Agriculture Update
Volume 8 | Issue 1 & 2 | February & May, 2013 | 212-216

Research Article

Analysis of constraints and suggestions of marginal farmers and landless labourers towards livelihood security in rainfed areas

■ SUNILKUMAR GOUDA, G.N. MARADDI, NAGESH AND H.S. SATISH

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :
Received:
13.02.2013;
Revised :
21.03.2013;
Accepted:
20.04.2013

SUMMARY : The present research study was conducted in rainfed areas of Koppal district of Karnataka during the year 2011-12. Koppal district was purposively selected as it receives lowest rainfall when compared to other districts of Hyderabad, Karnataka region. The ex-post facto research design used with the sample size of 120 respondents which consist of 60 marginal farmers and 60 landless labourers for the study. More than half of the respondents (65.00%) had faced the constraint like inadequate rainfall and erratic monsoon followed by difficulty in getting bank loan and lengthy procedure (58.33%) and lack of irrigation facilities (56.66%), lack of remunerative price for the farm produce and high price fluctuations (54.16%). 61.66 per cent suggested to provide irrigation facilities followed by subsidy should be increased for initiation of farm and non-farm activities in coupled with low rate of interest rate (53.33%), followed by 48.33 and 46.66 per cent suggested to provide minimum support price for various farm produce and more government schemes should be implement to increase the employment opportunities, respectively. It was observed that SES status of landless labourers was relatively lower side compare to marginal farmers in majority of the selected variables.

How to cite this article : Gouda, Sunilkumar, Maraddi, G.N. and Satish, H.S. (2013). Analysis of constraints and suggestions of marginal farmers and landless labourers towards livelihood security in rainfed areas. *Agric. Update*, **8**(1&2): 212-216.

KEY WORDS :
Constraints, Suggestions, Rainfed ecosystem, SES of respondents

Author for correspondence :
SUNILKUMAR GOUDA
Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA
See end of the article for authors' affiliations

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Among the rainfed agricultural countries in the world India ranks first in terms of both extent and value of produce. In India, out of the total geographical area of 329 million hectares about 143 million hectares is under cultivation. In this cultivated land, about 108 million hectares area is under rainfed agriculture. About 26 per cent of India's population is below the poverty line. Among these 70 per cent live in rural areas and is directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture. Poverty is mainly concentrated in rainfed areas, because of low land productivity, low labour productivity and higher population of landless households and agricultural labourers.

Livelihoods are an outcome of how and why people organize to transform the environment to meet their needs through technology, labour, power, knowledge and social relations. Livelihoods are also shaped by the boarder economic and political systems within which they operate. Livelihood intervention is more than income enhancement. It is about increasing economic power of people. It is facilitating asset creation, capacity building and access to opportunities. In nutshell, it is building securities for life.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in rainfed areas of Koppal district of Karnataka during the year 2011-12. Koppal district was purposively selected as it receives lowest rainfall when compared to other districts of Hyderabad, Karnataka region *viz.,* Gulbarga, Bidar, Bellary, Raichur, Koppal and Yadgir. Also it is one of the districts under the University jurisdiction. Koppal district consists of 4 taluks; out of 4 taluks three taluks were selected based on the lowest average rainfall, accordingly Koppal, Kustagi and Yelburga

taluks, from each taluk 2 villages were selected based on population, intern from each village 20 respondents were selected which constitutes 10 marginal farmers and 10 landless laborers on random basis, thus the total sample constituted 120 respondents which consisted of 60 marginal farmers and 60 landless labourers for the study.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads:

Constraints perceived by the marginal farmers and landless labourers for livelihood security in rainfed ecosystem:

The respondents analysis observed (Table 1) that several problems were being faced by the respondents in securing livelihood activities looking to the pooled analysis of both marginal farmers and landless labourers, more than half of the respondents (65.00%) had faced the constraint like inadequate rainfall and irratic monsoon, this might be due to predominant existence of this natural situation normally observed in rainfed ecosystem of study area, followed by difficulty in getting bank loan and lengthy procedure (58.33%) might be due to low literacy rate to understand the procedure coupled with deficiency of other collateral security, lack of irrigation facilities (56.66%) since the study conducted in rainfed area naturally above problem existed. The lack of remunerative price for the farm produce and high price fluctuation (54.16%) reason could be government not offering minimum support price for all crops inspite the losses incurred by farmers in worst conditions, the lack of infrastructure facilities to involve in various livelihood activities (41.66%) they need adequate government facility which are encourage them to get involve in entrepreneurial activity, the lack of awareness about government schemes (40.00%), this is due to illiteracy and low social participation of the sample respondents, The non-availability of work throughtout the year (37.50%), reason could be under employment in rainfed areas during both season, the lack of training for skilled activities in different livelihood systems (34.16%), it requires more encouragement from the government to undertake such livelihood development projects which may brought smile in the faces of several rural poor, The developments requires in terms of creating infrastructure facilities. Non-availability of timely inputs (30.00%) and the non-availability of suitable marketing facility and transportation (19.16%), villages are in interior in main roads and cities, problem in marketing products are getting low price for their produce. The findings are in agreement with the research results of Savitha (2010).

Suggestions of marginal farmers and landless labourers for livelihood security in rainfed ecosystem:

The information presented in Table 2 indicated the suggestions given by landless and marginal farmers for improving their livelihoods. It was revealed that 61.66 per cent suggested to provide irrigation facilities. Other suggestions offered were subsidy should be increased for initiation of farm and non-farm activities coupled with low rate of interest rate (53.33%), followed by 48.33 and 46.66 per cent suggested to provide minimum support price for various farm produce and more government schemes should be implement to increase the employment opportunities, respectively. Some of the other suggestions offered by them were wage rates could be increased (39.16%) and 20.00 per cent of the respondents suggested that promotion of non-farm income generating activities by providing skill oriented training.

As the study was conducted in rainfed ecosystem and resource poor area, which prompted the respondents to expect support from the government, private sectors and voluntary organizations to offer incentives and subsidies to stabilize their livelihood activities in resource less area. One more reason might be lower economic status of both marginal farmers and

Table 1 : Constraints perceived by the respondents in undertaking various livelihood activities **(n = 120)**

Sr. No.	Constraints	Marginal farmers		Landless labourers		Pooled		Rank
		Fr.	%	Fr.	%	Fr.	%	
1.	Lack of remunerative prices for the farm produce and high price fluctuation	44	73.33	21	35.00	65	54.16	IV
2.	Lack of awareness about government schemes	26	43.33	22	36.67	48	40.00	VI
3.	Difficulty in getting bank loan and procedure is lengthy	36	60.12	34	56.66	70	58.33	II
4.	Lack of training for skilled activities in different livelihood systems	18	30.00	23	38.33	41	34.16	VIII
5.	Non-availability of suitable marketing facility and transportation	11	18.33	12	20.00	23	19.16	X
6.	Lack of irrigation facilities	36	60.00	32	53.33	68	56.66	III
7.	Inadequate rainfall and vagaries monsoon	50	83.33	28	46.66	78	65.00	I
8.	Lack of infrastructure facilities to involved in various livelihood activities	22	36.66	28	46.66	50	41.66	V
9.	Non availability of timely inputs	17	28.33	19	31.67	36	30.00	IX
10.	Non availability of work throughout the year	14	23.33	31	51.66	45	37.50	VII

landless labourers tempted to involve in more number of livelihood activities to gain the livelihood security for the whole family.

Socio-economic status of marginal farmers and landless labourers:

It is revealed from Table 3 that nearly one third (33.33%) of the marginal farmers were illiterate and equal distribution (23.33%) of respondents were educated up to primary and middle school. In case of landless labourers, nearly half (46.67%) of the respondents were illiterate and 28.33 per cent were educated up to primary and 18.33 were educated up to middle school. Illiteracy of parents might have come in the way of getting them better education to their children. Another reason could be the distance of schools for higher study and financial constraints might have prevented the parents for providing higher education to their children. The findings are in line with the results of Arun kumar (2004). It observed that 43.33 per cent marginal farmers belonged to small family size, followed by medium family size (30.00%) and remaining 26.67 per cent belonged to large family size. As in case of landless labourers, it is observed that 38.33 per cent of them belonged to medium family size, followed by large family size (36.67) and remaining 25.00 per cent belonged to small family size. Study depicts that 41.67 per cent of marginal farmers had land between 1.48 to 2.12 acres, while 33.33 per cent of them had 0.10 to 1.47 acres and 25.00 per cent of marginal farmers had land between 2.12 to 2.50 acres of land. The findings are in conformity with the research results of Loganandhan and Premalatha Singh (2002). Data recorded in Table 3 reports that half (50.00%) of marginal farmers had medium level of income (Rs. 30,000-50,000), followed by 43.33 per cent of them had low income (upto Rs.30,000). In case of landless labourers nearly half (48.33%) of the respondents had medium level of income (30,000-50,000) followed by 41.67 per cent had low level of income (up to 30,000).This was due to their existing socio-economic background which induces the respondents to undertake various livelihood activities. The findings are in line with the research results of Vijaykumar (2001).The contents expressed that, half (50.00%) of marginal farmers had medium extension contact, whereas 26.67 and 23.33 per cent of them had high and low extension contact, respectively. In case of landless labourers nearly half (48.33%) of them had low extension contact, whereas 28.33 and 23.33 per cent of them had medium and high extension contact, respectively. It is noticed that forty per cent of the marginal farmers had low risk orientation. With regards to landless labourers, more than half (63.33%) of the respondents had low risk orientation. The possible reason might be that, agriculture in India was considered as gambling with nature due to erratic and scanty rainfall, farmer cannot expect good yield from crops particularly in rainfed ecosystem. The findings are in agreement with the research results of Vijay Kumar (2001). The results presented in Table 3 revealed that 43.33 per cent of marginal farmers and 40.00 per cent of landless labourers were belonged to medium achievement motivation category, The findings are in accordance with the results obtained by Kumar (2002). It is observed that, half (50.00%) of marginal farmers had medium social participation, In case of landless labourers nearly half (48.33%) of them had low social participation. The main reason for this might be their poor socio-economic status, lack of interest, inability of respondents to devote their time and lack of awareness about activities of various social institutions. The contents observed in the Table 3 that, one third (36.67%) of marginal farmers had medium mass media exposure, whereas 35.00 and 28.33 per cent of them had high and low mass media exposure, respectively. In case of landless labourers 45.00 per cent of them had low mass media exposure, whereas 28.33 and 26.67 per cent of them had medium and high mass media exposure, respectively. The reason might be due to illiteracy,

Table 2 : Suggestions from respondents for the improvement of the livelihood activity **(n = 120)**

Sr. No.	Suggestions	Marginal farmers		Landless labourers		Pooled		Rank
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
1.	To provide minimum support price for various farm produce	27	45.00	31	51.67	58	48.33	III
2.	Promotion of non-farm IGAs by providing skill oriented training	11	18.33	13	21.67	24	20	VI
3.	Subsidy should be increased for initiation of farm and non-farm activities coupled with low interest rate	36	60.00	28	46.67	64	53.33	II
4.	Provide irrigation facilities through minor irrigation projects and watershed activities	38	63.33	36	60.00	74	61.66	I
5.	More government schemes should be implemented to increase the employment opportunities	29	48.33	27	45.00	56	46.66	IV
6.	Wage rates could be increased	17	28.33	30	50.00	47	39.16	V

Table 3 : Distribution of the respondents according to their socio-economic and psychological attributes (n = 120)

Sr. No.	Attributes	Marginal farmers (n_1 = 60)		Landless labourers (n_2 = 60)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Education				
	Illiterate	20	33.33	28	46.67
	Primary	14	23.33	17	28.33
	Middle school	14	23.33	11	18.33
	High school	9	15.00	4	6.67
	PUC	2	3.33	-	-
	Degree	1	1.67	-	-
		Mean = 1.37, SD = 1.28		Mean = 0.85, SD = 0.95	
2.	Land holding				
	Low (mean – 0.425 SD)	20	33.33	-	-
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	25	41.67	-	-
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	15	25.00	-	-
		Mean = 1.80, SD = 0.76		Mean = 0, SD = 0	
3.	Annual income				
	Low income group (upto 30000)	26	43.33	25	41.67
	Medium income group (30000 to 50000)	30	50.00	29	48.33
	High income group (Above 50000)	4	6.67	6	10.00
4.	Family size				
	Low (mean – 0.425 SD)	26	43.33	15	25.00
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	18	30.00	23	38.33
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	16	26.67	22	36.67
		Mean = 5.77, SD = 1.62		Mean = 5.38, SD =1.37	
5.	Extension contact				
	Low (mean – 0.425 SD)	14	23.33	29	48.33
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	30	50.00	17	28.33
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	16	26.67	14	23.33
		Mean = 13.70, SD = 1.71		Mean = 9.85, SD =1.35	
6.	Risk orientation				
	Low (mean – 0.425 SD)	24	40.00	38	63.33
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	15	25.00	6	10.00
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	21	35.00	16	26.67
		Mean =11.50, SD = 4.16		Mean = 10.10, SD = 4.25	
7.	Achievement motivation				
	Low (mean– 0.425 SD)	13	21.67	20	33.33
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	26	43.33	24	40.00
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	21	35.00	16	26.67
		Mean = 18.98, SD = 1.26		Mean = 18.35, SD = 1.63	
8.	Social participation				
	Low (mean– 0.425 SD)	14	23.33	29	48.33
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	30	50.00	24	40.00
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	16	26.67	7	11.67
		Mean = 2.13, SD = 0.89		Mean = 1.68, SD = 0.87	
9.	Mass media exposure				
	Low (mean– 0.425 SD)	21	35.00	27	45.00
	Medium (mean ± 0.425 SD)	22	36.67	17	28.33
	High (mean + 0.425 SD)	17	28.33	16	26.67
		Mean = 7.30, SD = 3.16		Mean = 5.63, SD = 3.83	

lack of interest, unavailability of time with their engagement in different livelihood activities

Conclusion:

It was concluded that, In rain fed ecosystem, enormous constraints faced by both small and marginal farmers to get livelihood security, which needs some special programmes during off season, more of product subsidy than input subsidy and designed schemes to meet the demands of under employment through providing non-farm income generating activities and agro-based enterprises under rain fed ecosystem by providing skill oriented training.

Authors' affiliations :

G.N. MARADDI, NAGESH AND H.S. SATISH, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA

REFERENCES

Savitha, M.G. (2010), Livelihood systems for rural community in Chitradurga district of Karnataka state. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.,* **24**(3): 325-330.

Kumar, Hemanth (2002). A study on attitude knowledge and adoption of recommended practices by tobacco farmers in Chittoor district of A.P. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, A.P. (INDIA).

Loganandhan, L. and Singh, Premalatha (2002). Locus of control and self-esteem of rural youth in Delhi. *J. Extn. Edu.*, **13**(4): 3439-34451.

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

Vijay Kumar, X. (2001). Entrepreneurial behaviour of floriculture farmers in Ranga Reddy district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, A.P. (INDIA).