

A Profile of Agricultural Labourer in Andhra Pradesh

I.Venkata Reddy^{1*}, T. Gopi Krishna², P. V. Sathya Gopal³, Y. Radha⁴ and V. Srinivasa Rao⁵

¹Ph.D scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension, Agricultural College, Bapatla- 522101

²Principal Scientist, O/o. Director of Extension, ANGRAU, LAM, Guntur-522018

³Professor and University Head, Department of Agri-Business Management,
S V Agricultural College, Tirupathi- 517502

⁴Director of Planning & Monitoring Cell, ANGRAU, LAM, Guntur-522018

⁵Professor & University Head, Department of Statistics & Computer Applications,
Agricultural College, Bapatla- 522101

*Corresponding Author E-mail: ivrextedu18@gmail.com

Received: 3.11.2020 | Revised: 2.12.2020 | Accepted: 7.12.2020

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in three districts of Andhra Pradesh viz., Kurnool, Guntur, and Srikakulam during 2018-20 to identify the profile characteristics of agricultural labourers. An Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. To study the profile characteristics of agricultural labourers a total of 240 respondents were selected for the study. Results revealed that majority of the (36 years to 58 years) middle aged (56.66%), followed by illiterates (25.88%), medium (4 to 6 members) family size (69.58%), 11-20 years of agricultural labourer experience (42.08%), no farm experience (20.00%), marginal land holding (50.00%), marginal tenant landholding (36.66%), wage + agriculture (44.66%) main occupation, medium urban contact (70.83%), medium deferred gratification(72.50%), medium credit orientation (71.66%), medium achievement motivation (62.50%), medium economic orientation (60.84%), medium self-confidence (67.51%), medium achievement motivation (62.50%), of the agricultural medium level of aspiration (55.41%).

Keywords: Profile, Agricultural Labourer, Ex-post facto, Andhra Pradesh.

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural labourer constitute the most neglected class in Indian rural structure. Often they are not in a position to earn just enough to keep their body and soul together and are frequently exposed to the hazards of unemployment and irregular employment and

have neither private nor social security. Being unorganized, they do not have the most needed muscle to seek better living and working condition. Their income is low and employment irregular. Since, they possess no skill or training, they have no alternative employment opportunities (Kulamani, 2007).

Cite this article: Reddy, I.V., Gopi Krishna, T., Sathya Gopal, P. V., Radha, Y., & Srinivasa Rao, V. (2020). A Profile of Agricultural Labourer in Andhra Pradesh, *Ind. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 8(6), 205-212. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-2845.8453>

Between 2004-05 and 2011-12 was the first instance of workforce reduction in agriculture declined by around 30.57 million in spite of the total size of workforce continued to increase. Higher remuneration and growth of opportunities in alternate sectors is leading to the migration of workforce away from agriculture. This has resulted in labour shortage, increase in wages and consequent escalation of cost of cultivation. Government schemes like MGNREGA are affecting labour adversely and need immediate policy interventions (FICCI-KPMG Report, 2015).

The number of agricultural labourers rose almost three times over the period from 1951 to 1991 from 27.3 million in 1951 to 74.6 million in 1991. As per the census of 2011, 263 million people are engaged in the agriculture sector and over half of them are now agricultural labourers, a trend observed for the first time in the past 40 years. The number of agricultural labourers rose almost three times over the period from 1951 to 1991 from 27.3 million in 1951 to 74.6 million in 1991. As per the census of 2011, 263 million people are engaged in the agriculture sector and over half of them are now agricultural labourers, a trend observed for the first time in the past 40 years.

Considering the fact that large share of the working poor are engaged in agriculture, developments in that sector have a major impact on welfare throughout much of the world. Until 2000, agriculture was the mainstay of employment around the world. Since then, the services sector has assumed this mantle and the gap between the two has widened. Although employment growth in agriculture has slowed, the number of workers in this sector reached over one billion in 2009. An agricultural labourer is operationally defined as an individual who is a farmer/artisan and others, wherein, they work for

more than half of the total number of days in a year as an agricultural labourer and derive more than 50 per cent of income by doing agricultural work on others farm for wages (First Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee, 1950-51).

Agriculture and allied sector is unique because of its location-specific and variety and As per 2011 census highest number of agricultural labourers in North coastal zone reported in Srikakulam, which comprises 4,42,295 male and female agricultural labourers in South costal region Guntur district comprises 1,035,569 male and female agricultural labourers in Rayalaseema region Kurnool district 8,69,074 consists male and female agricultural labourers so selected for the three districts. Keeping these important issues in view, the present study entitled was conducted.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the present study *Ex-post facto* research design was followed. The present study was conducted three districts of Srikakulam, Guntur and Kurnool districts in Andhra Pradesh state were purposively selected based on the highest number of agricultural labourers from each district two mandals were selected by using simple random sampling, from each of the selected mandal four villages were selected by using simple random sampling procedure thus comes to a total of 24 villages. From each of the selected village, ten respondents were selected by using simple random sampling procedure thus coming to total of 240 respondents. The data was collected by personal interview method through a structured interview schedule and analyzed by employing suitable statistical methods. Fifteen variables were identified to study the profile characteristics of agricultural labourer.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**Table 1: Distribution of agricultural labourers according to their profile characteristics (n=240)**

S. No.	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Mean	S.D
i. Age					
1.	Young Age (<35 years)	40	16.67	-	-
2.	Middle Age (36 years to 58 years)	136	56.66		
3.	Old Age (>58 year)	64	26.67		
ii. Education					
1	Illiterate	62	25.88	-	-
2	Can read and write only	29	12.08		
3	Primary school	47	19.58		
4	Middle school	51	21.25		
5	High school	40	16.63		
6	Intermediate	5	2.08		
7	College education & above	6	2.50		
iii. Family Size					
1	Small (1 to 3 members)	39	16.25	-	-
2	Medium (4 to 6 members)	167	69.58		
3	Large (7 to 9 members)	31	12.91		
4	Very large (> 9 members)	3	1.26		
iv. Agricultural Labourer Experience					
1.	1 to 10 years	72	30.00	-	-
2.	11 to 20 years	101	42.08		
3.	21 to 30 years	56	23.33		
4.	31 to 40 years	8	3.33		
5.	41 to 50 years	3	1.25		
v. Farm Experience					
1.	No experience	48	20.00	-	-
2.	1 to 10 years	61	25.41		
3.	11 to 20 years	55	22.92		
4.	21 to 30 years	43	17.92		
5.	31 to 40 years	20	8.33		
6.	41 to 50 years	13	5.42		
vi. Land Holding					
1	Land less (no land)	105	43.75	-	-
2	Marginal (Up to 2.5 acres)	120	50.00		
3	Small (2.5 to 5 acres)	7	2.92		
4	Semi-medium (5 to 7.5 acres)	5	2.08		
5	Medium (7.5 to 10 acres)	3	1.25		
6	Large (>10 acres)	-	-		
vii. Tenant Land Holding					
1.	No tenant land holding	90	37.50	-	-
2.	Marginal (Up to 2.5 acres)	120	50.00		
3.	Small (2.5 to 5 acres)	25	10.41		
4.	Semi-medium (5 to 7.5 acres)	5	2.083		
5.	Medium (7.5 to 10 acres)	-	-		
6.	Large (>10 acres)	-	-		
viii. Occupation Status					
1.	Wage Work	52	21.66	-	-

2.	Wage Work + Agriculture	106	44.66		
3.	Wage Work +Agriculture + Livestock	73	30.41		
4.	others	9	3.75		
ix.	Urban contact				
1.	Low urban contact (<2.3891)	28	20.00	4.59	2.20
2.	Medium urban contact (2.3892-6.79)	170	70.83		
3.	High urban contact (>6.79)	48	9.17		
x.	Deferred gratification				
1.	Low deferred gratification (<30.70)	35	14.58	35.73	5.03
2.	Medium deferred gratification (30.71- 40.77)	174	72.50		
3.	High deferred gratification (>40.78)	31	12.92		
xi.	Credit Orientation				
1.	Low credit orientation (<7.629)	42	17.50	9.85	2.22
2.	Medium credit orientation (7.630-12.07)	172	71.66		
3.	High credit orientation (>12.08)	26	10.84		
xii.	Achievement Motivation				
1.	Low achievement motivation (<19.50)	38	15.84	23.18	3.67
2.	Medium achievement motivation (19.51-26.84)	150	62.50		
3.	High achievement motivation (>26.85)	52	21.66		
xiii.	Economic Orientation				
1.	Low economic orientation (<9.675)	34	14.16	11.83	2.16
2.	Medium economic orientation (9.676-13.98)	146	60.84		
3.	High economic orientation (>13.99)	60	25.00		
xiv.	Self Confidence				
1.	Low self confidence (<5.09)	49	20.41	6.366	1.27
2.	Medium self confidence (5.08-7.62)	162	67.51		
3.	High self confidence (>7.63)	29	12.08		
xv.	Level of Aspiration				
1.	Low level of Aspiration(<12.94)	15	6.25	16.14	3.20
2.	Medium level of Aspiration(12.94-16.14)	133	55.41		
3.	High level of Aspiration(>16.14)	92	38.34		

1. Age

It is evident from the Table 1 that more than half (56.66%) of the agricultural labourers belonged to middle age followed by those belonging to young (16.67%) and old (26.67%) age categories. Majority of the agricultural labourers were middle aged because they were actively involved in the farm activities.

From the above trend majority of agricultural labourers were, middle aged enthusiastic and they have more physical vigor, work efficiency and also have greater responsibility towards family.

This finding is in conformity with the findings of Ramya et al. (2016), Swathi et al. (2017) and Ramesh et al. (2019).

2. Education

Education plays a very crucial role in the social and economic development of agricultural labourers. From the Table 1 it is observed that more than one fourth (25.88%) of the agricultural labourers were illiterates followed by those educated up to middle school (21.25%), primary school (19.58%), high school (16.63%), can read and write only (12.08%), intermediate (2.08%) and college education & above (2.50%) education.

That majority of the agricultural labourers were illiterates followed by those educated up to middle school education because of their low land holding, social environment, poor economic status, poor educational facilities existing at the time of their childhood so that forced them to involve in agricultural labourer as their occupation. The agricultural labourers are more traditional and showing poor interest in taking formal education.

These findings were in agreement with that of Swathi et al. (2017) and. Kumar et al. (2018).

3. Family Size

It could be elucidated from the Table 1 that more than two third (69.58%) of the agricultural labourers were with medium family size (4 to 6 members), followed by those with small (16.25%), large (12.91%) and very large (1.26%) family size category.

Majority of agricultural labourers had medium family size because their living with nuclear family after marriage with his wife and new born babaies because of lack of comfortably in socio economic status.

The present finding of the study was in coherence with Saikia (2018) and Ramesh et al. (2019).

4. Agricultural Labourer Experience

An overview of the Table 1 depicted that majority (42.08%) of the agricultural labourers had 11-20 years of agricultural labourer experience followed by 1 to 10 years (30.00%), 21 to 30 years (23.33%), 31 to 40 years (3.33%), 41 to 50 years (1.25%) of agricultural labourer wage experience.

Majority belonged to 11 to 20 years of agricultural labourer experience because those above middle age leave the agriculture because they had semi medium land holding forcing them to have low profits and losses in agriculture, so they were considering agricultural labourer as an alternate option and choose agricultural labourer as an alternate occupation for nourishment of their living and improving standard of living conditions.

5. Farm Experience

From Table 1 it is revealed that more than one fifth (25.41%) of the agricultural labourers had 1 to 10 years followed by those with no farm

experience (20.00%), 11 to 20 years (22.92%), 21 to 30 years (17.92%), 31 to 40 years of farm experience.

This might be due to the fact that majority of the agricultural labourers belonged to middle aged and involvement in agriculture as occupation since ages and as their livelihood.

This finding is in conformity with the findings of Barman et al. (2013) Meena (2016).

6. Land Holding

From Table 1 it was evident that half (50.00%) of the agricultural labourers belonged to marginal land holding category followed by those belonged landless (43.75%), small (2.92%), semi-medium (2.08%), medium (7.50%), large (1.25%) land holding.

The possible reason might to be majority of agricultural labourers were either land less or marginal because they belonging to schedule castes, schedule tribes and backward classes from generations and had poor socio economic and communication status and depend on agricultural labourer as a livelihood option.

The result was in conformity with the findings of Barman et al. (2013) and Kale et al. (2015).

7. Tenant Land Holding

The findings presented in Table 1 indicated that more than one third (36.66%) of the agricultural labourers marginal tenant landholding followed by those belonged to small (22.50%), land less (22.50%), medium (8.34%), and semi-medium (7.50%), large (2.50%) categories. Majority of them belonged marginal followed by small land holdings and land less categories with respect to teant land holding. The present finding of the study was in coherence with Vijayabhinandana et al. (2019).

8. Occupation Status

From the Table 1 it could be observed that less than half (44.66%) of agricultural labourers had wage + agriculture as their main occupation followed by those had wage work + agriculture + livestock (30.41%), wage work (21.66%) and others (3.75%) as occupational status.

The wage earning was not sufficient to meet the family requirements so that majority of the also additionally engage themselves in agriculture as an additional livelihood option because from agriculture, crops by biproducts use for the dairy as they gain additional income from the agriculture. The findings of this study are in agreement with the findings of study conducted by Pandya et al. (2014).

9. Urban Contact

The results shown in the Table 1 indicated that more than half of the agricultural labourers of medium (70.83%), urban contact followed by those with low (20.00%) and high (9.17%) urban contact.

Majority of agricultural labourers had medium urban contact. The probable reason for that access to transport for everybody now a days they regularly go to cities for government services, agricultural, non-agricultural, health and market the produce.

These finding were agreement with the findings of Kiran (2011).

10. Deferred Gratification

From the Table 1 could be concluded that less than three fourths (72.50%) of the agricultural labourers had medium deferred gratification followed by 14.58 per cent of them had low and 12.92 per cent had high deferred gratification. As the annual income is medium, they are very conservative in spending money. Hence, the deferred gratification is medium.

The finding is in accordance with the findings of Chinnamnaidu (2012) and Pawar et al. (2019).

11. Credit Orientation

The results presented in the Table 1 clearly revealed that majority (71.66%) of the agricultural labourers had low credit orientation followed by 17.50 per cent had medium level of credit orientation and 10.84 per cent of them had high credit orientation.

This may be due to their medium information security and the medium level of education which might them to have medium level of credit orientation. This result was in agreement with Yashodhara (2011) Datta (2013) and Dhanasree et al. (2014).

12. Achievement Motivation

It could be concluded from the Table 1 that majority (62.50%) of the agricultural labourers had medium achievement motivation followed by those had high (21.66%) and low (15.84%) achievement motivation. From the results it could be concluded that the achievement motivation of the agricultural labourers was medium.

Achievement motivation forces the individual towards reaching goals, which they set for themselves. The reason for the above result is the middle age of majority of agricultural labourers. These middle aged people have medium motivation to achieve a higher status, and their aspirations are comparatively medium to excel in life with medium risk orientation.

The finding draws support with the studies of Suneetha and Jyothi (2011), Verma et al. (2013) and Dhanasree et al. (2014).

13. Economic Orientation

Table 1 clearly exhibited that they majority (60.84%) of the agricultural labourers had medium economic orientation, followed by the remaining with high (25.00%) and low (14.16%) economic orientation.

Since most of the respondents are middle aged and illiterate they are less oriented toward making the profits. On the other side, people having medium level of aspiration and innovativeness will have high economic orientation.

The present finding of the study was in conformation of Arathy (2011) and Chinnamnaidu et al. (2012).

14. Self-Confidence

A glance of the Table 1 indicated that majority (67.51%) had medium self-confidence subsequently, 20.41 per cent and 12.08 per cent had low and high self-confidence respectively. The lack of suitable training and skills upgradation may contribute to the above type of findings.

This result was in agreement with Suneetha and Jyothi (2011), Mubeena et al. (2017) and Kishor et al. (2019), Kumar et al. (2019).

15. Level of Aspiration

Table 1 revealed that more than half (55.41%) of the agricultural labourers had medium level of aspiration succeeded by those had high (38.34%) and low (6.25%) levels of aspirations. Agricultural labourers work for their livelihood, they might be stimulated to take up their activities with determination. The degree of willpower might be influencing their level of aspiration which was accrued as worth of life time experiences.

The findings of Suneetha and Jyothi (2011), Jyothi (2012), Ramya et al. (2016) and Naidu et al. (2018), were in line with the present.

REFERENCES

- Arathy, B. (2011). Constraint analysis of rice farmers of Trissur district of Kerala. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India.
- Barman, S., Pathak, K., & Pathak, P. K. (2013). Training needs of tribal farmers in rapeseed production technology of Upper Brahmaputra Valley Zone of Assam. *Journal of Academia and Industrial Research*. 1(11), 686-688.
- Chaturvedani, A. K., Lal, N., & Khalid, (2015). Livelihood security for tribal household through backyard poultry rearing in Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Extension Education*. 11(4), 46-48.
- Chinnamaidu, D. (2012). A study on farming performance and entrepreneurial behaviour of sugarcane farmers in north coastal zone of Andhra Pradesh. *Ph. D. Thesis*. Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India.
- Datta, J., Gangadharappa, N. R., & Debnath, A. (2014). Sustainability of Jhum Cultivation as perceived by the Tribal People of Tripura. *International Journal of Social Science*. 3(2), 179-190.
- Dhanasree, K., Vijayabhinandana, B., & Kumar, P. P. B. (2014). Socio-economic empowerment of tribal women in high altitude and tribal zone of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*. 3(2), 234-238.
- FICCI-KPMG Report. (2015). Agro sector faces mass migration-work force reduced by 30.57 million, federation house, tansenmarg, New Delhi.
- Ghosh, A., Dana, S. S., Sahu, P. K., & Adak, K. K. (2016). Socio-economic and livelihood profile of fishers in Indian Sundarbans: A descriptive study. *Journal of Crop and Weed*. 12(3), 70-78.
- Jyothi, V. (2012). Aspirations of Out-going B. Sc (Ag) Students of Agricultural College, Naira. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 59(2), 314-318.
- Kale, M., Mankar, D. M., & Wankhade, P. P. (2015). Impact of Government packages on livelihood sources of suicide prone farmer's families. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 28(1), 63-66.
- Kiran, S. (2011). A study on micro-finance for rural livelihood in district Hoshangabad of Madhya Pradesh. *Ph. D. Thesis* The School of Agricultural Science Yashwantrao Chavan Maharashtra Open University Nashik Maharashtra, India.
- Kishor, N. K., Jyothi, V., Vijayabhinandana, B., & Murthy, V. R. K. (2019). A study on the impact of ANGRAU Supported reliance foundation information services on beneficiary farmers. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 66(3), 560-563.
- KulamaniPadhi, (2007). "Agricultural Labour in India - A Close Look". *Orissa Review* 24-27.
- Kumar, K. R., Kumar, A., Verma, J., & Singh, S. R. K. (2018). Socio-economic, communicational and psychological profile of tribal farmers for their livelihood status in West Nimar region of Madhya Pradesh, India.

- International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 8(8), 1564-1569.
- Kumar, T., Singh, S. R., Kumari, P., & Panda, C. K. (2019). Socio-economic and psychological profile of Agripreneurs of Bhagalpur district of Bihar. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 8(2), 238-242.
- Meena, D. (2016). Knowledge and Attitude of Farmers about Agricultural Extension Programmes in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Bapatla, India.
- Mubeena, M. D., Lakshmi, T., Prasad, S. V., & Sunitha, N. (2017). Profile characteristics of members of PodupuLaxmikyaSangam. *Agriculture Update*. 12(4), 966-971.
- Naidu, C. D., Lakshmana, K., & Srinivasa Rao, M. M. V. (2018). Diffusion and adoption of mesta production recommendations in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*. 10(24), 7688-769.
- Pawarkapse, A. P., Bodke, B. G., Kapse, P. S., & Waghamare, P. K. (2019). Socio-economic and psychological characteristics of distress farmers in Hingoli district. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 8(2), 80-84.
- Pandya, S. P., Prajapathi, M. R., & Thakar, K. P. (2014). Assessment of training needs of farm women. *Gujarat Journal of Extension Education*. 25(2), 169-171.
- Ramesh, P. G., Ahamed, I. B., & Saravanan, A. (2019). Livelihood security of women agricultural labourers in Erode district of Tamilnadu. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*. 9(22), 318-321.
- Ramya, H. R., Gopal, S. P. V., Sailaja, V., & Prasad, S. V. (2016). Personal, socio-economic and psychological characteristics of the tribal farmers. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 2(2), 140-145.
- Saikia, P. (2018). A study on livelihood status of mishing women in tribal society of Assam. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 18(1), 66-69.
- Suneetha, B., & Jyothi V. (2011). Profile of self-employed rural women in Visakhapatnam district of Andhra Pradesh. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 58(4), 568-571.
- Swathi, G., Rambabu, P., Gopikrishna, T., & Rao, V. S. D. (2017). Livelihood profile of tribal farmers in Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Social Research*. 58(3), 313-324.
- Verma, N. K., Pandey, D. K., & Upadhyay, A. D. (2013). Performance evaluation of fishery based self-help groups in West Tripura. *Indian Reserach Journal of Extension Education* 13(3), 15-18.
- Vijayabhinandana, B., Jyothi, V., & VenkataSubbaiah, P. (2018). Enhancing the role of tenant farmers in achieving nutrition sensitive agriculture. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 18(1), 15-21.
- Yashodhara, B. (2011). A study on marketing behaviour of onion growers in Chitradurga district of Karnataka. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis*, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, india.