

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT

I  
J  
R  
C  
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

*Indexed & Listed at:*

[Ulrich's Periodicals Directory](#) ©, [ProQuest, U.S.A.](#), [EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A.](#), [Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.](#), [Google Scholar](#),

[Indian Citation Index \(ICI\)](#), [J-Gate, India](#) [link of the same is duly available at [Inflibnet of University Grants Commission \(U.G.C.\)](#)].

[Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland](#) with [IC Value of 5.09 \(2012\)](#) & [number of libraries all around the world](#).

[Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 6038 Cities in 194 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.](#)

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

# CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	<b>FEMALE ROLE PORTRAYAL IN INDIAN MEDIA: AN EXPLORATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING IT'S ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS</b> <i>FAREYA SIDDIQUI &amp; Dr. KALEEM MOHAMMAD KHAN</i>	1
2.	<b>ERGONOMIC SEATING: THE SEAT-DEPTH PROBLEMS</b> <i>MURAT DARCIN, MURAT ALKAN &amp; GURDOGAN DOGRUL</i>	5
3.	<b>A RELEVANCE OF TOURISM EMPOWERMENT AND TOURISTS VITALITY: A STUDY OF VIJAYAPUR</b> <i>MALLIKARJUN M. MARADI &amp; Dr. R. M. PATIL</i>	7
4.	<b>DEMONETISATION AND ITS IMPACT ON INDIAN ECONOMY</b> <i>VIJAY KUMAR</i>	13
5.	<b>A STUDY OF CUSTOMER'S ATTITUDE, PERSONALITY AND PERCEPTION TOWARDS INSURANCE</b> <i>RITOBRIITA DUTTA GUPTA &amp; ANURADHA SAHA</i>	16
6.	<b>SUSTAINABILITY OF COSMETIC SALES BY SALES PROMOTION</b> <i>Dr. J. ANITHA &amp; P. VINODHINI</i>	23
7.	<b>PERFORMANCE OF PRIMARY AGRICULTURE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES IN INDIA AND HARYANA</b> <i>VINOD KUMAR &amp; SANTOSH</i>	27
8.	<b>ROLE OF MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF INDIA - AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS</b> <i>VIPULESH.U, RAHUL.P &amp; Dr. MALABIKA DEO</i>	31
9.	<b>CAPITAL STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF HINDUSTAN UNILEVER LIMITED</b> <i>AJAZ AHMAD BHAT &amp; ANKITA SINGH</i>	35
10.	<b>MAIN THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO AGRARIAN CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT</b> <i>DILEEP CHANDRA M</i>	43
	<b>REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK &amp; DISCLAIMER</b>	47

**CHIEF PATRON****Prof. (Dr.) K. K. AGGARWAL**

Chairman, Malaviya National Institute of Technology, Jaipur  
*(An institute of National Importance & fully funded by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India)*  
 Chancellor, K. R. Mangalam University, Gurgaon  
 Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Faridabad  
 Founder Vice-Chancellor (1998-2008), Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi  
 Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

**FOUNDER PATRON****Late Sh. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Former State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana  
 Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri  
 Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

**CO-ORDINATOR****Dr. BHAVET**

Former Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

**ADVISOR****Prof. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

**EDITOR****Dr. A SAJEEVAN RAO**

Professor & Director, Accurate Institute of Advanced Management, Greater Noida

**FORMER CO-EDITOR****Dr. S. GARG**

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Business & Management, Urjani

**EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD****Dr. TEGUH WIDODO**

Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, Telkom University, Bandung Technoplex, Jl. Telekomunikasi, Indonesia

**Dr. M. S. SENAM RAJU**

Professor, School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**Dr. JOSÉ G. VARGAS-HERNÁNDEZ**

Research Professor, University Center for Economic & Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

**Dr. M. N. SHARMA**

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

**Dr. CHRISTIAN EHIOBUCHÉ**

Professor of Global Business/Management, Larry L Luing School of Business, Berkeley College, USA

**Dr. SIKANDER KUMAR**

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

**Dr. BOYINA RUPINI**

Director, School of ITS, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi

**Dr. MIKE AMUHAYA IRAVO**

Principal, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Tech., Westlands Campus, Nairobi-Kenya

**Dr. SANJIV MITTAL**

Professor &amp; Dean, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi

**Dr. D. S. CHAUBEY**

Professor &amp; Dean (Research &amp; Studies), Uttarakhand University, Dehradun

**Dr. NEPOMUCENO TIU**

Chief Librarian &amp; Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines University, Laguna, Philippines

**Dr. RAJENDER GUPTA**

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

**Dr. KAUP MOHAMED**

Dean &amp; Managing Director, London American City College/ICBEST, United Arab Emirates

**Dr. DHANANJOY RAKSHIT**

Dean, Faculty Council of PG Studies in Commerce and Professor &amp; Head, Department of Commerce, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia

**Dr. NAWAB ALI KHAN**

Professor &amp; Dean, Faculty of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

**Dr. ANA ŠTAMBUK**

Head of Department of Statistics, Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

**SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA**

Principal, Aakash College of Education, ChanderKalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

**Dr. SHIB SHANKAR ROY**

Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

**Dr. S. P. TIWARI**

Head, Department of Economics &amp; Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

**Dr. SRINIVAS MADISHETTI**

Professor, School of Business, Mzumbe University, Tanzania

**Dr. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engg. &amp; Tech., Amity University, Noida

**Dr. ARAMIDE OLUFEMI KUNLE**

Dean, Department of General Studies, The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Nigeria

**Dr. ANIL CHANDHOK**

Professor, University School of Business, Chandigarh University, Gharuan

**RODRECK CHIRAU**

Associate Professor, Botho University, Francistown, Botswana

**Dr. OKAN VELI ŞAFAKLI**

Professor &amp; Dean, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Cyprus

**PARVEEN KHURANA**

Associate Professor, Mukand Lal National College, Yamuna Nagar

**Dr. KEVIN LOW LOCK TENG**

Associate Professor, Deputy Dean, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Perak, Malaysia

**Dr. BORIS MILOVIC**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Sport, Union Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

**SHASHI KHURANA**

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

**Dr. IQBAL THONSE HAWALDAR**

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, Kingdom University, Bahrain

**Dr. DEEPANJANA VARSHNEY**

Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Dr. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA**

Associate Professor, Government College, Hodal

**Dr. BIEMBA MALITI**

Associate Professor, School of Business, The Copperbelt University, Main Campus, Zambia

**Dr. ALEXANDER MOSESOV**

Associate Professor, Kazakh-British Technical University (KBTU), Almaty, Kazakhstan

**Dr. VIVEK CHAWLA**

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**Dr. FERIT ÖLÇER**

Professor &amp; Head of Division of Management &amp; Organization, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Economics &amp; Business Administration Sciences, Mustafa Kemal University, Turkey

**Dr. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN**

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**Dr. RAJESH MODI**

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**YU-BING WANG**

Faculty, department of Marketing, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan

**Dr. SAMBHAVNA**

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

**Dr. KIARASH JAHANPOUR**

Research Adviser, Farabi Institute of Higher Education, Mehrshahr, Karaj, Alborz Province, Iran

**Dr. MELAKE TEWOLDE TECLEGHIORGIS**

Faculty, College of Business &amp; Economics, Department of Economics, Asmara, Eritrea

**Dr. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE**

Faculty, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

**Dr. THAMPOE MANAGALESWARAN**

Faculty, Vavuniya Campus, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

**Dr. VIKAS CHOUDHARY**

Faculty, N.I.T. (University), Kurukshetra

**SURAJ GAUDEL**

BBA Program Coordinator, LA GRANDEE International College, Simalchaur - 8, Pokhara, Nepal

**Dr. DILIP KUMAR JHA**

Faculty, Department of Economics, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur

**FORMER TECHNICAL ADVISOR****AMITA****FINANCIAL ADVISORS****DICKEN GOYAL**

Advocate &amp; Tax Adviser, Panchkula

**NEENA**

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

**LEGAL ADVISORS****JITENDER S. CHAHAL**

Advocate, Punjab &amp; Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

**CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA**

Advocate &amp; Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

**SUPERINTENDENT****SURENDER KUMAR POONIA**

## CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** **anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website ([FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)).

## GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

### 1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **THE EDITOR**

IJRCM

**Subject:** SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF \_\_\_\_\_.

(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, **please specify**)

#### **DEAR SIR/MADAM**

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' \_\_\_\_\_ ' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

#### **NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

Designation/Post\* :

Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code :

Residential address with Pin Code :

Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code :

Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No) :

Landline Number (s) with country ISD code :

E-mail Address :

Alternate E-mail Address :

Nationality :

\* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation **etc.** The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.

**NOTES:**

- a) The whole manuscript has to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. **pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration.**
  - b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail:**  
**New Manuscript for Review in the area of** (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)
  - c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.
  - d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB.**
  - e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.
  - f) **The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.
  - g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.
2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters, centered and fully capitalised.**
  3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline number (s), and email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.
  4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.
  5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully italic printing**, ranging between **150 to 300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.**
  6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.
  7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at [www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php](http://www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php). However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.
  8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER. It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end.**
  9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
  10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
  11. **MAIN TEXT:**

**THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:****INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESIS (ES)****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****LIMITATIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE****The manuscript should preferably be in 2000 to 5000 WORDS, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.**



12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR, centered, separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.**
13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.
14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.
15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. **The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper.** The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
  - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
  - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.
  - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
  - The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
  - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
  - **Headers, footers, endnotes and footnotes should not be used in the document.** However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders before the references.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**

**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

**JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES**

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

**CONFERENCE PAPERS**

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

**UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS**

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

**WEBSITES**

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>



---

**MAIN THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO AGRARIAN CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT**


---

**DILEEP CHANDRA M**  
**STUDENT**  
**SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS**  
**UNIVERSITY OF HYDERABAD**  
**HYDERABAD**

**ABSTRACT**

*Agriculture have a great impact on the development of the economy. This article gives an idea of different economists view on how agriculture produces surplus wealth and its contribution to the development process of the economy.*

**KEYWORDS**

agriculture, development

**JEL CODE**

Q10

**INTRODUCTION**

In Japan agriculture was responsible for financing development. There was an increase in the consumption levels of the farm population and this increase was less than the rise in the productivity of agriculture. As a result, the increment was used for financing capital formation. Tax revenues collected from the agricultural sector funded development projects: model factories were built, shipbuilding industry, railroads, investment in education and research (Johnston & Mellor, 1961). Thus, from this example, we clearly see that agriculture can and do play an important role in economic development. Similar results can be seen from the analysis of Douglas Gollin, Stephen Parente & Richard Rogerson (2002) that built a model and with their mathematical analysis concluded that improvement in agricultural productivity is extremely important for economic growth. They also tested their result by examining the data of a total of 62 developing countries (as defined by Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nations) for the period of 1960 to 1990 and found out that improvements in agricultural productivity allow the resources to be allocated for other activities. And, these activities can hasten industrialization. Therefore, we see a clear link between agriculture development and economic development and how it triggers economic growth. Are there other ways in which agriculture development and productivity can contribute to economic development? Apart from agriculture contributing to capital accumulation for expansion of other sectors of the economy there are four other ways in which it can contribute to economic growth. First, expanded demand for agricultural products characterizes economic development. Failure to expand food supplies can lead to volatile food prices thus creating pressure on wages which in turn can have an adverse effect on profits, investment and economic growth. Second, agricultural exports are a source of foreign exchange and can contribute to rising national incomes especially in the early stages of development. Third, it is an important source of labour for other sectors of the economy. Fourth, the countryside is an important market for the industrial sector hence increase in rural purchasing power is essential for industrial expansion (Johnston & Mellor, 1961).

So far we have been able to draw a link between agriculture and economic development and seen how crucial this sector is for any economy. However, there has been a change over time in the role of agriculture in structural transformation. From 1940s to 1960s economic development by classical theorists was viewed as a process where reallocation of factors of production takes place from a traditional, low productive agriculture sector to a more productive capitalist sector. This strategy can be more appropriately called 'industrialization led development' where agriculture was seen as an antecedent to industrialization. From mid- 1960s there was a revision in the development thinking and there was an argument for viewing agriculture as a major driver of growth especially in the early stages of development. Until late 1990s, a market dominant view towards developing agriculture with the Washington consensus was in place which changed slightly with the emergence of post Washington consensus. In the late 90s with the focus on equity and employment, links between poverty reduction and agriculture were highlighted (Byerlee, Janvry & Sadoulet, 2010). Along with these mainstream approaches, there existed a marxian political economy view of the agrarian change and development.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This paper attempts to discuss both mainstream and Marxian political economy approaches. The first section will focus on the mainstream perspective which is divided into five sub-sections mainly, Classical theorists, early neoclassical school, Washington Consensus and Post Washington Consensus. The second section of the paper discusses the Marxist theoretical approaches theorized by Bernstein, Byres and Carlos Oya. The third and final section will try to shed light on why it is important to rethink agriculture's role in development and what challenges a renewed interest in agriculture poses.

**METHODOLOGY**

The research methodology adopted is qualitative in nature. The different views of economists has taken into account and their observation on agrarian change and development was observed. The historical perspective of the different schools of thought is taken into consideration.

**ANALYSIS****MAINSTREAM THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO AGRARIAN CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT****CLASSICAL THEORISTS**

The classical approach was dominant until the mid and late 1960s. There was strong emphasis on development planning, state intervention before markets could flourish. Rosenstein-Rodan (1943) in *Problems of industrialization of eastern and south-eastern Europe* makes a strong case for planned industrialization with state intervention. While talking about what should be done to industrialize the international depressed areas of eastern and south-eastern Europe, there is an underlying assumption that there is excess population in the rural areas and it would be beneficial to transport this labour towards industrialization. The development of the entire region, according to him, should be planned like a one big industry or firm comprising of several complementarity industries. Moreover, there should be active state intervention. This is because state can provide training to labour which is not a very profitable investment for private firms motivated by profits (trained work force might come in contact with another firm and leave the former!). Private investors and firms also have insufficient knowledge to change the entire economic structure of the region. In addition to this, reliance on private investors would mean the process of industrialization would be slower and the rate of investment smaller. Therefore, produce a final equilibrium that would be below optimum which a planning board with active state involvement can achieve. There is also a general agreement in this approach that industrialization would benefit the population of the region and would lead to equal distribution of incomes and raise the incomes of depressed areas.

A similar view by another classical theorist W. Arthur Lewis views economic development as a growth process where factors of production are transported from an agricultural sector to a modern sector. Lewis talks about the existence of a dual economy with a traditional (agriculture) and a modern sector (industrial). It is further assumed in his analysis that traditional sector is labour intensive whereas the modern sector is capital intensive. A fundamental assumption is that there

is a surplus of labour in the traditional sector which is absorbed by the modern sector. This transfer of labour is determined by the demand of the non-agricultural sector and is limited by rate of capital accumulation. Thus, capital accumulation becomes the driver of growth and development while agricultural sector provides labour at subsistence wages (Ray, 2009; Johnston and Mellor, 1961).

#### **EARLY NEOCLASSICAL PERSPECTIVE (MID 1960s)**

In contrast to the macroeconomic perspective of Rosenstein-Rodan and Lewis, Theodore Schultz followed a microeconomic orientation focusing on peasant behavior and raising agricultural productivity. He did not focus on the question of how agriculture should finance industrialization. It was argued that technological investment in agriculture is essential and price incentives should be provided to farmers in order to encourage them to adopt technology. He further added and critiqued Lewis' assumption of surplus labour in agriculture sector. According to him there was no surplus labour and no need for state to mobilize labour into industrial sector. This is because he considered peasants as rational actors (Varshney, 1993). In 1960s, Raj Krishna, an Indian economist tested through econometric analysis if peasants in poor countries respond to changes in price movements. He used inter war period data and showed that peasants are rational actors in poor countries just like the advanced world (Byres, 2003). Thus in the 1960s there was a revision in the development thinking and this revision was based on the core contributions of Schultz (1964) and Hayami and Ruttan (1971) where a case was made for rapid adoption of science based technology to transform the agricultural sector into a modern sector thus delegating it as a driver of growth especially in the early stages of development. Furthermore, strong linkages between growth of agriculture and industry were recognized by economists (Mellor as cited in Janvry & Sadoulet, 2010).

#### **WASHINGTON CONSENSUS ON AGRICULTURE**

The early neoclassical view based on peasants as rational actors and profit maximizers was taken to another level altogether with the coming in of Washington consensus. Williamson coined the term 'Washington Consensus' and proposed it as 10 axiomatic policy suggestions concerned with economic growth in developing countries. The broad policy recommendations included: controlling inflation to facilitate macroeconomic stability, reducing fiscal burden of the government, trade and capital liberalization, privatization and deregulation (Galore, 2000). International institutions like the IMF and World Bank were the torch bearers of this approach. Gaining momentum in the late 1960s this view reached its peak in the 1980s and remained a dominant view until the late 1990s (Byres, 2003). This approach has its roots in neoclassical work with theoretical underpinnings as: existence of perfect markets, perfect competition, perfect information and no transaction costs. Farmers are considered as rational profit maximizers (treated as 'competitive firms') as well as rational consumers. They can respond rationally to price incentives. This approach adopted anti-panning, anti-state view with a pro market stance. Thus, getting prices right became the most important agenda in 'development' and it was considered that individuals could come together on their own to remove the inefficiencies in resource allocation and are prevented from acting in this way by government intervention. Therefore, the belief was the economic forces can naturally lead to economic efficiency in an economy (Oya, 2005; Byres, 2003).

Thus, there was a paradigm shift in development thinking. This was not just as simple as a shift from state-led development to market dominant development policies. In calling it a paradigm shift as Galore (2000) highlights that it is crucial to take into account the change in the disciplinary matrix and world view. In other words, these changes were "the partial globalization of development policy analysis and a "shift from historicism to ahistorical performance assessment" (p.790). The former used international normative evaluations for reference with a combination of nationalist form of explanation that explained what was happening within countries to national policies and factors. Latter, describes a change in theorizing development in 1950s to 1970s based on historical analysis of long term sequences of social and economic change to a performance based assessment. Countries are categorized as good or bad performers based on their performances in different categories such as agriculture, industry, trade, poverty reduction, human development, etc.

#### **POST WASHINGTON CONSENSUS**

Extreme market fundamentalism was replaced by the emergence of 'market friendly' approach to development by the late 1990s. This pointed to a marked revision from the Washington Consensus (Galore, 2000). There was an acknowledgement of the fact that state was not dichotomous to markets, moreover, they are complementary to each other. It was recognized that market failures do occur and state can play an important role in correcting market imperfections and failures. However, there was a continuation of the market efficiency. Peasants were considered as rational actors but Stiglitz in his work on post Washington consensus noted the existence of information asymmetry and transaction costs. Furthermore, he highlighted the absence of certain markets in the less developed countries. Therefore, he tried to put a case for a positive role of state in development. He rejected the 'efficient markets hypothesis' and stressed that markets by themselves cannot generate development (Byres, 2003). Byres (2003) explains the difference between the Washington consensus and post Washington consensus through the difference in treatment of land leasing and interlocking markets within these two approaches. Firstly, the proponents of Washington Consensus consider leasing out land as inefficient because of the disincentives associated with sharing. They are of the view that surplus generated from land is taken away and as a result few resources are left to reinvest and improve productivity. On the other hand, Stiglitz argues that land leasing and sharecropping provides an effective institutional framework for risk sharing especially when other forms of mitigating risks such as insurance are unavailable. Secondly, interlocking of markets where loans were taken from landlords, money lenders and traders on different terms such that landlord may dictate what crops are to be sown using that loan or who should they be sold to or the tenant may work at a particular wage. Such interconnections were considered inefficient by the Washington consensus. On the other hand, Post Washington consensus argued that such market imperfections can minimize costs and lead to mutual advantage thereby dispensing various kinds of risks (risk of seeking employment, risk of agricultural production etc.).

Byres (2003) goes on to challenge this dominant orthodoxy and highlight the gaps in such a view. It is assumed that peasantry is homogeneous and antagonistic class relations and social segmentation of this class is ignored. Underlying the so called rational behavior to price changes is the class situation of the peasants affecting how they behave. For example, large, rich, or capitalist farmers at one end of the spectrum react due to their involvement in the market motivated to earn profit. At the other end of the spectrum, small producers or poor peasants are forced to act because they are trapped in interlocked markets. The former looking for 'true commercial surplus and the latter involves 'distress surplus'. Such differential class responses have been ignored. PWC supporters in reference to interlinked markets talk about mutual advantage and sharing of risks. But, are not these relationships of exploitation rather than mutual advantage? There is a particular class relationship between the landlord (dominant class) who is a lender and the peasant (subordinate class) who is a borrower. This relationship enables a particular form of exploitation; a way of extracting maximum surplus. Another problem with PWC is the failure to recognize the asymmetry of economic power among different classes which is quite implicit in the first two criticisms made before. While low transaction costs make sharecropping attractive for landowners, the tenants have hardly any say. This is because the bargaining process is skewed towards the more powerful one and 'negotiation costs' as talked about by neoclassical proponents are nothing but a fiction. PWC also fails to look into the causes of backwardness. Why does this happen? The interlinked contracts and various modes of exploitation are crucial. It is because they encourage certain kinds of investments which are speculative and unproductive in nature and from which the dominant classes benefit increasingly. Thus, productive investment is at disadvantage thereby has an adverse impact upon the rate of surplus itself. Had there been more opportunities for productive investment, surplus generation would have been greater. Most importantly, the PWC have a very ambiguous view of the state. Stiglitz, himself, while talking about the role of state is lacking a more nuanced and positive view of the state in development. He distant himself from making any arguments in favour of a developmentalist state. The wider and crucial role that state can play beyond education health and roads is ignored. The dynamic role that state can play in transforming agriculture and developing rural areas by using land reforms, changing agricultural policies thereby expanding availability of formal credit, research and extension, etc. is not discussed.

#### **NEO CLASSICAL NEO-POPULISM: DISCUSSING THEORETICAL APPROACHES BY LIPTON AND GRIFFIN**

Michael Lipton in 'Why poor people stay poor: Urban bias in World Development' discusses that the most important conflict in poor countries of the world is the conflict between rural and urban classes. He puts forth two propositions: First, the third world witnesses a development process which is systematically biased against agriculture. Second, the countryside is economically backward due to political powerlessness. He further adds that urban bias rather than equity or efficiency is reflected in the allocation of resources. This biasness is manifested in many policy areas such as investment, taxation and prices. The most important being food prices as they are very critical and help in industrial development. Urban classes are in favor of cheap food prices whereas rural classes are against cheap food. According to Lipton, it is this political power that is a key force in shaping industrialization where agriculture is squeezed and surplus extracted in order to benefit industrial sector (Varshney, 1993)

What is important to understand, Varshney (1993) points out, is that 'transfer of surplus from agriculture' and 'squeezing agricultural sector' are two different things and have two different implications altogether. Former may help agriculture and development whereas latter may hurt both. He further goes on to question and criticize the urban bias theory of Lipton. Lipton did not look into the dynamics of power. Can the power equations change over time? Is power structure static or dynamic? These are important questions that were not answered. Moreover, power structure within urban bias theory is assumed but not at all demonstrated by Lipton in his work. Robert Bates through his work on Africa tried to fill in some of these gaps. He used theories of collective action and said that prices that put countryside at disadvantage help in extracting surplus and in the state of Africa, state benefits are distributed selectively thus creating a divide among the people in countryside. As a result, a collective action in the rural side becomes difficult as each peasant only has a small share in the large agricultural sector. Therefore, communication is difficult. On the other hand, it is easy to organize a small industrial sector where the share of each producer is large in the market (Varshney, 1993).

Other criticisms of urban bias theory includes: First, it neglects political institutions. What are the implications of the way politics is organized on rural interests? Different forms of government multi-party or single party can have varying effects on rural interests. These can be society-centered like in our discussion above where policy biases were a result of power or interest groups. They can also be state centered in the sense that state agencies can either support rural interests or constraint them. Second, what about the role of technology in making agricultural sector powerful? Urban bias theory ignores how agro industries can also engage in lobbying which can benefit agriculture by lowering costs and moderating food prices. Third, it also ignores the non-class identities such as ethnic or religious identities which might become the basis for mobilization and to move forward politically. Lastly, the boundaries between rural and urban might be hard to detect (Varshney, 1993).

Griffin's statement of the neo-classical neo-populist arguments focuses on key structural characteristics in agricultural sector such as distribution of land, other productive resources and political power in the intra-sectoral model. He argues that inequality in the distribution of these resources leads to market imperfections in allocation of resources. In his basic model he assumes 2 types of producers: peasants and landlords. He makes a case for redistributive land reforms: transfer of property rights from landlords to small peasants and landless labourers. This could lead to a widespread reduction in poverty and income inequality and could also replace inefficient agriculture with a more efficient system. How can the redistribution of land become effective? Such a measure would require the elimination of 'landlord bias' and urban bias. Landlord bias favoured large landowners while penalizing small peasant cultivators. On the other hand, urban bias is an allocative bias against the agricultural sector which reduces incentives and thereby the output (Byres, 2004).

Criticism for neo-classical neo-populism: according to Byres (2004) neo classical neo populism presents a response to capital accumulation and offers a utopian alternative. Why is so? This is because it talks about both equity and efficiency at the same time. It excludes questions of class and caste struggles which are deeply rooted in capitalism itself. Moreover, it is seeking solution for absorption of labour in a capitalist sector which is driven by machines. Again, there is the same mistake in Griffin's formulation of treating peasants as a homogeneous class as discussed above in the criticism of urban bias theory. Moreover, there is no mention of the capitalists in the countryside. It has also been pointed out that such a measure of redistributive reforms would require state to intervene but how the state will act is not discussed.

It is important to reflect on the why are the above discussed theoretical approaches called neo classical and neo populist in conceptualization? This is because they talk about efficient allocation and also just like the neo classical theorists views rural class structure as a homogenous group. Even within the countryside there can be further segmentation which is not taken into account. It is called neo populist because there is an emphasis on small farming and call for an egalitarian rural structure.

The next section discusses the alternative view: theoretical approaches by Marxian political economy and will focus on Carlos Oya and Bernstein's conceptualization of agrarian change.

#### **MARXIST POLITICAL ECONOMY**

Carlos Oya (2005) talks about the neoliberal thought in agriculture. The main policy targets of which in the 1980s and 1990s were: removal of subsidies on agricultural inputs, elimination of currency overvaluation in order to incentivize export agriculture, elimination of parastatal marketing agencies so as to encourage private traders, deregulation and liberalization, reduce fiscal debts, bad debts and replacing subsidized agricultural credit with alternative financial institutions. What was the role of state in this framework? State was supposed to enable the market and provide an environment favorable for private investment. What was the agrarian neoliberalism in practice? Liberalization and deregulation of markets combined with withdrawal of the state proved to be mutually inconsistent and had contradictory effects on different classes of farmers. There are methodological limits in analyzing the impact of neoliberal reforms on agriculture. However, the experience of developing countries show that neoliberal policy have proved to be a benefit for some people while there have been some losers on the other end. The winners more than usual have been capitalist and rich farmers who are economically and politically capable of adjusting to changing market conditions while losers have been poor farmers who are mostly dependent on rural subsistence wages. Export agriculture has been uncertain and unable to compete with cheaper imports from advanced countries of the world. There has been price volatility, lack of access to infrastructure such as storage and transport especially with the withdrawal of the state and unequal flow of private investment. Living costs have been increasing at a rate higher than the wages, cultivation costs have increased. There have been negative consequences for equity as people from marginalized communities, widows, elderly, moreover, women headed households have limited access to assets and social capital.

The next major theoretical approach within the Marxist political economy framework is the agrarian question approach. What is the classic agrarian question? What is the agrarian question of capital? Is it relevant today? These are some of the questions that we look to answer while talking about the agrarian question. The agrarian question in classic Marxist theory has been interpreted as the transition in agriculture from feudalism to capitalism. It also discussed how agrarian capitalism is contributing to industrialization. Bernstein (2009, 2011) argues that this agrarian question is actually the question of capital but has never been interpreted that way. Furthermore, he argues that this agrarian question of capital is not relevant in the contemporary times because either it has lost its relevance or has been solved. He also attempts to reinterpret the agrarian question of capital as agrarian question of labour.

The transition of agrarian capitalism in England has been theorized by Marx. A rich account of transition from feudalism to capitalism in agriculture and of the class dynamics was provided by Marx. According to Bernstein (2009, 2011) it is the transition from 'predatory landed property' and peasantry to 'capitalist landed property' and agrarian capital. For him, the classic agrarian question was about the formation of capitalist mode of production. Now, this mode of production included capitalist social relations along with development of productive forces in farming. Feudal landlords were transformed into capitalist class whereas peasant labour transformed to wage labour; overall there was a transition from agricultural to industrial economy as a result of investment of agricultural surplus in industry (Mehrotra, 2012). This transformation was a result of interaction between capital class and its opponents in different countries and historical contexts but Bernstein points out one common feature: use of land reforms to dispossess the agrarian classes of pre-capitalist period. These land reforms took place throughout 1910 to 1970s but between 1940 and 1970 these reforms shaped state-led developmentalism in many decolonized countries of Asia (Bernstein, 2006, 2009). As pointed out that by 1970s, the pre-capitalist landed property as significant social and political force had dissolved which was a marker of the end of agrarian question of capital on a world scale (Bernstein, 2011). The attention now turned to the rural classes of labour.

Under capitalism, agriculture can fund industrial accumulation and is 'taxed' in various ways. The condition of labour is affected or control of state over production increases or promotion of capital accumulation promotes the interests of the richer strata. In the twenty-first century, globalization has an impact on the agrarian question. Generalized commodity production, expansion and diversification of non-rural sources of capital, employment diversification by rural labour, and the decomposition of the 'pure' agrarian labour affected the way in which farming enterprises were organized. It is important to note that here farming is not synonymous to agriculture because the set of relations here are much more complicated than simple relations in the feudal societies between agrarian classes. As a result of globalization, "fragmentation" of "classes of labour" occurs. "Classes of labour", according to Bernstein (2009, 2011), talk about the group of people who are dependent on the sale of their labour power in order to ensure their survival (Panitch & Leys as cited in Bernstein, 2011). On the other hand, "fragmentation" emphasizes on how classes of labour in a capitalist society engage in various wage employment, informal labour and often combine them with small farming. Thus, they are subjected to different exploitation which is in turn intensified along the lines of caste, class and gender. Therefore, what all of this tells is - "the crisis of labour as crisis of reproduction" (Bernstein, 2011, p.455) is unique to the model of capitalism and is further accentuated by globalization. Thus, there is a need to

consider the agrarian question of labour that originated from the scarcity and insecurity of employment and its failure to provide the most basic wage to reproduce in the contemporary capitalism (Arrighi and Moore as cited in Bernstein, 2006).

In neoliberal globalization, capital concentration in advanced economies, insecure employment and fragmentation leads petty commodity producers to combine elements of capital and labour thereby diversifying their income and employment sources. Thus, they are subjected to different exploitation and there is also a possibility of their disaggregation into classes of labour and capital. According to Bernstein the class differentiation among the petty commodity producers is as follows: at the top of the hierarchy are rich farmers and petty capitalists who are able to reproduce themselves. This is an accumulating class and also pursues diverse economic activities. In the middle are medium farmers or petty producers who are able to produce on a simple basis. Basically, means that they are not accumulating like the petty capitalists. They combine both family and wage labour, thus, lease in and lease out land whenever possible on sharecropping arrangements, may hire wage labour and also can work on other people's lands. This diversification gives them the power to exploit but at the same time can be exploited because the partition between middle or poor farmers is blurry. Lastly, at the bottom are the classes of labour which are unable to reproduce themselves. It is very difficult for them to secure a living on a daily basis. They are highly mobile across locations as they are looking for work and engaged in various types of non-agricultural labour, self-employment activities along with small farming. They also show high mobility across social division of labour (Mehrotra, 2012). Thus, we see how Bernstein re-interpreted the classical agrarian question as the question of capital and how he rejected the agrarian question of capital in favour of agrarian question of labour in contemporary times. This is because globalization has transcended local and regional borders and made the linkages between national agriculture and national industry weak. The impact of globalization is intensified as the financialization of capital and its sources are diversified and take place across nations. However, Byres criticizes the generalization of rejecting the classical agrarian question of capital. He points out that a successful transition to capitalist agriculture is limited to some regions only such as Punjab, Haryana and West UP in India. He argues that pre-capitalist rural classes do exist in other regions (Mehrotra, 2012).

## CONCLUSION

Throughout the paper it has been highlighted why agriculture as a sector is important and how different approaches have looked at development as a process and the role they have given to agriculture in this process. In this final section, we again go back to answering some very basic questions. Why is it important to rethink the role of agriculture in development? What are the challenges posed by the renewed interest in agriculture?

Structural transformation still understands agriculture as handmaiden of industrialization. However, the broad recognition that started in 1970s with the increased focus on equity and employment went on to establish links between agriculture and poverty reduction by the 1990s. It has been increasingly recognized by governments, donors, international organizations such as World Bank, IMF that the realization of global agenda is nearly impossible without an explicit focus on 'agriculture for development' rather than 'agriculture in industrialization'. Today the circumstances in which agriculture operate has changed drastically. Globalization (rapid growth for agricultural exports, opening up of potential markets for importing food for developing nations etc.), new technologies new biotechnologies, emerging markets for production of biofuels etc. offer a scope for faster growth. Institutional innovations in organizations, governance and civil society along with decentralization of state in certain areas but a smaller state presence in services like finance, insurance, greater role for private sector all offer reasons for why a dynamic view on policymaking related to agriculture is required. Agriculture plays multiple roles; however, its role in five central pillars of development agenda is crucial which are as follows: agriculture triggering economic growth, poverty reduction, addressing widening disparities, its continuing role in food security and finally the link between agriculture, natural resources and environment which makes harnessing agriculture as a steward of the environment.

Renewed interest in agriculture and the commitment to 'agriculture for development' presents two challenges. First, it is important to manage the political economy of agriculture. Political economy of agriculture has been changing and this change has been in the favor of agriculture owing to the volatile prices, growing recognition of agriculture's multiple roles and emergence of increased decentralization and other new approaches based on participation and public-private partnerships. This management is important for overcoming policy biases, underinvestment and mis-investment. Second, it is extremely important for strengthening governance for policy implementation especially in developing countries. It is crucial for governments to coordinate between sectors, to involve private sector and civil society in development initiatives. Community participation becomes important as it facilitates usage of local knowledge, social capital and creativity. Engagement of the civil society is equally important as NGOs and other stakeholder organizations can contribute in making governance more efficient. International commitments and support also becomes critical and can prove very helpful in achieving the development agenda. Institutional reforms can facilitate greater coordination among international agencies and enhance the capacity of agriculture as a sector (Byrlee, Janvry, Sadoulet, 2010). What needs to be done is set the priorities for different nations according to their own existing economic, social and political structures. Thus, we see even in the twenty-first century agriculture occupies an extremely important place in the development agenda.

## REFERENCES

- Bernstein, H. (2006). Is there an agrarian question in the 21st century *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 27(4), 449-460.
- Bernstein, H. (2009). Agrarian questions from transition to globalization. In A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi & C. Kay (Eds), *Peasants and Globalization: Political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 239-262). Oxon: Routledge.
- Byrlee, D., De Janvry, A., & Sadoulet, E. (2009). Agriculture for development: Toward a new paradigm. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.*, 1(1), 15-31.
- Byres, T. J. (2003). Agriculture and development: the dominant orthodoxy and an alternative view. *Rethinking development economics*, 1, 235-250.
- Byres, T. J. (2004). Neo-Classical Neo-Populism 25 Years On: Déjà Vu and Déjà Passé. Towards a Critique. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 4(1-2), 17-44.
- Gollin, D., Parente, S., & Rogerson, R. (2002). The role of agriculture in development. *American Economic Review*, 160-164.
- Johnston, B. F., & Mellor, J. W. (1961). The role of agriculture in economic development. *The American Economic Review*, 566-593.
- Mehrotra, I. (2012). *Political economy of rural female labour: a study of labour relations in east Uttar Pradesh (UP), India* (Doctoral dissertation, SOAS, University of London).
- Oya, C. (2005). Sticks and carrots for farmers in developing countries: Agrarian neoliberalism in theory and practice. 127-134.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P. N. (1943). Problems of industrialisation of eastern and south-eastern Europe. *The economic journal*, 202-211.

## **REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**Dear Readers**

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as, on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com).

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

**Academically yours**

Sd/-

**Co-ordinator**

## **DISCLAIMER**

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.



## ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

### *Our Other Journals*

