Competitive Social Sciences Research Journal (CSSRJ), 3(2), 300-309
ISSN (Print):2708-9029,ISSN(Online):2708-9037
www.cssrjournal.com

THE SOCIOLOGICAL AND AGRICULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONAL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY IN GILGIT BALTISTAN, PAKISTAN

***Zakir Hussain**
Department of Rural Sociology University of agriculture Faislabad
Kanwal Asghar
Department of Rural Sociology University of agriculture Faislabad
Farkhanda Anjum
Department of Rural Sociology University of agriculture Faislabad
Muhammad Iftikhar
Department of Agricultural extension University of Agriculture Faisalabad Pakistan.

*Email of the corresponding author; zakir.edu.pk@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The agriculture sector has been defining the livings of the poor people, giving them employment opportunities in the past, but at present, the agricultural sector has limited its potential to fulfill the increasing demands of employment due to a long list of limiting factors. Therefore, greater emphasis is placed on forces that precipitate youth to switch one occupation over another, especially from farming to non-farming occupations. The present study investigated the sociological and agricultural transformational factors responsible for occupational mobility in Gilgit Baltistan, Pakistan. The immediate objective of the study was to ascertain the sociological and agricultural transformational factors affect occupational mobility, examine the pattern and mobility, investigate the relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and occupational mobility, and A structured questionnaire was used to elicit the related information from professional respondents in three divisions; Gilgit Skardu and Diamar in Gilgit Baltistan transitional province, Pakistan. Through convenient and simple random sampling techniques, data was collected from 408 respondents both quantitative and qualitative analyses were used. After editing and cleaning, a three-fold analysis was undertaken at uni-variate, bivariate, and multivariate levels of coded data to establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables. Data were analyzed with the aid of statistical package (SPSS) version-16.0. The main findings at bi-variate level analysis show a significant relationship between all sociological and agricultural transformational factors (i.e., socioeconomic factors such as age, educational level of the respondents, educational level of the respondent's father, family types family size, annual income of the respondent's work and ownership status size in (Kanals), sociological factors, economic factors, environmental

factors, policy-making issues in the agriculture sector, traditional farming system and locational factors. The multivariate analysis showed that the most important and contributing sociological and agricultural transformational attributes in explaining the factors responsible for occupational mobility were educational level, family size family types, land ownership status in (kanals), sociological factors, environmental factors, and policy-making issues in the agriculture sector and locational factors. From the focus groups discussions, it was found that scarcity in land size, coordination with cities after the development of transportation system, better income and job opportunities in cities, hardworking and fewer incentives in agriculture, loss of cooperation among farmers during farming practices, division of land among the siblings, lack of basic facilities such as road, school, health centers, security threads in boarders areas, availability of jobs concerning achieved status in urban areas, lack of policy for seasonal cropping pattern, unemployment in agriculture due to harsh environmental conditions, flawed irrigation system, lack of policy to extend the agricultural services, issues regarding sale out the production to market, lack of modern technologies to increase the production of agriculture and surplus household labor in the family were discussed as factors for farming occupational mobility.

***Keywords*:** Occupational Mobility, Agricultural Transformational, Mobility, Gilgit Baltistan

To cite this article: Hussain, Z., Asghar, K ., Anjum, F Iftikhar, M (2022). The Sociological And Agricultural Transformational Factors Responsible For Occupational Mobility In Gilgit Baltistan, Pakistan. Competitive Social Science Research Journal (CSSRJ), 3(2), 300-309

INTRODUCTION

Occupational mobility, changing jobs, or leaving traditional employment can mean a change in acceptable living standards, principles, and ideologies and a change in the overall situation in which people earn a living. Occupational mobility provides a barometer for monitoring the changing trends in the rural economy employment structure and a reliable measurement of rural communities' urbanization trends. As it reflects the essential activities that people depend on for a livelihood, the village's employment structure highlights certain essential aspects of people's socio-economic conditions (Bian & Li, 2012). Occupational mobility has become an important source of rural households' livelihood strategies in most developing countries. In developing countries, the main reason for the increasing importance of non-agricultural household income is decreased land supply (Nielsen *et al*., 2013).

In developing countries, agriculture can be associated with direct or indirect connections as a source of economic development (Aykhilomen *et al.*, 2014). Although financial barrier capital appears to be productive, cash income from non-agricultural activities can help increase agricultural production, increase household income, and reduce the risk of crop failure. Consequently, one of the activities in which agriculture is supposed to be integrated with industries (Khatun & Roy, 2012) Off-farm activities are becoming increasingly important in mo st developing countries, contributing to 30 to 50 % of rural incomes (Davis *et al*., 2010). The higher the non-agricultural income, the greater the capital endowment; the higher the capital endowment can help produce more and more products and even help increase productivity (Uchida & Rozelle, 2009)**.** The possibility of modern agricultural

inputs producing sufficient productive and marketable commodities to establish trade links, the demand for agricultural inputs, and commercialization itself lead to non-commercial development of agricultural activities (Vasco & Tamayo, 2017) In Ecuador, the determinants of non-farm employment and non-farm earnings are explored. The results show that women are more likely to be self-employed than men, but their income is significantly lower than people who quit because of manufacturing. This is a common choice for landless families with a higher level of education, and paid work is usually the only choice for landless people without education.

According to empirical findings, off-farm incomes relieve the burden on agriculture by enabling households to have higher earnings. As a result, they contribute to food security by controlling food consumption fluctuations better than a household that does not participate in such activity. In the present, with the uncertain farm, returns help by maintaining total household incomes. Off-farm cash income is a significant source of alternative commodities for rural families, and it is the rural poor's primary source of income (Deere, 2005).

According to the 59th SAS (Situation Assessment Survey) of farmers, about 41% of rural households in the state do not want to farm. If offered a choice, they would prefer to choose a different career. The main reasons for their dislike of farming are recorded to be non-profitability, risk, and a lack of social status. The diversification of income is driven by a desire to protect against agricultural production and market risks and expand farm income.

Gradually rural communities are shifting away from other income-generating and non-crop farming (poultry or dairy) activities, primarily part-time farming. The most popular direction of movement among part-time farmers is in the direction of migration. Moreover, the rate of occupational mobility is much higher in different regions than it changes over time. Generally, forecasts indicate that single-farm farming will decrease in the future. In contrast, part-time agricultural and non-agricultural farming activities will increase. At the national level, the non-agricultural farming sector will affect this type of diversification, not the agricultural activity itself (Salam & Bauer, 2018). In both farming and non-farming occupations, female labor has lower occupational mobility than their male counterparts. In Uttar Pradesh, the wage gap between women and men in agriculture is about 34%. Non-agricultural wage rates are also higher than agricultural wage rates for male and female labor.

Occupational mobility is caused by many factors at the individual level, including age, education, knowledge, and skills. For example, individuals might change jobs to maximize their lifetime earnings by exploiting their human capital, such as education, work skills, and work experience. Migration may increase opportunities for occupational mobility for those who move by enabling. According to research, to obtain a better return on education and skills investment, they must move to the most likely to develop rapidly, and the older they are, the farther the changes will be leaving the occupation is the most productive relatively young, qualified, and ambitious (McCollum *et al.*,2018).

In Pakistan, Agriculture continues to be the most important source of employment in rural communities. However, its importance has declined over time. In rural areas, there is a shift away from the farm to non-farm activities. Paid employment and self-employment are the sources of non-farm revenue for rural households. Self-employed workers are mostly

employed in trade and transport, with services and construction accounting for two-thirds of non-farm paid employees in rural areas. Individual-level employment diversification showed that the majority of rural workers work in just one primary sector, either agriculture (53 %) or non-farm (40 percent), with only 5% of workers working in both primary and secondary work activities (known as mix activity. The main determinants that affect rural workers' livelihood strategies are their education, gender, land availability, and access to infrastructure. Households with further work diversification have a higher percentage of mixed households, which conduct farm and non-farm activities.

Haggblade *et al.,* (2010) found that in poor rural areas, despite the wage gap between the two sectors and the risks inherent in each form of employment, some households still choose to take advantage of the substitutability provided by non-rural areas, thereby increasing income and agricultural possibilities, On the other hand, due to the lack of agricultural opportunities, other families are also facing other agriculture, such as drought or low land use rate, which may lead to similar increases in non-agricultural wages.

MacConkey (2014) stated that Public sector institutions, such as schools, kindergartens, clinics, hospitals, and cultural institutions, employ a large part of the rural population (for example, dance and art teachers). "Rural intellectuals," that is, rural intellectuals, are mainly composed of these people. Many people work in various departments, such as restaurants and dress-making shops and cafeterias**;** all of these activities were formal, but those who worked in them were referred to as "state workers." Since Armenia has no formal private sector, all non-farm activities were under the scope of the government. Many urban and rural areas are engaged in various non-agricultural activities and businesses, do not register activities, and pay legal taxes informally**.** These individuals were the backbone of Soviet Armenia's "parallel" or "informal" economy. Administrative jobs composed a separate group of non-farm employees in rural communities.

Research Methodology

The present research is focused on both quantitative and qualitative analytical methodology. Target population was youth of Gilgit Baltistan. Total 408 units were selected through simple random sampling and convenient sample. Data was collected through questionnaire. Data was processed through SPSS and results were interpreted after focused group discussion.

Results & Conclusion

The information revealed at the univariate analysis level is interesting and useful. The socio-economic and agricultural characteristics of the interviewees play a vital role in career mobility. The survey showed that as respondent's educational level, age, father's educational level, father's occupation, family income, family size, family type, land ownership pattern' sociological factors, economic factors, environmental factors, policymaking issues in the agriculture sector, traditional farming system, scarcity in land size and adjustment after leaving influence. Influence the respondents and responsible to change their occupation from farming to non-farming sector.

In recent years, sociological research has given people a better understanding of the role of forces that shape the career mobility of young people. Occupation is regarded as a stepping stone towards hierarchical social status. Research shows that work preference is one of the

main concerns of young people entering work life. Therefore, the focus is more on the power that encourages young people to choose one profession rather than another. This research aims to explore the sociological and agricultural transformational factors that lead to occupational mobility.

The analysis of quantitative data in chapter four provided important findings. Subsequent discussion concerning the factors responsible for occupational mobility illustrates how occupational preferences are not simply individualized choices but are socially embedded and therefore remain circumscribed by a structure such as educational level, income, father's occupation, land ownership pattern, family income, family background, sociological factors, economic factors, environmental factors, traditional farming system, policymaking issues in agriculture sector and locational factors influences. The current study results show that socio-economic characteristics exerted statistically significant influences on respondent's occupational mobility process. For instance, across socio-economically, education of the respondent, educational level of the respondent's father, the income of the respondent's work-family income, and the family type and family size exhibit strong influences on respondent's occupational choices, prioritization of occupation, and preference of occupation for their children. Moreover, the findings also suggested

Sociological factors emerged as definers and modelers for affecting respondent's occupational preferences. Mostly they valued social status. The advanced facilities in urban areas attract rural people towards it in the same pattern the rural areas are expanding and gradually converting into urban and peri-urban, which adversely affect the occupational decision-making process of the respondents. In contrast, respondents were found to put weight on socio-economic status in their decision and were at odds to choose a field corresponding to their skills and education. Consequently, the majority of the respondents changed their occupations concerning their achieved status.

The study found that environmental factors influence to some degree, determine respondent's occupational mobility process. The respondents were on the odds to consider the different environmental factors influences in their occupation. Moreover, some policymaking issues in the agriculture sector push farmers towards non-farming activities even if they are not interested. The study also found that traditional farming practices and locational characteristics also play a vital role in the respondents' occupational mobility from agriculture to nonagricultural activities. The study found substantial evidence that the respondent's choice of occupation depends on the expected economic returns in a particular field. The labor market participation opportunities and associated economic advantages within the occupation are a linchpin of respondent's occupational mobility choices.

There is an association between socio-economic characteristics and occupational mobility.

Socio-economic Characteristics	**Attributes**	**Respondent's level of preferences for occupational mobility**			
		Low	**Medium**	**High**	**Total**
	Illiterate	8	9	29	46

The educational level of the respondents		2.0%	2.2%	7.1%	11.3%
	Primary	10 2.5%	11 2.7%	30 7.4%	51 12.5%
	Metric	18 4.4%	19 4.7%	61 15.0%	12.5% 24.0%
	Higher secondary	28 6.9%	29 7.1%	47 11.5%	104 25.5%
	Graduation and above	40 9.8%	32 7.8%	37 9.1%	109 26.7%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤0. .002 (23.896[a]) Somers' d ≤.000 Gamma ≤ 0. .000 (-.191)				
The educational level of the respondent's father	Illiterate	33 8.1%	36 8.8%	97 23.8%	166 40.7%
	Primary	18 4.4%	26 6.4%	37 9.1%	81 19.9%
	Metric	27 6.6%	14 3.4%	30 7.4%	71 17.4%
	Higher secondary	11 2.7%	4 1.0%	18 4.4%	33 8.1%
	Graduation and above	15 3.7%	20 4.9%	22 5.4%	57 14.0%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%

Statistics	Chi-Square ≤ **0**.016 (20.491) Somers' d ≤ 0.001 Gamma ≤ 0.001-(0176)				
Family type of the respondent	Nuclear family	26 6.4%	40 9.8%	8 2.0%	74 18.1%
	Joint family	58 14.2%	128 31.4%	80 20.0%	266 65.2%
	Extended family	16 3.9%	25 6.1%	14 3.4%	55 13.5%
	Blended family	4 1.0%	8 2.0%	1 0.2%	13 3.2%
	Total	104 25.5%	201 49.3%	103 25.2%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤ **0**.016 (15.668) Somers'd ≤0. 0120 Gamma ≤0. 0120 (0. .118)				
Family size of the respondent	2-4	20 4.9%	14 3.4%	15 3.7%	49 12.0%
	5-6	37 9.1%	28 6.9%	54 13.2%	119 29.2%
	7 and above	46 11.3%	58 14.2%	135 33.1%	239 58.6%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤0. 001 (19.143) Somers'd ≤.000 Gamma ≤ 0.000 (.272)				
	20-25	59	53	109	221

Age of the respondent		14.5%	13.0%	26.7%	54.2%
	26-30	16 3.9%	24 5.9%	53 13.0%	93 22.8%
	31-35	18 4.4%	9 2.2%	30 7.4%	57 14.0%
	40 above	11 2.7%	14 3.4%	12 2.9%	37 9.1%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤ 0.0001(11.552) Somers' d ≤ 0.0001 Gamma ≤ 0.0001 (- 021)				
Income of the respondent's work	100001-200000	58 14.2%	52 12.7%	87 21.3%	197 48.3%
	200001-300000	24 5.9%	22 5.4%	69 16.9%	115 28.2%
	300001-400000	18 4.4%	26 6.4%	47 11.5%	91 22.3%
	400001 and above	4 1.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.2%	5 1.2%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤0. .005 (18.520) Somers'd ≤ 0. 166 Gamma ≤0. .166 (0. .094)				
	No land ownership	11 2.7%	4 1.0%	49 12.0%	64 15.7%

Land ownership status size in (Kanals)	1-10	22 5.4%	25 6.1%	54 13.2%	101 24.8%
	11-20	41 10.0%	31 7.6%	76 18.6%	148 36.3%
	21 and above	30 7.4%	40 9.8%	25 6.1%	95 23.3%
	Total	104 25.5%	100 24.5%	204 50.0%	408 100.0%
Statistics	Chi-Square ≤ 0.0001(5.403) Somers' d ≤ 0.0001 Gamma ≤ 0.0001 (-.317)				

The data in Table 4.2.1 shows a significant positive correlation between respondents' education level and their preference for occupational mobility in low-income communities (significant chi-square value ≤ 0.0001). High preference for occupational mobility and non-agricultural occupations. Therefore, it can be inferred that the improvement of the interviewee's education level has had a positive impact on occupational mobility.

REFERENCES

Abate, T., A. Huis, & J. Ampofo, 2000. Pest management strategies in traditional agriculture: an African perspective. Annual Review of Entomology, 45:631-659.

Belton, B., M. M. Haque, D. C. Little, 2012. Does size matter? Reassessing the relationship between aquaculture and poverty in Bangladesh. J. Develop. Studies, 48: 904-922.

Bian, Y., L. Li. 2012. The Chinese general social survey (2003-8) sample designs and data evaluation. Chinese Sociological Review, 45: 70-97.

Cherrafi, A., S. Elfezazi, A. Chiarini, A. Mokhlis, K. Benhida. 2016. The integration of lean manufacturing, Six Sigma, and sustainability: A literature review and future research

Deere, C. D. 2005. The feminization of agriculture? Economic restructuring in rural Latin America (No. 1). UNRISD Occasional Paper.

Ethiopia: A review. Haggblade, S., Theriault, V., Staatz, J., Dembele, N., &

McCollum, D., Y. Liu, Y., Findlay, A., Feng, Z., and G. Nightingale. 2018. Determinants of occupational mobility: the importance of the place of work. Regional Studies, 52(:1612-1623.

Nielsen, Ø. J., S. Rayamajhi, P. Uberhuaga, H. Meilby, C. Smith Hall. 2013. Quantifying rural livelihood strategies in developing countries using an activity choice approach. Agric. Econ. 44: 57-71.

Oyakhilomen, O., R. G. Zibah. 2014. Agricultural production and economic growth in Nigeria: Implication for rural poverty alleviation. Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture, 53: 207-223.

Ranjan, 2008. Determinants of Rural Non-Farm Employment: Microlevel Evidence from Uttar Pradesh. Social Scientist, 22-50

Salam, S., S. Bauer. 2018. Structural changes of farm size and labor's occupation in Bangladesh-A Markov chain analysis. Open Agriculture, 3: 609-617.

Salami, A., A.B. Kamara and Z. Brixiova. 2010. Smallholder agriculture in East Africa: Trends,

Taylor, J. E., I. Adelman. 2003. Agricultural household models: genesis, evolution, and extensions. Review of Economics of the Household, 1: 33-58.

Vasco, C., G. N. Tamayo. 2017. Determinants of non-farm employment and non-farm earnings in Ecuador: Cristian Vasco and Grace Natalie Tamayo. CEPAL Review, 2017: 53-67.