DOI : 10.18843/rwjasc/v8i4/17
DOI URL : http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/rwjasc/v8i4/17

EXPLORING FRONTIERS OF LIVELIHOOD CAPITALS AMONG TRIBALS: EXPERIENCE FROM ODISHA

Bishnuprasad Mohapatra,
Research Scholar,
Department of Sociology,
Utkal University, India

Sasmita Ojha,
Ph. D Scholar,
Department of Sociology,
Utkal University, India

ABSTRACT

In present discourse over tribal development, enhancement of livelihood capitals has been considered as an emerging factor to sustain their livelihood security in modern development processes. The frontiers of livelihood capitals among tribals are largely confined to their socio-cultural, ecological and geographical setting. The present study makes an attempt to explore the availability of livelihood capitals among the tribal households in a backward district of Odisha. The study has been conducted in the tribal dominated, backward and undeveloped districts of the state. The study found that the frontiers of capitals are limited to lack of educational attainment, low health status, low income and saving, inadequate infrastructure, lack of communication and basic services, deterioration of land, water and forest resources and finally development of individualistic and self-centric nature among the study area. The study also reveals that though they are using diversified capitals for their day to day living but all the capitals are misleading. As a result, the findings are further questing to the existing development models in the tribal areas for sustainable livelihood generation.

Keywords: Capital, Assets, Livelihood, Tribal Development.

INTRODUCTION:

In the present development discourse, the debate over livelihood has been considered as an alternative paradigm for developing and underdeveloped countries. The discussion on livelihood gained public recognition in research, academic as well as in planning. Generally, livelihood concern as how people make living, by making enough food on the table, fulfills basic necessity for a good life like shelter, clothing etc. But theoretically, it means gaining a living through the capability, activities and assets. A livelihood is socially and environmentally sustainable which can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintains and enhance it capability and assets and provide sustainable livelihood opportunity for the next generation and which contributes net benefit to other livelihoods at local and global levels and in the short and long term (Chambers and Conway, 1992). Ellis (2000) in his study highlight that natural, social, human, financial and physical capitals or assets, activities and access to these together three determined the individual or household livelihood (Mishra, 2009). Further Department for International Development (DFID) in his Sustainable Livelihood Framework guidance note suggests five foremost capitals to livelihood analysis and they are presented as assets pentagon. Chambers and Conway further divide assets and capitals into two types one is tangible assets and intangible assets. Intangible assets it includes resources and stores; like saving, credit, gold, jewelry, land, water, forest, tools, domestic assets, occupational assets, livestock etc and in intangible assets it includes claims and access; like demand and appeals for rights, issues etc. So, the individual or household livelihood is based on the maximum utilization of both the tangible and intangible capitals in their activities to satisfy their needs. The development of capitals in villages, communities, groups, households, and individuals, is not only responsibility of individual but also other stakeholders; like government and non-government organizations. As livelihood framework has been designed to address the issues faced by the rural and underdeveloped people. So, government, voluntary, non-government organizations and donor agencies have been continuously introducing different plan, policies and programs for the rural and disadvantage people like tribals for to make their livelihood sustainable. All stakeholders are engaging themselves in infrastructural, educational, occupational, social as such development for betterment these people.

The livelihood structure and capital among the rural or disadvantaged people of India, particularly among tribals are largely confined to their socio-cultural, ecological and geographical settings. Agriculture, forest product and forest food collection are constituted major livelihood source and river, land, forest, community living, culture, traditional knowledge, homogeneity are such called as assets or capitals of livelihood generation among the tribals. These ways of livelihood generation among them make them sustainable from generation to generation. But, in order to integrate them into mainstream society, secure their livelihood and to overcome them from poverty trap government and other stakeholders has implemented various programmes, plans, policies and projects in the tribal and backward regions. But, the development services are not reaching nearer to the beneficiaries nor any improvement has been marked in capitals and other services development in these areas. In this context, the present study makes a modest attempt to explain livelihood assets or capitals among the tribals in backward district of Odisha.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Chamber and Conway (1992) discuss on capability, equity and sustainability as the base of sustainable livelihood. To focus on the future human needs it suggests sustainability of environment as well as social aspects for the sustainability of livelihood. It focuses on personal livelihood environment balance sheets for the better off and the for the poorer, enhancing capability, improve equity, increase social sustainability, estimate net environment demand of their livelihood for the rich and poorer, livelihood intensity of local economy and factor influencing migration and in lastly they indicated practical development and testing the concept and method of sustainable livelihood. While the paper indirectly talking about sustainability of livelihood capitals of communities for the betterment of livelihood sustainability.

Bokil (2002) explain the issues of tribal livelihood are more critical because the access and control over the surrounding natural capital have been undergone change. With influence of monopolized nature of state activity, private interest, ecological degradation, urbanization and industrialization, as a result they lose their 'Nerve' of their sustenance. The paper describe how, with the optimal utilization of local natural resources or capital, can make decent and sustainable livelihood for the tribals of Warlies in Thane district of Maharashtra with horticulture development which helpful for poverty alleviation and economic development by suitable combination of technology, enterprise and motivation as a result conservation of environment and increased participation of women in development. This model of tribal's areas highlights the need and urgency for secured

land rights and access to natural resources and capitals.

Fay (2007) attempts to locate livelihood from the environment. While describing the concept livelihood, the author talk about diverse capability of households gives ability to manage stresses and shocks while managing their livelihood. Both production and employment approach to livelihood can't reliance the household on natural resources, in contrast the sustainable livelihood approach draws the attention the role of environment in household economy connected through the sustainable use of natural resources and should focus on the existing strengths and potential.

Nair et al (2007) examine the livelihood risk factors by in-depth case studies in tribal dominated agrarian village of Kerala. It examined the livelihood outcomes of the villagers in terms of consumption achieved, income received, price and productive risk of crops to farmers as income risk, wage risk and employment risk as labour, households coping strategy towards risk: like reduction in household consumption expenditure, reduction of wages and hired labour, distress sale of assets and borrowing and sharecropping commonly employed by farmers in time of livelihood crisis, household adoption strategy in risk: they have adopted diversification of employment and cropland leasing and involvement of women in SHG activity are prominent and author emphasized on the state intervention should be in favors of straitening their livelihood assets. Because the study village shows that improvement in livelihood assets improved livelihood outcomes vis-à-vis and institution affect access and strengthen to assets and livelihood outcomes.

Mohanty (2008) analyze the emergence issues and concern of tribal development through various livelihood programs in Koraput district of Odisha. Here the author describes how poverty among the tribals of Koraput district undermine the socio-economic and health condition of tribal population as well as deprived to live in miserable condition, which questions on the sustenance of tribal livelihood. The author explains six major factors for poverty and lack of livelihood among the tribals of Koraput district. These are imbalance regional development, lack of sustainable development practices, heavy dependency on primary sector, inadequate farm practices, shifting cultivation and lastly the problem of financing. To overcome from the problem author suggested the development of the tribal must be based on the need, capability and acceptability of tribals and all the stockholder should be take up their collective responsibility to eliminate the poverty and create a sustainable livelihood for the tribal which will lead to sustainable development.

Mishra (2009) analyse the impact of coal mining on the livelihood of local people near to the Ib Valley coalfield of Odisha. To analyse the impact on livelihood the paper focuses on the five major livelihood capitals of local communities. The paper shows that impact on physical and social capital is diverse and mixed, whereas negative impact found on natural and human capital. Findings also show that the enhancement of financial capital due to the availability of physical capital. So due to larger negative impact on livelihood capitals with short benefits will result un-sustainability in long run.

Singh and Sadangi (2012) The study reveals several types of livelihood pattern among tribal people in Koraput and Rayagada district of Odisha like crop based, wage based, forest based, horticulture based, migration, service and animal husbandry based. It has also seen that the resources base of tribal household are not financially and physically sound and didn't have adequate facilities for meeting several basic requirements for a reasonable standard of living. The resources base of tribals becomes unproductive and inaccessible. The study recommended strong resources base for sustainability of livelihood.

Eneyew and Bekele (2013) explain the linkage between livelihood capitals in households wellbeing, where they critically discuss the livelihood building blocks of southern Ethiopia focusing on the wealth indicators of households as well as communities through the institution supports. The study found that all capitals in the study area; access to education, credits, land, membership to cooperatives, farm inputs, infrastructures were limited as well as skewed by wealth. As their major wealth is livestock, land and food sufficiency and the contribution to these wealth has been declining due to overpopulation and land degradation. At the same time efforts has to be made for improving the livelihood to divert community from land to non-land options to minimize the scarcity of land resources. In last the author talk about the policy innervations regarding labor intensive plant/industry for access to finance would be an inevitable solution.

Mohapatra (2016) reveals that the traditional livelihood structure of the study village in the pre-displacement era was self sustainable while the modern livelihood structure has now become more fluctuating and causing livelihood insecurity off and on. It is also found that people of this area are quite deficient in five categories of capitals or assets, which are pre-requisites for strengthening their livelihood. Poor education, low skill, low natural resource base and insufficient infrastructure in the changed environment of modern development push the aboriginal ecosystem people into livelihood insecurity.

Mishra et al (2016) find that the socioeconomic backwardness with depletion of natural resources due to

development intervention in the study area has compelled the people to change their livelihood pattern. Though the tribals are balancing between traditional and changing livelihood pattern for their subsistence, at the same time the livelihood capital structure among the households is misleading which will bring insecurity in long run. The paper suggested for urgent attention of all the stockholders towards sustainability livelihood among the tribals focusing on livelihood capital enhancement.

OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY:

The present study broadly grounded on understanding access to livelihood capitals among tribal household in backward districts of Odisha. The study based on the collection of primary data of 92 households in four tribal dominated villages of Potangi block of Koraput District in Odisha in September and October 2015. Multistage sampling method has been adopted for the selection of district, block, villages and households. The district selection has been based on the basis of backwardness, infrastructural development and tribal dominance; Koraput is 8th (with 49.62 %) in tribal inhabited population, the human development index rank is 27 (0.431), gender development index is 26 (0.415) and infrastructural development index is 17 (95.93), though the district is far from human development but it has developed their infrastructural development so fast than other tribal dominated district in the state. As the district is affected by left wing extremism and the Potangi block has no exception, the block has seen various attacks by the group from time to time. The village selection was based on tribal dominance and among them, two villages near to block office and other two are interior villages and all villages was nearest to forest coverage. The villages are Badapadu, Karanjiguda, Karidi and Kadabalsa and the covered tribal communities are Paroja, Gadaba and Khanda. Primary data have been collected through interview schedule, group discussion and personal interactions. The collected data are interrogated and interpreted with focusing on the assets and capitals of all surveyed household possess.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

Human Capital:

In the sustainable livelihood framework, human capital possesses a major factor in analyzing livelihood assets of individuals or households. It represents individual capability, knowledge, skills and health as the main components in livelihood analysis. At the household level it varies according to household size, leadership potential, skill levels, health status etc within the members of the household. Generally, it implies the amount and quality of individual possess in the household (Mishra et al, 2016). The measurement of sustainable livelihood through human capital among individual and households living in rural and less develop areas can be discussed through the attainment of education, education among productive age groups, as well as individuals health status. The current study made such attempt to examine existing human capital among the poorest of the poor or tribals who are leaving in backward and tribal regions.

Table 1: Age wise Literacy Status

Educational Attainment	Age						Total
	0-5	6-15	16-30	31-45	46-60	61 above	
Illiterate	55	14	79	68	28	16	260
Elementary to 8th standard	0	77	26	13	2	0	118
Under matriculate	0	3	5	1	0	0	9
10th to 12th standard	0	0	3	1	1	0	5
Intermediate/ Higher secondary pass	0	0	7	0	1	0	8
General graduate	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	**55**	**94**	**121**	**83**	**32**	**16**	**401**

The above table shows that the village has a very high percentage of illiterate population besides 0 to 5 year or 7 year children. Among the literates comprising only 35.16 per cent of the total, 29.42 per cent of the population are having education up to Class 8th level including the just literate category persons, 13 per cent have studied up to Class VIII level, 5.48 per cent are educated up to Class 12th and only 0.2 person passed graduation. Besides low level of education the present enrolment level of children in their school going age is found to be very low

The table no 01 also shows age wise educational attainment status of the individuals in study villages and the researcher divided age groups of individuals into six categories. If we will look into the productive age group particularly 16 to 60 years it constituted almost 59 percent of the total individual. The table also reflects that

among 59 percent of individuals 81.77 percent are illiterate followed by Elementary to 8th standard (17.37%), under matriculate (2.5%), matriculate (2.1 %), intermediate (3.38 %) and graduate (0.4 %). So, further it is found from study that educational attainment among the productive age group is extremely low.

The study also describes frequency of diseases occurrence among household members in the study area in the form of human capital. Among all the household 47 .8 percent claims quarterly occurrence of diseases followed by 37 percent half yearly and 15.2 percent yearly. During survey time period it also found that 38 members of household, those who are within the productive age group fall in sick, among them malaria (21), typhoid (4), dysentery (9) and jaundice with fever (4). Besides productive age groups it also seems that malaria, typhoid, dysentery, fever, jaundice, skin diseases and other chronic and acute illness are prevalent among the members of household in the study area. The households health expenditure (Rs 99 per month) which is double than educational expenditure, but there is no such improvement have been marked.

Thus, due to lack of education attainment among the household members it is too difficult to gain a regular full employment with adequate monthly income. The situation is further worsening when they fail to take adequate nutrition and vitamins to keep them healthy from diseases and illness. Less education leads to low income and poverty, poverty leads to fails to take adequate calories and nutrition and further it affect individual capability to earn for their livelihood.

Financial Capital:

Financial capital denotes flexible and versatile assets in sustainable livelihood analysis as it can convert to other capitals. It refers to available stocks and regular flow of financial resources that helps individual to achieve their livelihood outcome. In financial capital analysis stock refers to cash, bank deposit, liquid assets, jewellery etc and regular flow of financial resources refers to labour income, pension etc which help to achieve livelihood objectives (Mohapatra, 2016). It also includes loan, shares etc which household posses and can converted into other capital or assets (Akki and Reddy, 2015 ; Ellis, 2000). The financial capital is measured on the basis of individuals saving, income sources security, investment, indebtedness, household assets, occupational assets, livestock assets etc while examining the livelihood sustainability of the individual and household. The present study made a modest attempt to explain availability financial capital among the surveyed household.

Table 2: Household Income

Income	No of Household	Percent
Below 1500	18	19.6
1500-2500	28	30.4
2500-3500	26	28.3
3500-4000	9	9.8
4000-5000	5	5.4
5000-7000	2	2.2
7000 Above	4	4.3
Total	**92**	**100**

Income structure of individuals in the household is based on their capability to perform through their occupations. In the study area household member's occupation determines the income of the household and the income varies on the basis of the nature of occupation the household members performs. On the basis of the income structure, the income level of the households is dived into six categories, which are shown in above table (No. 02). It is seen from Table that only 11.9 % of the households earn monthly income above Rs. 4000 and among them there are only 04 households above Rs.7000. if we will examine the 68th round NSS (National Sample Survey) and Tendulkar Committee Methodology, the poverty level expenditure in rural Odisha is Rs.695 per month in 2011-12. That means a household consisting of five persons on an average in rural Odisha earning less than Rs.3475 per month was placed below the poverty line in the year 2011-12. On this basis if we assume around 15 per cent increase in price level between the year 2011-12 to 2015-16, the poverty level earning of an average rural household in Odisha at the time of our survey in 2015 would be Rs.3997 per month. This reveals from the household level data shown in above Table that except 11 households of the study area earning a monthly income of Rs.4000 and above per month the rest 81 (88.04%) households of the village are living in poverty. More so,

none among the non-poor category households is economically much well-off and all those eleven households were found to be equally vulnerable to poverty due to their unsteady source of income.

Table 3: Household Saving and Indebtedness

Category		Frequency	Percent
Saving In Bank and Co-operative Society	Yes	20	21.7
	No	72	78.3
Life insurance	Yes	7	7.6
	No	85	92.4
Loan	Yes	38	41.3
	No	54	58.7
Source of loan	Bank	16	42.1
	Cooperative	8	21.1
	Moneylender	5	15.7
	SHG	3	7.9
	Relatives/Friends	5	13.2
Loan purpose	Subsistence needs	7	18.4
	For business	3	7.9
	Marriage	2	5.3
	Agricultural activity	26	68.4
Loan repaid	Yes	15	39.5
	No	23	60.5

The above table (No. 03) describes household saving and their indebtedness status. The study shows that among all surveyed households merely 21.7 percent household have saving in bank and co-operative society and also only 7.6 percent household cover up their family members under life insurance schemes. The table further reveals that 41.3 % household take lone from different sources; bank (42.1%), co-operatives (21.1%), moneylender (15.7%), SHG (7.9%) and from relatives or friends (13.2%). The basic purposes of loan among the study household are for subsistence needs (18.4%), business (7.9%), marriage and ceremony (5.3%) and agricultural activity (68.4%). Among the surveyed households the study finds that every household have some livestocks, occupational and household assets in their house. The survey reveals that 72 household have posses cows and oxen, 49 posses goats, 53 posses hens and only 5 posses pigs as their livestock assets. Further the study finds that household assets among the surveyed household are TV (14 household), Mobile (55), Fan (13), Cycle (37), Motorcycle (10), Radio (22), Auto (2), Refrigerator (1), DVD Player (3), water pump (1), Digital setup box (14), Grinder (5) and Ornaments (52). And the occupational assets among the households are Tractor (1 household), Pump Set (3), Generator Set (1), Carpentry Assets set (1), Mason work set (12), wooden plough (88), Hand Sprayer (35) and every household have Sickles, Axe types of items which help in their occupational and daily work activity.

Though every household in the survey area have occupational, domestic and livestock assets for productive livelihood generation, but the average value of all assets per household is very low. There are very few people above the poverty line, without indebtedness and it is hardest part of them to invest in assets, saving and security to protect their livelihood.

Physical Capital:

In sustainable livelihood analysis, physical capital is the foundation or the background on which the process of livelihood activity and final outcome of the individual is based. It comprises basic infrastructures and produce goods like health centers, schools, road, shelter, building, transport, water supply, sanitation, energy and communication etc (Mishra et al, 2016). Analysis of physical capital among the poor people in the less develop areas is broadly based on the availability of infrastructure and communication facilities which are the founding stone in livelihood outcome. So, the present work picturised the infrastructural and network facility available at the study villages.

Table 4 – A

Locational Distance in K.m. of Basic Services in Surveyed Villages							
Sl No	**Village**	**District HQ Koraput**	**Block Potangi**	**Primary School**	**Middle school**	**High school**	**College**
1	Badapadu	48	7	0	4	4	7
2	Karanjiguda	46	5	0	3	3	4
3	Karidi	54	13	0	5	8	13
4	Kadabalsa	60	19	0	4	9	19
Total		**208**	**44**	**0**	**16**	**24**	**43**
Average		(52)	(11)	(0)	(4)	(6)	(10.75)

Table 4 – B

Sl No	**Village**	**CHC Center**	**Public Transport**	**Bank**	**Cooperative society**	**Post office**	**Rail station**	**Market**
1	Badapadu	7	6	7	7	7	24	7
2	Karanjiguda	5	1	5	5	5	22	5
3	Karidi	13	7	13	13	13	31	13
4	Kadabalsa	19	4	19	19	4	36	19
Total		**44**	**18**	**44**	**44**	**29**	**113**	**44**
Average		(11)	(4.5)	(11)	(11)	(7.25)	(28.25)	(11)

It may be seen from above table (No:4-A and B) that in the surveyed villages, the available of basic infrastructure, services and their locational distance like educational institution, health services, public transports, banking services, cooperatives, post offices, rail station and market. The table reveals that though in surveyed villages there are primary schools but middle and high school are located in the radius of 3 to 5 and 3 to 9 kilometers. Despite of distance, it is found that lack of teachers, proper infrastructure as well as material and quality education in the schools. Further the data reveals that one fourth of the surveyed villages have kuchha road and no public transport facility, as a result it is difficult to school going children to access the educational facility and it noted that eighty percent of medium and high school going children goes to school by walking. Similarly, there is no dispensary located in the villages or near to surveyed villages and it is found that ANM and health workers were not visiting regularly to their concern villages. The study further adds that in one village there is no aganwadi centre and in which villages it is exist found not function properly due to kilometers distances and lack of public transports to villages and it is reported that in Karidi village anganwadi worker have to walk 7 to 8 k.m. to reach at the village, so it is difficult to walk every day. Transport and communication networks found to be very low among the surveyed villages. In the study area it is found that despite of one village, other surveyed villages do not have proper or even a fair road for transport. Walking with foot and use of bicycle are the only means of transport, but due to hill areas and up and down roads it is difficult ride a bicycle among the villagers. Most of the village household members walk average 5 K.m. to catch the bus for to reach at block or district head quarters or access to service like health, banking, postal and market facility. The study found that only 5. 4 percent of the households have pucca houses structure followed by semi-pucca (68.47) and kucha (26.08) house structure and also it further add that every household have average 2 rooms in the surveyed villages. Only 3 percent households have access to toilet facility against 92 percent of the household avail electricity facility. It also found that no village have proper drainage facility and people through wastes and dusts near open pit (51 %) followed by open pit outside house (49 %).

The physical capital as infrastructure, network and communication which is prime means are found very insignificant among village and household level. In this present context of physical capitals it is difficult on the part of individual as well as household level to achieve their sustainable livelihood objective or outcome.

Natural Capital:

While discussing livelihood security among marginalized section people and less develop backward areas,

natural capital play a key role in livelihood outcome among the region and people. In sustainable livelihood framework natural capital refers to natural resources stocks like land, water, forest, air etc. These are the essential components of daily life and survival among poor households like tribals. Measurement of natural capital assets among the poor household is based on their land holding capacity, availability of forest products and resources, availability of water resources etc. Our focus is mainly on the land ownership and collection of minor forest product as natural capital and a way to livelihood outcome among the surveyed households.

Table 5: Ownership of Land

Land Holding Size	Frequency	Percent
Land less	4	4.35
Marginal	17	18.48
Small	48	52.17
Medium	19	20.65
Large	4	4.35
Total	92	100

The study finds that the average ownership land holding size among the surveyed household is 3.2 acres and among the land holding structure; landless (04 Household), Marginal landholders with less than two acres land (17), Small landholders with 2 to 5 acres of land (48), Medium landholders with 5 to 8 acres land (19) and Large landholders with holding size of 10 acres and above (04). Among the land holding structure the study found that 54 percent are forest land and only 24 percent are irrigated land. Further, it is found that majority of land are located in forest, hill and sloppy areas in the surveyed villages, as a result they faced number of difficulties in cultivating. It also finds 50 percent still do not have forest land *pata* though they have cultivated the land from the generation.

Forest is the major source of tribal livelihood. The study found that in surveyed village's households collect, sell and consume different seasonal forest product over the year. These are; mango, guava, jackfruit, black and red berry, tamarind, dry-plums (bara koli), date palm (kajuri), pineapple, honey, lac, stone apple (bela), *mahua flower and seeds, sal seeds, kendu leaf etc.* Besides these products, fuel wood and brushwood need of the every household in the surveyed villages for cooking purposes. It is further found that among the surveyed household not only consume and use the forest product but also sell, 20 household sell forest fuel wood and 27 household sell minor forest products listed above in the nearest market. Besides forest resources, stream water plays a vital role in the day to day life of surveyed villages. It is found from the study area that 33.7 percent household depends upon the stream for drinking and cooking purposes as well as 56.5 percent households used stream water for other household needs and use it in daily activity.

The natural capital is the primary source of livelihood among tribals from long generation and the study area found no such exception. Land, water and forest resources determine both primary and secondary sources of livelihood among the survey households. Though the availability of forest resources are and stream water flow decreasing day by day, but same time the consumption and use of these resources is continuing as major source for livelihood objective. Though almost every household have land, but due to sloppy, hill area, lack of modern technology and irrigation, it is difficult on their part to cultivate in over the year to meet the need of household. Thus it is found that the natural capitals in survey area are negligible and misleading day by day.

Social Capital:

In the context of sustainable livelihood analysis social capital means availability of social resources upon which the objective of livelihood is drawn. It also considers as the software of human communities as well as glue of all other capitals assets (Mishra et al, 2016). Sometimes it is described as the 'politics of life' and the elements are network, connectedness, trust, co-operation, mutual support, collective representation, participation, patronage, neighborhoods, leadership etc. (Kamil and Rashid, 2011; Mohapatra 2016), Reddy and his colleague add migration pattern as a representation of social capital. Generally, it is the ability of individual to secure benefits by virtue of member in different social group, network and structure and it is the mutual relationship within household members, institutions and communities. This ties and relationship among the members and community can be seen as an investment in gaining future livelihoods (Akki and Reddy 2015; Ellis, 2000; Krishna, 2003). Rew and Rew (2003) further add that livelihood were completely ways of life that are socially constructed. To measure the social capital for sustainable livelihood security in rural and less develop areas, it

need to focus on the joint family, share cropping, cooperation among family and community members, participation in house and community work, individual leadership, membership in group and association, livestock sharing, migration pattern etc. and the present study made a such modest attempt to describe social capital among the surveyed household.

Co-operation, trustship, unity, homogeneity, group participation, restitutive laws etc are some of the characteristics of social capital in tribal society. The present study found that increasing the trend of nuclearization of family in household level and it is found that in surveyed households 85 % are nuclear family. In the village level participation it was notice that individualistic nature are growing among the family members, this process indirectly creating a space for the self centric nature of development. Though, the individualist approach growing among the members but also at the same time their co-operation and social network is strong towards village, community and in their working place. The findings suggest that village people unite and act against common problems for the village development, though the problems are not fulfilled but they are continuingly representing the issues of infrastructure development and other problems in the front of Sarapancha as well as at block office. Further the study found that those households has active in agriculture as their primary and secondary occupation, among them 22 households participated in share cropping and it is one of the strategy for livelihood diversification through the social and neighborhood relationship. As occupation plays a vital role in determining their livelihood status, those household adapted migration as an occupational strategy in off-seasons helps in developing social networks in the workplace, which helps them to build co-operation between fellow workers, contractors and people nearer to the place and it leads to further finding out work for their livelihood. Besides occupational and group actions among the tribals, it also reveals from study that in the time of urgent need like instant loan, travel to hospital and workplace, household needs etc households take the help of their neighbors and friends.

The livelihood is socially constructed through the network, trust, connectedness etc among the tribal people. Since there is co-operation and network among the members in there and outside society or workplace but the study find that in the study villages tribals are developing towards self centric and individualistic nature, which itself a bigger threat to their homogeneity and unity among the community as well as same time to social capital.

CONCLUSION:

The livelihood capitals are considered as the noteworthy aspect among the tribals and in their areas. The issues of livelihood capitals or assets among tribal communities and in their areas are always concern of development debates and also to address these issues is always challenging among the development practitioners. As a result for to sustain the livelihood strategy through the asset or capital pentagons among these communities government, non-government and voluntary organizations are implementing various plans, programmes, projects and policies from time to time to strengthen the capitals. Unfortunately, the present study reveals that all the capitals in the study area are misleading. While exploring the frontiers of livelihood capitals among the study areas it is found that human capitals encompassing education and health are in lowest status, financial capitals encompassing basically income and saving are found low and negligible with high poverty line, physical capital encompassing infrastructure, communication and assets availability are found very insufficient and insignificant, natural capital encompassing land, water and forest resources are found still as a major sources of livelihood strategy with deteriorating condition and social capital encompassing co-operations and networks which is the prime factor among tribal society, developing towards self centric nature. However, the frontiers of livelihood capitals are found to be limited and misleading and as a result it is questing to the structure of livelihood sustainability among tribal communities and in their area. Thus, it is the high time to not only to think and act about for livelihood generation by all the stockholders but also to invest in its base; livelihood capitals which is the prime energy for a sustainable livelihood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The authors are thankful to Prof. R.K. Meher, faculty member Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar and Dr. A.K. Mishra, faculty member at Dept. of Sociology, Central University of Orissa for their valuable suggestions and comments. Authors are also thankful to surveyed households, Jitendra Sahoo, Debadutta Nayak, Lingaraj Pradhan, and Diptimayee Jena for their co-operation and views during the field survey.

REFERENCES:

Akki, M. J. and S. Reddy (2015). Livelihood in India: Ann Overview, *Indian Streams Research Journal,* Vol.4 (12), pp.1-4.

Bokil, M. S. (2002). Tribal communities and sustainable livelihoods: lessons from Bordi, *Journal of Rural Development,* Vol. 21 (2), pp. 163-189.

Chambers, R. and Gordon, C. (1992). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concept for the 21st Century, *Institute for Development Studies*, Discussion Paper 296, UK: Brighton.

Eneyew, A. and W. Bekele (2013). Analysis of Wealth and Livelihood capitals in southern Ethiopia: A lesson from policy makers, *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences,* Vol 5 (1), pp. 1-10

Fay, D. (2007). Livelihood, in Paul Rpbbins (Eds) *Encyclopedia of Environment and Society,* pp. 1056-1059, Sage Publications.

Mishra, A. K. et al. (2016). Interrogating Livelihood among Tribals: A case study from Odisha, *Social Vision*, Vol.3 (2), pp.19-31.

Mishra, P. R. (2009). Coal Mining and Rural Livelihood: A Case of the Ib Valley Coalfield, Orissa, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44 (44), pp. 117-123.

Mohanty, J. K. (2008). Sustainable Livelihood of Tribals: issues and Concers, in S R Padhi and B Padhy (Eds) *trends and Issues in Tribal studies,* Delhi: abhijeet Publication.

Mohapatra, B. P. (2016). Livelihood Status among Marginalised Community (SCs and STs): A Study of Parajapondi Village of Koraput District, Odisha, in Sheeladitya Paul and Subikash Chowdhury (eds) *Issues in Rural Livelihood*, pp.11-28, Kolkata: Progressive Publishers.

Nair, K. N. et al. (2007). Livelihood Risks and Coping Strategies: A Case study in the agrarian Village of cherumad Kerala, *Working Paper 394,* CDS, Thiruantapuram.

Rao, N. (2003). Life and Livelihood of Santal Parangas: Does the right to livelihood really exist?, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 38 (39), pp. 4081-4084.

Reddy, V. R et al. (2004). Participatory Watershed Development in India: can it Sustain Rural Livelihood?, *Development and Change*, Vol.35 (2), pp. 297-326.

Rew, Alan and Martin Rew (2003). Development Models 'out of place': social research on methods to improve livelihoods in eastern India, *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 38(3), pp. 213-224.

Singh, Abha and B.N. Sadangi (2012). Livelihood Patterns and Resources Base of Tribals in Koraput and Rayagada District of Odisha, *Indian Research Journals of Extension Education*, Vol.1, pp.307-312.
