## RESEARCH PAPER

# Relationship between profile and livelihood status of bhil (tribal) farmers of Nandurbar district in Maharashtra state

Prakash L. Patel*, Mukesh A. Koli, Sandip S. Patil **and** Chandrashekar U. Patil
Department of Agricultural Extension Education, K.V. Patel College of Agriculture, Shahada, Nandurbar (M.S.)
India (Email: saac555@gmail.com)

**Abstract :** The present study was carried out in Nandurbar district of Maharashtra state to analyze relationship between profile and livelihood status of bhil (tribal) farmers. Total 20 villages from four selected talukas were identified for the present study. Ex post facto research design was used and 200 sample size were selected for the study by using random sampling method. The result of relational analysis shows that education (r= 0.239*) and number of earning member (r= 0.203) were found to be positive and highly significant, while family size (r=-0.569) and family type (r=-0.185) had negative and highly significant relationship with livelihood status of Bhil farmers. Whereas, occupation (r = 0.164), annual income (r=0.171*) and economic motivation (r=0.140*) were found to be positive and significant relationship and age (r=-0.146*) had negative and significant relationship with livelihood status of bhil farmers.

**Key Words :** Livelihood status, Co-efficient of correlation

## INTRODUCTION

India has the largest concentration of tribal people. These groups are concentrated in Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Lakshdwip, Dadra and Nagar Haweli, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Bihar, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Manipur, Himachal Pradesh, Andman and Nicobar Islands, Goa, Daman and Diu. They also live in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu, Karnataka, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh. Among these the 'Bhil' tribes are found in Khandesh Region of Maharashtra state particularly in district of Nandurbar, Dhule, Jalgaon and Nasik.

Under the tribal sub plan strategy, area of tribal concentration were carved out and made into integrated tribal development project (ITDP). Various development schemes were started by state government through integrated tribal development programme. Specially, in agriculture and allied sectors for the effective implementation of these schemes. Tribal development division was established at national level from May 1, 1983. The amelioration of the lot of the under privileged people in India, particularly of the tribes, then castes and classes which are given on inferior status due to the accident of birth has to be an important aim for any

---

*Author for correspondence:

**Prakash L. Patel,** Mukesh A. Koli, Sandip S. Patil **and** Chandrashekar U. Patil

government committed to democracy. The constitution of India prescribes protection and safeguard for scheduled castes and scheduled tribes with the object of removing their social disabilities and promoting their varied interests.

The benefits of democracy and a decade of economic liberalization have not trickled down to the lower strata of rural society in general and 'Bhil' community in particular, still stepped in immemorial poverty. So long as the economic and social conditions of these people do not improve; all the spectacular changes, which have taken place in the rural and urban areas mean nothing to the submerged half of the people and to the condition as a whole. Availing the benefits otherwise available through the provisions of constitutions, schemes and programmes introduced from time to time primarily for livelihood upliftment, how far and to what extent social change has been taken place among the small and marginal farmers belonging to these communities was a matter of curiosity and concern.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Nandurbar district of Maharashtra which is declared as Adivasi district by state government. It was conducted in purposively selected four talukas namely Navapur, Shahada, Akkalkuwa and Dhadgaon of district. Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. The sample size of 200 bhil farmers as respondents were selected by 'nth' method of proportionate sampling.

The relationship between independent and dependent variable was found out with the help of co-

efficient of correlation the following formula was used to calculate the co-efficient of correlation.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy - 1/n \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2/n}\sqrt{\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2/n}}$$

where,
r = Co-efficient of co relation
x = Independent variable
y = Dependant variable
n = Number of respondent

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads.

### Age and livelihood status :

Table 1 indicates that the relationship between age and livelihood status of Bhil farmer was negative and significant (r = -0.146*) at 5 per cent level of significance. It indicates that the livelihood status of young Bhil farmers was observed high as compared to old age farmers. Thus, the null hypothesis for age was, therefore, rejected. The probable reason may be that, the older age people were not so keen with various livelihood improving factors because of their illiteracy and traditional thinking regarding old and ancestral pattern of living. Young farmer were hard working and get support from their parents so to improve their livelihood status. This finding has been supported by finding of Rathod (2007).

### Education and livelihood status:

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.239**) between

| Table 1: Correlates of livelihood status with independent variables | | (n=200) |
|---|---|---|
| Sr. No. | Variables | Co-efficient of correlation |
| 1. | Age | -0.146* |
| 2. | Education | 0.239** |
| 3. | Occupation | 0.164* |
| 4. | Land holding | 0.134NS |
| 5. | Family size | -0.569** |
| 6. | Family education | 0.105NS |
| 7. | Family type | -0.185** |
| 8. | Annual income | 0.171* |
| 9. | Number of earning members | 0.203** |
| 10. | Economic motivation | 0.140* |
| 11. | Sources of information | 0.072NS |
| 12. | Social participation | 0.087NS |
| * and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively | | NS= Non- significant |

education and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is positive and highly significant relationship. It indicates that education was observed good in case of Bhil farmer having more livelihood status. Thus, the null hypothesis for education was, therefore, rejected. The probable reason may be that because of getting education the Bhil farmers get change in their knowledge, skill and attitude with respect to improve standard of living and overall behaviour. This finding is similar with the findings of Swati Gawande (2007) and Marbaniang (2010).

**Occupation and livelihood status:**

The correlation coefficient (r = 0.164*) between occupation and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is positive and significant relationship. It indicates that the livelihood status of Bhil farmers was observed more in case of farmers having subsidiary occupation. Thus, the null hypothesis for occupation was therefore rejected. The probable reason may be that the Bhil farmers get additional income from subsidiary occupation which could be a surplus income which motivate him to go for improvement in himself and his family life style. This finding supported the findings of Rathod (2007) and Swati Gawande (2007).

**Land holding and livelihood status :**

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.134) between land holding and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is no significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed similar in case of farmer having marginal, small and medium category of land holding. Thus, the null hypothesis for land holding was therefore accepted. The probable reason may be that because of fragmentation of land due to sub division of family most of the Bhil farmers of the study area possess land ranging from below one hectare to two hectare. Meager of them had land ranging from 2.01 hac to 4.00 hac. So, they may mostly not adopt market oriented farming. They may mostly produce the crops for feeding their family. This finding supported to findings of Rathod (2007) and Swati Gawande (2007).

**Family size and livelihood status:**

The correlation co-efficient (r = -0.569**) between family size and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is negative and highly significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status was observed well in case of Bhil farmers having small and medium size of family. Thus, the null hypothesis for land holding was, therefore, rejected. The probable reason may be that more number of members in family needs more income to reach minimum life style standard. The Bhil farmers of study area had less income in proportion to total members of the family. Because of which they are unable to provide the things required for improving their livelihood status. This result is in line with the result of Marbaniang (2010).

**Family education and livelihood status that livelihood status:**

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.105) between family education and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is no significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed same in all cases of family education categories. Thus, the null hypothesis for family education was therefore accepted. The probable reason may be that the education facility available in village is limited upto primary and secondary level and for college level education they had to approach district or divisional place. Due to their limited income they can't afford above secondary education to their family members. This leads tribal people to adopt their traditional culture and rural environment which make them only literate but not educated. This result is in line with the result of Biradar (2008).

**Family type and livelihood status:**

The correlation co-efficient (r = -0.185**) between family type and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is negative and highly significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed good in case of farmer having nuclear family. Thus, the Null hypothesis for family type was, therefore, rejected. The probable reason may be that due to less members in nuclear family they can fulfil their family needs in their limited income. The other reason might be that joint family earners are few and their dependents are more, as well as there is lack of co-ordination in decision making with respect to the factors that improve livelihood status. This result is in line with the result of Biradar (2008).

**Annual income and livelihood status:**

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.171*) between annual income and livelihood status of Bhil farmers

indicates that there is positive and significant relationship. It indicate that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed good in case of farmers having medium to high annual income. Thus, the Null hypothesis for annual income was, therefore, rejected. This may because of more income they can fullfil their needs and can pay extra to improve their life style. This result is in line with the result of Marbaniang (2010).

### Number of earning members and livelihood status:

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.203**) between number of earning members and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is positive and highly significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed good in those family having more number of earning members. Thus, the Null hypothesis for number of earning members was, therefore, rejected. This may due to more earners in the family they get more income, so they can easily complete their requirements and get motivated for improving their standard of living. This result is in line with the result of Biradar (2008).

### Economic motivation and livelihood status :

The correlation co-efficient (r= 0.140*) between economic motivation and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is positive and significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed good in those Bhil farmers who are having medium to high economic motivation. Thus, the Null hypothesis for economic motivation was, therefore, rejected. Economic motivation is basic character upon which other motives and drives are build when one develops higher level of economic motivation and wants to achive it he would strive hard and get internalized himself about different aspect of improving their livelihood status.This may be a right reason for obtaining such result. This finding is similar to reported by Swati Gawande (2007) and Marbaniang (2010).

### Sources of information and livelihood status :

The correlation co-efficient (r=0.072) between sources of information and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is no significant relationship. It indicates that livelihood status of Bhil farmer was observed same in case of farmer having low,medium and high category of sources of information. Thus, the Null hypothesis for sources of information was, therefore,

accepted. The probable reason may be that in tribal area formal sources of information like gramsevak, extension officer etc. cannot approach easily as compared to informal sources so they mostly depend on relatives, friends, neighbours etc. which are living in their village or near by the villages. The other reason might be the lack of utilization of information that they gain from various sources in practical life due to unavailability of the material at right time which lead to decrease income and livelihood status. This result is in line with the result of Marbaniang (2010).

### Social participation and livelihood status:

The correlation co-efficient (r = 0.087) between social participation and livelihood status of Bhil farmers indicates that there is no significant relationship. Thus, the Null hypothesis for social participation was, therefore, accepted. Social participation provides an opportunity to interact with other people in society to gain knowledge regarding various aspects of improving livelihood. In study area most of the Bhil farmer was observed in no social participation category, livelihood status of Bhil farmers were observed same in all categories of social participation and there is less interest and awareness about importance of participation in social organizations due to less education and guidance. This might be probable explanation of non-significant relationships. This result is in line with the result of Marbaniang (2010).

### Conclusion :

On the basis of the result obtained in present study it can be concluded that education and number of earning member were found to be positive and highly significant, while family size and family type had negative and highly significant relationship with livelihood status of Bhil farmers. Whereas, occupation, annual income and economic motivation were found to be positive and significant relationship while age had negative and significant relationship and land holding, sources of information and social participation had non relationship with livelihood status of Bhil farmers

## REFERENCES

**Bhatnagar R. (2001).** Socio-economic status of tribals in Singari Ranchi. *Tribal Res. Bull.,* **24** (2): 31-39.

**Biradar, B. N. (2008).** A study on impact of income generating activities on sustainable rural livelihoods of kawad project

beneficiaries. M. Sci. (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka (India).

**Devaarajaiah, M. K. (2009).** A study on livelihood diversification of small and marginal farmers in Kolar district of Karnataka. Ph.D. SRW, YCMOU, Nashik, India.

**Gawande, Swati (2007).** Socio-economic and livelihood analysis of tribal women. Ph.D. (Ag.) Thesis , Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, M.S. (India).

**Girase K.A. and Desai, B.R. (1993).** Communication behaviour of tribal contact farmers selected under T and V system. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.* **12** : 47-50.

**Kasar, D. V., Kale D. R. and Pawar, P. P. (1999).** A study of employment and income pattern in tribals in Pune district of Maharashtra. *Tribal Res. Bull.*, **11**(2) : 28-31.

**Mahajan, K. (2003):** Globalization and change among scheduled tribes in India. *Indian J. Social Res.*, **45**(4): 339-359.

**Marbaniang, E. K. (2010).** Livelihood activities of tibetan rehabilitants of mundgod- a socio-economic analysis. M.Sc. Thesis , University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka (India).

**Nagne G. D. (2002).** A study of socio-economic problems experienced by women agricultural labourers and their role in family decision making. M.Sc.(Ag.) Thesis, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Ahmednagar (M.S.) India.

**Pande, Vijaya and Rohini, Dev (1988).** A cross select ional study on certain socio-economic aspects of tribal in Kinwat. *Tribal Research Bulletin,* **10** (2) :11.

**Rathod, A. R. (2007).** A study on sustainable livelihoods of Lambani farmers in Hyderabad Karnataka. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka (India).

**Roy, M. N. and Choudhary, R. K. (1995).** Socio-economic profile of the schedule caste women in the development block in Assam. *Rural India*, 26-28.

**Sandhya, C. (2000).** Impact of home science training on in service tribal women. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **19** : 329.

**Singh, B. (2000).** Tribal products and development. *IASSI Quarterly,* **19** (2) : 1-13.

**Suryawanshi, D.B. (2002).** A study of participation of Bhil youth in agriculture and allied activities and their vocational preference in Sakri tahsil of Dhule district. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Ahmednagar (M.S.) India.

**Takle, S. R. and Solanke, A. V. (2000).** A study of Government Ashram Schools in Kinwat taluka. *Tribal Res. Bull.,* **23** (2): 46.

18th Year
★ ★ ★ ★ ★ of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★