

RESEARCH ARTICLE :

Problems encountered and felt needs of rehabilitated tribals for the sustainable development

■ **Y.B. VENKATA REDDY, M.V. SRINIVAS AND B.S. LAKSHMAN REDDY**

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :

Received :

18.12.2016 ;

Revised :

29.12.2016;

Accepted :

07.01.2017

SUMMARY : The present study was conducted in Gudlur village of Coorg district and Nagapura village of Mysore district and from each village, 75 beneficiaries were selected randomly. Thus, the sample size was 150. The findings reveal that cent per cent of the beneficiaries felt that lack of extension support, wild life damage to their crops, Almost all the beneficiaries felt that lack of capital to carry out agricultural operations (98.66%) and no employment during off season (90.60%) were problems. Cent per cent of the beneficiaries expressed financial assistance for self employment activities, great majority (81.33%) of the beneficiaries felt irrigation facilities as a need. Further nearly half (46.66%) expressed providing loan for milch animals.

How to cite this article : Reddy, Y.B.Venkata, Srinivas, M.V. and Reddy, B.S. Lakshman (2017). Problems encountered and felt needs of rehabilitated tribals for the sustainable development. *Agric. Update*, **12**(1): 95-100; DOI : 10.15740/HAS/AU/12.1/95-100.

KEY WORDS :

Rehabilitation, Jenu Kuruba, Betta kuruba tribals, Sustainable development, Rajeev Gandhi National Park

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

In Karnataka, Jenu Kuruba and Betta Kuruba tribals have inhabited Rajeev Gandhi National Park. As in the rest of the state, the density even among these tribal communities has increased several folds. In Rajeev Gandhi National Park that spans to an area of 643 square kilometers, a total of around 6,000 Kuruba populations reside inside the park limits. This human density of ten persons per square kilometer is very high. Commercial harvesting of NTFP is no more sustainable. Probably in the Amazons where the human densities are less than one person per square kilometer, reaping forest produce can be sustainable, but with high populations densities

it is unsustainable. In this regard, efforts were continuously being made to relocate people from the forest area, under India Eco-Development Project. India Eco-Development Project (IEDP) has been taken up in seven Protected Areas (PAs) of our country with a total project cost of US\$ 67 million for a period of five years. The project aims at conserving bio-diversity by implementing Eco-development strategies in and around the PAs. The project aims at conserving bio-diversity by implementing Eco-development strategies in and around the PAs. Among these seven PAs, Rajeev Gandhi National Park is one among them. Rehabilitation of people from the forests,

Author for correspondence :

Y.B. VENKATA REDDY
Coffee Board,
BENGALURU
(KARNATAKA) INDIA
Email:ybvreddy100@gmail.com

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

particularly the tribals, is problematic in view of their lack of socio-economic development, their attachment to their traditional customs and practices, which limit their capacity to adopt to the changing environment and situation. With this background the present study was conducted with the following objectives;

- To know the profile of the beneficiaries of relocation programme of the Rajeev Gandhi National Park
- To ascertain problems of sustainable development
- To identify felt needs of sustainable development

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in Gudlur village of Coorg district and Nagapura village of Mysore district of Karnataka state. From each of the purposively selected two villages, 75 beneficiaries were selected randomly as respondents for the study. Thus, the sample size for the study was 150. Ex-post-facto research design was employed in this study. To know the problems and felt needs of the beneficiaries, a list of ten statements for both Gudlur and Nagapura were prepared on the basis of earlier visits and conversation with the beneficiaries and beneficiaries were asked to indicate their problems and felt needs. Frequency and percentages were used to analyze problems and felt needs of the beneficiaries.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present study as well as discussions have been summarized under following heads:

Profile of the beneficiaries :

Table 1 reveals that 46 per cent of the beneficiaries were middle aged at Gudlur and 41 per cent are young aged at Nagapura. This could probably due to the fact that most of the young people go to school or go outside for work at Gudlur, but in Nagapura, the old people are illiterates, more conserved and most of the decisions were taken by the young people. Further, nearly half of the Gudlur beneficiaries had primary school education but at Nagapura a considerable per cent were illiterates. The possible reason might be that Gudlur beneficiaries were relocated long back and have improved their education standards compared to the Nagapura beneficiaries who

are relocated recently. Almost all the beneficiaries of Gudlur had less than two acres of land holding whereas all the beneficiaries at Nagapura had five acres of land holding. The reason is that quantum of land is allotted for the beneficiaries when they were relocated. A majority of the beneficiaries had medium level of family size because the benefits were given to individual families at the time of relocation and they have divided their families in order to get more benefits. This has lean to smaller families. Further, a majority of the respondents had medium level of possession of assets at both the places. The reason might be, in case of Gudlur, the savings were very poor and they cannot afford to purchase these assets and also they were not provided any assets during relocation. Whereas in case of Nagapura, after relocation the income level was very poor to purchase any assets and also the implements provided after relocation are very less. The source of income at both the places for all the beneficiaries is agriculture, as it is the primary occupation and secondary source is labour. A majority of the beneficiaries of Gudlur had medium level of social participation. Whereas, majority of the Nagapura beneficiaries had low level. The reason might be, Gudlur beneficiaries were relocated long back and have improved their contact with outsiders when compared to the Nagapura beneficiaries. Also, two-third of the Gudlur beneficiaries had low level of extension participation when compared to Nagapura where a majority of the beneficiaries had high level of extension participation. The reason might be, in case of Nagapura a good number of extension activities were conducted after relocation but in Gudlur none of the extension programmes (except one bee keeping training programme) were conducted. Majority of the beneficiaries of both the villages were belonged to medium level of standard of living because of very poor income. A majority (58% and 62%) of Gudlur and Nagapura, respectively were having medium level of aspirations due to low level of education, economic status, standard of living, social participation and level of extension participation. Majority of the beneficiaries had medium level of cultural change but little higher in Nagapura beneficiaries. Since, the Nagapura beneficiaries are tribals who were more traditional and after relocation they were to change a lot in their culture in order to adjust to the new area.

Problems of sustainable development :

The results in Table 2 reveals that cent per cent of

Table 1 : Profile of the beneficiaries

| Category | Gudlur (n=75) | | Nagapura (n=75) | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Age | | | | |
| Young (35 and below) | 16 | 21.33 | 31 | 41.34 |
| Middle (36-50) | 35 | 46.67 | 28 | 37.33 |
| Old (51 and above) | 24 | 32.00 | 16 | 21.33 |
| Education | | | | |
| Illiterate | 8 | 10.67 | 24 | 32.00 |
| Functional literate | 4 | 5.33 | 18 | 24.00 |
| Primary School | 37 | 49.34 | 24 | 32.00 |
| High School | 22 | 29.33 | 7 | 9.34 |
| PUC level | 4 | 5.33 | 1 | 3.33 |
| Degree level | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.67 |
| Caste | | | | |
| Non-tribes | 74 | 98.67 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Tribals | 1 | 1.33 | 75 | 100 |
| Land holdings | | | | |
| Land less | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| <2 acres | 72 | 96 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2-5 acres | 1 | 1.33 | 75 | 100 |
| >5acres | 2 | 2.67 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Family size | | | | |
| Small (1-3members) | 14 | 18.67 | 16 | 21.33 |
| Medium (4-6members) | 54 | 72.00 | 51 | 68.00 |
| Large (7 and above) | 7 | 9.33 | 8 | 10.67 |
| Possession of assets | | | | |
| Low (5.17) | 1 | 1.33 | 30 | 40.00 |
| Medium (5.17-21.27) | 44 | 58.67 | 45 | 60.00 |
| High (>21.28) | 30 | 40.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Source of income | | | | |
| Agriculture | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Job/service | 7 | 9.33 | 7 | 4.66 |
| Wages | 62 | 82.66 | 70 | 93.33 |
| Others | 64 | 85.33 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Social participation | | | | |
| Low (<0.067) | 2 | 2.67 | 43 | 57.33 |
| Medium (0.067 to 3.512) | 57 | 76.00 | 32 | 42.67 |
| High (>3.512) | 16 | 21.33 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Extension participation | | | | |
| Low (<0.235) | 50 | 66.67 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Medium (0.235 to4.536) | 25 | 33.33 | 32 | 42.67 |
| High (>4.536) | 0 | 0.00 | 43 | 57.33 |
| Standard of living | | | | |
| Low (<10.11) | 0 | 0.00 | 21 | 28.00 |
| Medium (10.11 to 14.43) | 58 | 77.33 | 54 | 72.00 |
| High (>14.43) | 17 | 22.67 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Aspiration | | | | |
| Low (<10.11) | 2 | 2.67 | 32 | 42.67 |
| Medium (10.11 to 14.43) | 51 | 68.00 | 42 | 56.00 |
| High (>14.43) | 22 | 29.33 | 1 | 1.33 |
| Cultural change | | | | |
| Low (<3.168) | 13 | 17.33 | 9 | 12.00 |
| Medium (3.168 to 5.0) | 52 | 69.34 | 66 | 88.00 |
| High (>5.0) | 10 | 13.33 | 0 | 0.00 |

the beneficiaries felt that lack of extension support, wild life damage to their crops, lack of irrigation and inadequate improved agricultural implements were the problems at Gudlur and no employment during off season, lack of bullock carts to transport inputs and produce, wild life damage to the crops, lack of irrigation, inadequate agricultural implements, lack of capital to carry out agricultural operations, lack of experience in agriculture and lack of extension support were the problems at Nagapura. Almost all the beneficiaries felt that lack of capital to carry out agricultural operations (98.66%) and no employment during off season (90.60%) were problems at Gudlur and a great majority of the Nagapura beneficiaries expressed that lack of draft animals (82.70%) as a problem. A least per cent felt that lack of bullock carts to transport Inputs and produce (10.60%) and none of them felt that lack of draft animals and lack of experience in agriculture as problems for their sustainable development at Gudlur. The reason for wild life damage to their crops may be, these are relocated to areas which are adjoining to the National Park, where the wild life damage to their crops is very common and from which these beneficiaries are losing their crops every time.

Further the protection measures taken are not sufficient as the elephant proof trench is insufficient to control rouge elephants raiding the crops. With respect to lack of irrigation facilities, in case of Gudlur they are growing coffee and paddy for which irrigation is required whenever there is shortage of rainfall. In case of coffee rainfall is very much essential for at the time of flowering for better yields. But most of the times they are not receiving rainfall, at that time they have to provide sprinkler irrigation for which water source is required and they do not have any water source to provide irrigation. It is also known fact that the beneficiaries are unable to get open / bore well facility due to their poor economic status. At Nagapura they are given dry lands and are growing rain fed crops depending on rainfall. But most of the times they are not receiving rainfall at proper time and ultimately getting poor yield which is insufficient for their sustainable development. Hence, they need irrigation facilities to grow commercial crops by which they can improve their economy.

With respect to inadequate improved agricultural implements, the Gudlur beneficiaries have not provided any improved agricultural implements at the time of

Table 2 : Problems of the Gudlur and Nagapura beneficiaries for their sustainable development

| Problems | Gudlur (n=75) | | Nagapura (n=75) | |
|--|---------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| Lack of extension support | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Wild life damage to their crops | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Lack of irrigation | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Inadequate improved agricultural implements | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Lack of capital to carry out agricultural operations | 74 | 98.66 | 75 | 100 |
| No employment during off season | 68 | 90.60 | 75 | 100 |
| Lack of bullock carts to transport input and produce | 8 | 10.60 | 75 | 100 |
| Lack of draft animals | 0 | 0.00 | 62 | 82.70 |
| Lack of experience in agriculture | 0 | 0.00 | 75 | 100 |

Table 3 : Felt needs of the Gudlur and Nagapura beneficiaries for their sustainable development

| Felt needs | Gudlur (n=75) | | Nagapura (n=75) | |
|---|---------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | No | % | No. | % |
| Financial assistance for self employment | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Improved agricultural implements | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Protection from wild life | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Technical guidance on various enterprises | 75 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| Irrigation facilities | 61 | 81.33 | 75 | 100 |
| Loan for milch animals | 35 | 46.66 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Draft animals | 14 | 18.66 | 61 | 81.33 |
| Marketing facility | 1 | 1.33 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Extension of financial support for few more years | 0 | 0.00 | 75 | 100 |

relocation or any other time and the implements, which they possess are not enough for their improvement in the agriculture. In case of Nagapura, they are given agriculture implements like, spade and sickles and except these implements their level of possession of these assets is very poor. Without these improved agricultural implements they cannot carry out agricultural operations. Hence developmental departments should provide required agricultural implements for their improvement in agriculture. Regarding lack of extension support, the Gudlur beneficiaries have not received any guidance about agriculture and allied activities from the developmental departments because of that their level of knowledge is poor about agriculture and allied activities. Whereas in case of Nagapura, during past two years a good number of extension activities like demonstrations, trainings, study tours, field visits and group discussion meetings have conducted. But these are not sufficient as the tribals are new to the profession of agriculture and need further extension support in order to make these tribals familiar with the modern agriculture.

In case of Gudlur almost all the beneficiaries felt that no employment during off-season and lack of capital to carry out agricultural operations as problems for their sustainable development. Whereas in case of Nagapura all the beneficiaries felt these as the problems. The reason might be these beneficiaries have to depend on only agriculture and they do not have any other subsidiary occupations to engage themselves during off-season. Also they are not getting income from any other source other than agriculture and also the income what they are getting is insufficient for their house hold expenses. So, they are facing problems to spend money on agricultural operation. Regarding draft animals, a great majority of the nagapura beneficiaries expressed as problems as most of them don't possess, whereas in case of Gudlur none of them as expressed it as a problem as all the beneficiaries possess draft animals. The reason might be, draft animals are the major resource in agricultural operations and without which they cannot carry out most of the agricultural operations.

Felt needs of beneficiaries:

Table 3 revealed that cent per cent of the beneficiaries expressed financial assistance for self employment activities, Improved agricultural implements, protection from wild life, technical guidance on various

enterprises as felt needs at Gudlur and extension of financial support for few more years, irrigation facilities, financial assistance for self employment activities, improved agricultural implements, protection from wild life and technical guidance on various enterprises as felt needs at Nagapura. A great majority (81.33%) of the beneficiaries felt irrigation facilities as a need at Gudlur and draft animals at Nagapura. Further, nearly half (46.66%) expressed providing loan for milch animals, nearly one fourth (18.66%) expressed draft animals and a least per cent of them (1.33%) expressed marketing facility as a felt needs at Gudlur. None of the beneficiaries felt that extension of financial support for few more years as a need at Gudlur and marketing facility and loan for milch animals as needs for sustainable development at Nagapura.

Since both of these beneficiaries are depending on agriculture and the income what they are getting out of agriculture is insufficient for their sustainable development and they need to start subsidiary enterprises. In order to get additional income for their sustainable development. Hence, developmental departments need to take necessary steps for sustainable development of these people. With regard to improved agricultural implements, the possession of agricultural implements is very poor which are very essential for the agricultural operations. Hence, developmental departments should provide these implements, as these people cannot afford to purchase.

As wildlife damage is very severe problem in the surroundings of the National Park and these people cannot afford the damage caused by wildlife to their crops. Hence, Forest Department should take necessary steps to stop the damage from the wildlife to the crops of these people. The beneficiaries need to take up subsidiary enterprises for their sustainable development, but they lack knowledge on any such enterprise and they need guidance from the experts from different fields in this regard. A great majority of the beneficiaries of Gudlur and all the beneficiaries of Nagapura felt that irrigation facility is a need. The reason might be in case of Gudlur, they need irrigation facility for providing sprinkler irrigation to the coffee and also to take up commercial crops on the low lands to improve their income. In case of Nagapura, the beneficiaries are depending on rain fed crops but rainfall is uncertain and income from these crops cannot improve their economic status. Hence, they

have to take up commercial crops to improve their economic status for which irrigation facilities are very much needed. Similar work related to the present investigation was also carried out by Ratnakar and Sudharshan Reddy (1991); Markute (1990); More *et al.* (2015); Suganthi *et al.* (2013); Suresh and Jayaramaiah (1995); Vijay (2012) and Yadav (1970).

Conclusion :

The tribals felt that lack of extension support, wild life damage to their crops, lack of irrigation and inadequate improved agricultural implements and no employment during off season were the problems and they expressed employment opportunities and improved agricultural implements for sustainable development. Hence, the government has to take necessary policy measures to provide continued benefits and development department should give more interest for providing irrigation facilities to grow commercial crops and impart the training for improvement of these tribals.

Authors' affiliations :

M.V. SRINIVAS, Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, G.K.V.K., BENGALURU (KARNATAKA) INDIA
Email : patraseena@rediffmail.com

B.S. LAKSHMAN REDDY, University of Horticultural Sciences, BAGALKOT (KARNATAKA) INDIA
Email : bsreddyextn@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

Markute, S.R. (1990). *Socio-cultural study of schedule Tribes*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi (INDIA).

More, B.D., Kale, R.B. and Singh, Khajan (2015). Role performance of the NGO personal in sustainable livelihood generation for tribal dairy farmers. *Indian. J. Agric. Res.*, **49** (1) :96-98

Ratnakar, R. and Sudharshan Reddy, M.S. (1991). Tribal farmers perception about ITDA programmes. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Educ.*, **10** (2): 75-78.

Suganthi, S., Venkataprabhu, J. and Muthiah Manoharan, P. (2013). Cultural characteristics of the tribal communities, *J. Extn. Edu.*, **25** (1) : 5004-5009

Suresh and Jayaramaiah (1995). Constraints of tribal farmers in animal husbandry and employment generation, programmes. *Rural India*, **58** (4) : 69-73.

Vijay, Oraon (2012). Changing pattern of tribal lively hoods A case study in Sundargrh district Odisha. MA Thesis, National Institute of Technology Rourkela

Yadav, K.S. (1970). Soclo-cultural obstacles to the development of Adivasis, *Yojana*, **14** (5) : 13.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ **12th** Year
of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★