agro based industry and background characteristic; and opinions are tabulated and analyzed. This data is primarily and is first ever study of Tharparkar on the subject. Questions asked were enough to know the livlihood divesification.. (**ii) to identify the livlihood available resources and attitute of Thareis to these resoures.** We come to know that there are main

three resources: Rainfed agriculture, livestock and natural vegetation available in the rangeland for the purpose of fodder, timber and fuel. There are alternate of it like working in cities, artisanal goods, and common labor work.

From the questions it is concluded that 95 percent families have strong attachment with crops agriculture and livestock rising. They waste their time in expectation for rainfall, which is never confirmed. They do not search alternate source of income generation eagerly. Majority of Tharis is poor and 80 percent are in debt. For the purpose of income generation, every one suggested livestock; and out of it, goat is at first level and sheep at second.

Goat can survive in drought too. Mostly people like the income generating at their own villages. If 20-50 goats are reared then one family can meet, their needs properly even in drought. All types of livestock except buffaloes can be the source of income if fodder is made available by any meant. If poor would be given better races of livestock on loans, refundable on installment basis then up to coming four years they can be independent and self sustained. But these loans should follow the policy as some NGOs are working. It needs some new techniques to be implemented for the proper management. Help can be taken from the studies for like: Herani (2002); Herani, Rajar and Khaskheli, (2007); Herani, Rajar, Zaman and Alam (2007); Herani (2007); Rajar, Herani and Dhakan (2007); Herani, Rajar and Dhakan (2007).

From the literature review it is found that in developing countries people's livelihood is depending up on-farm and non-farm activities. In some areas intervention in the livelihoods by Government and NGO has played a significant role in the diversification. People left or decreased the agriculture and adopted diversified options. Lots of areas show that mixture of adoption of diversified opportunities and agriculture are good combinations and it helps people in improving on-farm activities and making assets like livestock, lands etc., and some people get benefits in different ways. So main result is that people improve there livings style and get prosperous. It is also found that if development takes place in the areas then, diversified opportunities are available for the livelihood. So for Thar more development programs are needed to give the opportunities for diversified livelihoods. In this way Tharies will get more prosperous.

.

4. IMPLICATIONS

Tharis should be given four to five goats per family as a loan and no family should be left without livestock. Recovery be done in the form of livestock after three to four years in installments. Fodder should be managed for three to four years at subsidized rate by government /NGOS through (Community Based Organizations) CBOs. After four years again details opinion poll should be conducted and in the light of this evaluation further program be set.

Simultaneously alternate resources which are available should be encouraged in same above manner. Participation of endogenous/local leadership is must in these programs. Recommendations given in the different research studies of Thar be considered and new research studies should be carried out.

REFERENCES

Abdulai, A. and A. Crole Rees (2001), Determinants of Income Diversification amongst Rural Households in Southern Mali, *Food Policy*, 26: 437-452

Ashley (2000), *Applying Livelihood Approaches to Natural Resources Management Initiatives: Experiences in Namibia and Kenya*. Working Paper 134; Overseas Development Institute, U.K

Bryceson, D. (2000), Rural Africa at the Crossroads: Livelihood Practices and Policies, *ODI Natural Resource Perspectives,* No.52.

Bryceson, D.F. and V. Jamal (Eds) (1997), Farewell to Farms: Deagrarianisation and Employment in Africa, *Research Series No. 1997/10*, Leiden, Netherlands: African Studies Centre

Bryceson, D.F. and L. Bank (2001), End of an Era: Africa's Development Policy Parallax, *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1: 5-23

Bryceson, D.F. (2002), The Scramble in Africa: Reorienting Rural Livelihoods, *World Development*, Vol. 30, No. 5, May

Center for Economic and Social Studies (2003), Andhra Pradesh District Poverty Initiatives Project (APDPIP): Baseline Survey Report in Sustainable Livelihood Framework

D'Silva E, Wani S.P and Naganath B. (2004), The Making of New Powerguda Community Empowerment and New Technologies Transform a Problem Village in Andhra Pradesh.

Dercon. S. and P. Krishnan (1996), Income Portfolios in Rural Ethiopia and Tanzania: Choices and Constraints, *Journal of Development Studies*, 32 (6): 850-875.

District Census Report of Tharparkar 1998, (Islamabad: population census organization, Statistics Division, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad. September 1999).

Ellis, Frank (1998), Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification, *The Journal of Development Studies,* (35) 1: 1-38

Ellis, Frank (1999), Rural Livelihood Diversity in Developing Countries: Evidence and Policy Implications, *Natural Resource Perspectives Number 40, ODI*. http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/40.html

Ellis, Frank (2000), *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, F. and H.A. Freeman (2004), Rural Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction Strategies in Four African Countries, *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4, April

Ellis, F. and N. Mdoe, (2003), Livelihoods and Rural Poverty Reduction in Tanzania, *World Development*, Vol. 31, No. 8:1367-1384

Economic Survey (2005-06), Economic Survey, State Bank of Pakistan, Ministry of Finance, Government of Pakistan

Floyd, C., Harding, A-H., Paudel, K.C., Rasali, D.P., Subedi, K and Subedi, P.P. (2002), Household Adoption and The Associated Impact of Multiple Agricultural Technologies in the Western Hills of Nepal, *Agricultural Systems* Vol. 76: 715-738.

Francis, E. (2000), Making a Living: Changing Livelihoods in Rural Africa. Routledge: London

Gwynne, R.N. and T. Klak, and D.J.B. Shaw (2003), *Alternative Capitalism: Geographies of Emerging regions*, London: Arnold.

Grant, R. and J. Nijman (2004), The Re-Scaling of Uneven Development in Ghana and India, *Tijdschrift voor Economche en Sociale Geografie* 95(5):467-481

Garforth, C.J., Y.B. Malla, R. p. Neopane, and B.H. Pandit, (1999), Socioeconomic Factors and Agro-Forestry Improvements in the Hills of Nepal, *Mountain Research and Development* Vol. 19, No. 3: 273-278.

Hussein, Karim and John Nelson (1999), *Sustainable Livelihoods and Diversification*, IDS Working Paper 69, London: Institute of Development Studies.

Hassan, Arif and Fiona A. Hardy.1993. *Tharparkar rural Development Project (TRDP) Evaluation 1993*, (Government of Sindh, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Save the Children Fund (SCF)-U.K)

Herani, Gobind M. (2002), *A Comparative Study of Agro-based industry of Tharparkar with Canal Barrage Area Sindh (1988-2000) Suggested Techniques Leading to an Industrial Economy.* Sindh: PhD Theses, Department of Economics, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, April: 253

Herani, Gobind M., Allah Wasayo Rajar and Muhammad Ali Khaskheli (2007), Reforming Farmland and Rangeland at Tharparkar: Suggested Implementations for Income Generation. *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 1: 16-36 (Spring)

Herani, Gobind M., Allah Wasayo Rajar, Noor Zaman and Adnan Alam (2007), Knowledge Transformation and Economic Development: The Role of Digital Technology-An Analysis, *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 1: 37-50 (Spring)

Herani, Gobind M., Allah Wasayo Rajar and Ali Akbar Dhakan (2007), Demographic, Social and Economic Changes and Future Prospects of Tharparkar District (188-2006), *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 2:107-128 (Fall)

Herani, Gobind M., Allah Wasayo Rajar and Ali Akbar Dhakan (2007), Self-Reliance Micro-Finance in Tharparkar-Sindh: Suggested Techniques, *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 2:147-166 (Fall)

Herani, Gobind. M (1007), Farming Management in Pakistan: Suggested Factors and Techniques, *International Journal of Management Research and Technology* (July-December) Accepted

Hanson, K.T. (2003), Creative Allocation of Space as a Response to Economics Crisis, In: *Critical Perspectives on Politics and Socio-Economic Development in Ghana,* Eds. W.J. Tetty, K.P. Puplamu, B.J. Berman. Leiden: Brill Academic Publications: 201-222

Mkandawire, T. and Soludo, C. (2003), *African Voices on Structural Adjustment*, Trenton, NJ: African World Press.

Mandel, J.L. (2006), Creating Profitable Livelihoods: Mobility as a 'Practical' and 'Strategic' Gender Need in Porto Novo, Benin, *Tijdschrift voor Economche en Sociale Geografie* 97(4):343-363

Oberhauser, A. M., J.L. Mandel, and H.M. Hapke (2004), Gendered Livelihoods in Diverse Global Contexts: An Introduction, *Gender Place and Culture*, 11(2):205-208

Oberhauser, A. M. and Kobena Hanson (2007), *R-scaling House Hold Strategies: Globalization and Livelihoods in Accra, Ghana*, Working paper, USA: Regional Research Institute, West Virginia University

Oberhauser, A. M. and A. Pratt (2004), Women's Collective Economic Strategies and Transformation in Rural South Africa, *Gender, Place and Culture,* 11(2): 209-228

Pollin, R., G. Epstein, J. Heinz, and L. Ndikumana (2006), *An Employment Targeted Economic Programme for South Africa.* New York: UNDP

Rena, Ravinder (2007), Global Economic Imbalances - A Focus on African Economy, *Bharatiya Samajik Chintan,* Vol.6. No.1: 15-20 (April-June), New Delhi: (A Quarterly Journal of Indian Academy of Social Sciences).

Reardon, T. *et al* (1997), Using Evidence of Household Income Diversification to Study of Rural Non-farm Labour Market in Africa, *World Development*, 25 (5): 735-747.

Reddy, Ratna V., and Soussan John (2001), *Assessing the Impacts of Watershed Development Programmes: A Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Framework*

Rakodi, C. (2002), Livelihood Approach-Conceptual Issues and Definitions, In: Urban Livelihood, Eds, C. Rakodi, and T. Lloyd-Jones. London: Earth-scan : 2-23

Reardon, T., J. Berdegue and G. Escobar (2001), Rural Nonfarm Employment and Incomes in Latin America: Overview and Policy Implications, *World Development*, Vol. 29, No. 3: 395-409

Sreedevi TK., B. Shiferaw and S.P. Wani (2004), Adarsha Watershed in Kothapally Understanding the Drivers of Higher Impact. *Global Theme on Agro ecosystems* Report no.10:24. Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics

Sudan, Falendra. K (2007), Livelihood Diversification and Women Empowerment Through Self-Help Micro Credit Programme: Evidence from Jammu and Kashmir, *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 2:90-106 (Fall 2007)

Slater, R. (2002), Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Contested Livelihood in Qwaqwa National Park, South Africa, *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 168 (2):116-129

Springate-Baginsky, O., Dev, O.P., Yadav, N.P. and Soussan, J., (2003), Community forest management in the middle hills of Nepal: the changing context, *Journal of Forest and Livelihood* Vol. 3, No. 1: 5-20.

Turner, B.L., Hyden, G. and Kates, R.W. (eds.) (1993), *Population Growth and Agricultural Change in Africa*, Gainsville: University Press of Florida.

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and African Union (2007), *Economic Report on Africa 2007: Accelerating Africa's Development through Diversification*, Ethiopia: Addis Ababa

Wasim, Mohammad Pervez (2007a), Contribution of High-Yield Varieties Seeds to Major Food Crops Production, Yield and Area in Punjab – Pakistan, *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 1: 51-57 (Spring)

Wasim, Mohammad Pervez (2007b), Trends and Growth in Livestock Population in Sindh: A Comparison of Different Censuses, *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 1: 58-75 (Spring)

Wani, S.P., P. Pathak, H.M. Tam, A. Ramakrishna, P. Singh and T.K. Sreedevi (2002), Integrated Watershed Management for Minimizing Land Degradation and Sustaining Productivity in Asia. In Integrated Land Management in Dry Areas. Pages 123-147 in Proceedings of a Joint UNU-CAS International Workshop (Zafar Adeel, ed.), Beijing, China. 8-13 September 2001.

Whitehead, A. (2002), Tracking Livelihood Change: Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Perspectives from Northeastern Ghana, *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 28(3):575-598

Wong, M. (2006), The Gender Politics of Remittance in Ghanaian Transnational Families, *Economic Geography,* 82(4):355-382

Thar. 2000. *Thar Drought Presentation (1997 - 1998, 1998 - 1999, 1999 - 2000, 2000-2001).*http://www.un.org.pk/drought/Sindhmission.htm(4-12 June 2000)

Thar. 2001. *Schemes launched in Thar, 23rd May, Karachi*. (Internet source)
Dawn. Local, 19, ctomber.2000.http://www.dawn.com/2000/10/19
DAWNS - Local, 01 November 2000. Oct 31: Various schemes of water, roads, electricity and health care were being undertaken in the desert area of Tharparkar to solve basic problems http://www.dawn.com/2000/11/01/local.htm (HYDERABAD, Oct 31 :)

DAWN-Letters 09 July 2000 in the drought- http://www.dawn.com/2000/07/09/letted.htm
www partnership partnerships and Collaborations. Welfare Help build this site If http:///www.doleta gov/ /www.partnerships/default.asp