



## Profile Characteristics Of Un-Reached Farmers

**Key words :** Characteristics, Un-Reached Farmers, Profile.

Agriculture is a way of life, a tradition, which is for centuries, has shaped the thought, the outlook, the culture and economic life of people. Agriculture is and will continue to be central to all strategies for planned socio-economic development of the nation. The progress made in agriculture during the last six decades has been one of the biggest success stories of independent India.

Several developmental programmes were initiated by the state and central governments for the welfare of the farming community. All these programmes one way or other touched only a part of the farming community covering progressive, resource rich and literate farmers. The left out farming community comprises not only small farmers, marginal farmers, agricultural labourers but also innocent, illiterate resource poor farmers we call them as laggards, were continuously been untouched. This content and percentage of laggards seems to be universal in all the developmental programmes. In order to achieve sustainable development in agriculture sector and also the well being of the entire nation, there is a need to concentrate on developing strategies in such a way that these sectors of farmers also should be effectively covered. Hence this study was taken up to study the profile characteristics of un-reached farmers. The results will help in designing appropriate strategies to enable them to be mainstreamed.

For the present study the Un-reached farmer is operationally defined as the farmer who is not been reached and/or not received the services and benefits of developmental organizations and their modern technologies such as utilization of information sources, extension services etc.. followed by lack of awareness, knowledge and adoption of latest production technologies in agriculture.

The study was conducted in Andhra Pradesh state, since the researcher belongs to the same state and familiar with the local language and culture which facilitated the researcher to do in-depth study. Andhra Pradesh has three regions having distinct geographical differences. Hence all the three regions of Andhra Pradesh state namely Telangana, Coastal and Rayalaseema regions were selected. Adilabad,

Srikakulam and Anantapur districts were selected randomly to cover one district from each region. Three mandals from each district were selected at random thus making a total of 9 mandals from three districts. From each of the selected mandals, two villages were selected randomly thus making a total of 6 villages from each district to cover 18 villages from entire Andhra Pradesh. It was assumed the poor information source utilization followed by lack of awareness, knowledge and adoption of latest production technologies could be a measure of un-reachedness of un-reached farmers. Such farmers with poor information source utilization followed by lack of awareness, knowledge and adoption of latest production technologies were identified with the help of an index developed for the study. The farmers with lowest 10 scores for the index from each village were identified as the un-reached farmers. They were selected as the respondents for the present investigation. Accordingly 10 un-reached farmers from each village were selected from all the 18 selected villages to form a total sample size of 180 un-reached farmers for the present investigation.

It is evident from the results that, 58.33 per cent of un-reached farmers belonged to middle age category and remaining were almost equally distributed under young (21.11%) and old age (20.56%) categories. The above trend may be due to the fact that the children of un-reached farmers were sent for schooling rather than doing agriculture. On the other side, the old people also trying to vest the responsibility of agriculture on their sons/daughters, as it is becoming very risky. So, majority of the un-reached farmers were under middle age category. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Krishnaprasad (2005)

In all the three regions put together 85.56 per cent of the un-reached farmers were illiterates, followed by 'can read and write', primary school education category and a very meager percentage were under middle and higher school education. Almost similar type of distribution was observed in all the three regions individually. The above trend might be due to the fact that, there were no proper educational facilities in the villages at that time. At present, they were not interested to go for non formal

education, because of lack of awareness on the importance of literacy in the agriculture. They were simply involved in agricultural operations with out much knowledge on latest production technologies in agriculture. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Karna (1999).

In all the three regions 66.11 per cent of un-reached farmers had medium farming experience, followed by low and high farming experience. The above trend may be due to the fact that, the young farmers were not been encouraged by their parents to involve in farming and they were sent for education or to other occupation. On the other hand, the aged farmers might be distributing the lands to their children and not involving much in farming operations. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Sivanandan (2002).

The data pertaining to all the three regions put together indicates 99.5 percent of un-reached farmers belonged to Scheduled castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Castes, a very negligible percentage (0.55%) of un-reached farmers belonged to forward castes. The above trend might be due to the fact that, the SCs, STs and BCs were not been properly considered while implementing different developmental programmes. They were almost neglected and all the efforts were concentrated only on certain categories of people, this resulted in more un-reachedness in those categories of people. The other factors illiteracy, low land holding, also must have contributed to this trend. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Sharma (2000).

Ninety six per cent of un-reached farmers were distributed under nuclear family category and only 3.89 per cent were under joint family category. Almost similar results were observed in all the three regions. The above trend might be that, in the present society the people are trying to have more individuality rather than living with their family members and to work as an associate member or a dependent. The monitory conflicts among the family members might have contributed significantly for the nuclear family approach. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Krupakar (2001).

The data pertaining to all the three regions put together indicates that 74.44 per cent of un-reached farmers had medium family size and 23.89 per cent had low family size. Very negligible percentage (1.67%) of un-reached farmers had high family size. The above trend might be due to the reason that, most of the families were of nuclear type and also the people were more aware on population control. The above two reasons might have contributed to such type of distribution. This

finding is in conformity with the findings of Sharma (2000) and Raju (2002).

In Telangana and Coastal regions more than half the un-reached farmers had mud walls with thatched roof and a very meagre percentage of un-reached farmers had brick walls with asbestos roof. In Rayalaseema 35.00 per cent of un-reached farmers had mud walls with thatched roof and 65.00 per cent had brick walls with thatched roof. Further the pooled data of all the three regions indicates that, 50.00 per cent of un-reached farmers had mud walls with thatched roof and 46.67 per cent had brick walls with thatched roof and only 3.33 per cent had brick walls with asbestos roof. This may be due to the reason that, most of the un-reached farmers were running their lives below the poverty line because of so many reasons like low income, low land holding, low profits, exploitation of money lenders etc.. so they were not in a position to construct a good house for living. This is an indication of their standard of living. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Krishnaprasad (2005).

In all the three regions put together 93.89 per cent of un-reached farmers had agriculture + agricultural labourer as their main occupation. Only 6.11 per cent of the un-reached farmers had agriculture + agricultural labourer+ caste Occupation as their occupation. This might be due to the reason that, the un-reached farmers had low land holding and also they were not getting good returns from their limited land holding. They were not in a position to meet the expenditure required to run the family with only agriculture as the source of income. So they coupled agricultural labourer occupation with agriculture. Regarding caste occupation was concerned as their father and fore fathers might be involved in their caste occupation and the same being continued by them also. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Veerendranath (2000).

About ninety three per cent of the un-reached farmers had only informal social contacts, followed by very meagre per cent (7.22%) of un-reached farmers with membership in formal organizations. This is the clear indication that all the un-reached farmers had very poor social contacts with out side the community. Their periphery of activities was confined with in the community. This may be due to their illiteracy and poor socio economic conditions, resulted in lack of awareness, knowledge and adoption of latest improved production technologies by the un-reached farmers. They may be interacting among themselves with co-farmers and neighbours and friends but not the real sources of information like key communicators,

extension workers, scientists etc.. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Kumar (2001) and Ananthan and Anita (2002).

The data regarding land holding 86.67 per cent of un-reached farmers were small and marginal (47.22% marginal and 39.45% small), followed by 13.33 percent were big farmers. The above trend indicates that, the un-reached farmers were doing agriculture under very bad conditions of low land holding, tenant farming, rainfed based agriculture etc... This condition might be due to the fact that they could not be able to purchase land because of financial constraints. In addition, the tenant farming was very risky and it was not yielding even the cost of cultivation incurred by the farmer. This finding is in conformity with findings of Kistaiah (2001), Singh *et al* (2004) and Prasanthkumar (2007).

The data pertaining to total annual income clearly indicates that 17.78 per cent of un-reached farmers were in 'up to Rs.10,000' annual income range, followed by 65.00 per cent of un-reached farmers were under 'Rs.10,001-Rs.20,000' annual income category. 15.00 per cent of un-reached farmers were distributed under the range of 'Rs.20,001-Rs.30,000' annual income. As most of the un-reached farmers were small and marginal, they were depending on their own land for their livelihood. To meet the day to day expenditure they were also been depending on the daily wages either for farm operations and other allied works in the village. Hence the income levels of most of the un-reached farmers were very poor and running their lives below the poverty line. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Ghosh *et al* (2002) and Rajaram (2002).

Regarding material possession, 25.56 per cent of un-reached farmers were under 'no material possession' category, 52.22 per cent had 'low', followed by 20.00 per cent had 'medium' and only 2.22 per cent of un-reached farmers were under 'high' category. The above trend may be due to the fact that most of the un-reached farmers were operating under very poor economic conditions and they could not be able afford for purchasing those materials either farm or household items. Lack of knowledge on latest production technologies in agriculture also contributed for the above result. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Krupakar (2001) and Ghosh *et al* (2002).

Seventy three per cent of the respondents had medium decision making ability, followed by low and high decision making ability. Further the data pertaining to all the three regions put together

revealed that 72.78 per cent of the respondents had medium decision making ability, followed by low and a very meagre per cent (4.44%) had high decision making ability. The above result might be an indication of poor decision making ability of un-reached farmers. Most of the un-reached farmers fell under only medium and low decision making ability. This might be due to lack of confidence and predictability on their operations being performed in farming. Further, the factors like lack of knowledge on latest production technologies and economic insecurity in farming influenced significantly for the above result. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Raju (2002) and Kumar (2001).

about seventy three percent of un-reached farmers were under medium achievement motivation category followed low and high achievement motivation category. This is because of the fact that most of the un-reached farmers were living in poor socio economic conditions coupled with their illiteracy, they were always striving for good results from their farm and also aiming at getting more income through agricultural labourer occupation; with out that, they could not survive themselves and also their family members basically for their food and shelter, but they were been regularly failed in meeting their requirement. This condition might have resulted in such trend. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Prasad (2005).

The results clearly indicates that, most of the un-reached farmers had medium management orientation, followed by low and high management orientation, this might be due to the fact that, most of them were very poor in planning of their agricultural operations, marketing of their produce and also in terms of knowledge on agricultural production technologies. Above all, their illiteracy and poor economic status contributed for such trend. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Kumar (2001).

The overall distribution indicates that 65.55 per cent were under medium self confidence category, 22.78 per cent of un-reached farmers were under low self confidence category and 11.67 per cent were under high self confidence category. The reasons for the above results might be due to the fact that most of the un-reached farmers had very poor social contact and this condition narrow down the vision of the un-reached farmers and became unaware of the ongoing developments in field of agriculture. Hence the self confidence levels of un-reached farmers were very low. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Paramaguru and Paramaguru (2005).

About sixty three per cent of un-reached farmers were under medium risk orientation category, followed by low and high risk orientation category. The above trend clearly indicates that, majority of un-reached farmers were not in a position to take risks in farming. This may be due to the reason that they had low land holding, and dependence on rain fall as the main source of irrigation associated with their poor economic status could not afford them to take risks in farming. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Kumar (2002)

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Ananthan P S and Anita J 2002.** Farmers' perception of pollution in Bhavani River basin and the media's construction of it. *Indian Journal of Extension Education* Vol. XXXVIII No 3&4 2002 p.146-152
- Ghosh S, Kannan K, Singh R and Kundu D K 2002.** Socio-economic profile and cropping pattern in canal command area in Khurda district of Orissa. *Indian Journal of Extension Education* Vol. XXXVIII No 1&2 2002 p. 99-103
- Karna B 1999.** An evaluative study on Horticulture programme of ITDA, Bhadrachalam in Khammam district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Kistaiah G C 2001.** Production constraints of turmeric cultivation in Karimnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad
- Krishnaprasad T 2005.** A study on rural poverty and sustainable livelihoods in agrarian sector of Andhra Pradesh. Un published Ph.D. thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Krupakar G 2001.** A critical analysis of factors leading to death of cotton farmers in Warangal district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Kumar K V 2001.** Entrepreneurial behaviour of flouriculture farmers in Ranga reddy district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Paramaguru S and Paramaguru S 2005.** Attitude of farmers towards Krishi Sahayak Kendra, *Journal of Extension Education*, Orissa Society of Extension Education Vol IX & X Nos. 1&2 2004-2005 p. 25-31
- Prasanthkumar T V R R 2007.** A study on knowledge and adoption of AMC level trained and un trained farmers in Mahaboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Rajaram K M 2002.** A study on production constraints of groundnut cultivation in Sangali district of Maharashtra state. Un published M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.
- Veerendranath G 2000.** A critical study on flow, utilization and source credibility of agricultural information among rainfed castors of Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh. Un published Ph.D. thesis, ANGRAU Hyderabad.

Department of Extension Education  
S V Agricultural College  
Tirupati 517 502, Andhra Pradesh

**P V Satya Gopal**  
**Pochaiah Maraty**  
**B Vijayabhinandana**

(Received on 29.11.2010 and revised on 24.01.2011)