~~Socio-Personal,Economic,Communicational Variables,Psychologicalvariable,Characterof~~ Livelihood Security and Personal Attributes of small and marginal farmers in Rewa block of Rewa District (M.P.)

ABSTRACT

The ~~present~~ study was conducted in the Rewa block of the Rewa district of Madhya Pradesh in 2021. Rewa block consists of 211 villages. Out of which 10 villages namely, ~~consisting of ten villages *viz*~~, Karhiya, Ataria, Bisar, Bhitwa, Rithi, Jori, Lohi, Bansi, Kitvariya and Khajua of Rewa block were~~as~~ selected randomly. A village-wise list of small and marginal farmers adopting various occupations along with farming was prepared. From~~rm~~ this list of small and marginal farmers, 6 small and 6 marginal farmers were selected from each selected village ~~through random sampling method~~ to give a total sample size ~~make a sample~~ of 120 respondents (60 small and 60 marginal farmers). ~~Thus, the sample for the study consisted of 120 farmers.~~ The study revealed that the majority of respondents of the respondents were from the middle age group, had education up to primary level, belonged to OBC category, were medium family size, equal percent of respondents were found as marginal as well as small size ~~of~~ land hold~~ers~~ing, possessed less livestock holding, medium social participation, had medium level of experience in farming, majority of the respondents were involved in only agricultural activities, had low family income, most of the respondents had low cropping system. Further, the study shows that the majority of the respondents had medium mass media exposure, had medium level of exposure, low achievement motivation, most of the respondents had medium risk orientation, and medium economic motivation.

Keywords: Socio-personal, Economic, Communicational, Psychological Profile and Livelihood Security.

1.INTRODUCTION

"Livelihood Security" can be defined as adequate and sustainable access to income and other resources to enable households to meet basic needs. This includes adequate access to food, potable water, health facilities, educational opportunities, housing, time for community participation and social integration. Frankenberger, 1996[1]

The risk of livelihood failure determines the level of vulnerability of a household to income, food, health and nutritional insecurity. Therefore, livelihoods are secure when households have secure ownership of, or access to, resources and income-earning activities, including reserves and assets, to offset risks, ease shocks and meet contingencies. Chambers, 1992[2]

Unfortunately, not all households are equal in their ability to cope up with stress and repeated shocks. Poor people balance competing needs for asset preservation, income generation and present and future food supplies in complex ways. Maxwell and Smith, 1992[3]

The livelihood security is a term that comprises of several other securities such as food security, economic security, educational security, social security, health security, institutional security and infrastructural security. All these securities are together contributing in achieving the overall livelihood security of a person.Rewa Division is an administrative geographical unit of Madhya Pradesh state of India situated in the northeast part of state bordering with Uttar Pradesh and Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. Rewa is the administrative headquarters of the division and district of Madhya Pradesh. Farmers mostly depend on agriculture for their livelihood and income.Thus, the income from

Commented [ES1]: The variables should be subsumed in the work

Commented [ES2]: The aim of the paper should begin the paper. It provides a signpost for the work.

Commented [ES3]: Provide the Percentage values in parenthesis

Commented [ES4]: Livelihood security is a transitional variable, hence, the need to use current citations/literature sources alongside with old ones in order to paint a dynamic picture about the concept

Commented [ES5]: Define small size farmers and marginal farmers

agriculture was generally low in the study area. To enhance the income and livelihood status of famers, present study was carried out in Rewa district of Madhya Pradesh.

1.1 Statement of the problem:

Despite having 3 billion economy India's rural population is still living below the poverty line. More than 80 percent of the population depends on farming and also their livelihood depends on farmingtheir socio-economic attributes of the small and marginal farmers also play a significant role in influencing their livelihoods. This finding would be helpful for policymakers, governmental and non-governmental agencies, development professionals and other agencies, which are working for agricultural development through the implementation of livelihood security programmes.

1.2 Objective:

Keeping the above issues in this study thus seeks to provide an in-depth understanding of determinants of livelihood security of small and marginals farmers. The specific objective of research was-

1. To study about Socio-Economic Character of Livelihood Security of small and marginal farmers in Rewa block of Rewa District (M.P.)

~~**1.3 Scope of Research**~~

~~This finding would be helpful for policy makers, governmental and non-governmental agencies, development professionals and other agencies, which are working for the agricultural development through the implementation of livelihood security programmes.~~

~~**1.4 Limitations of the Study**~~

~~Though the study has practical relevance, it has the following limitations.~~

1. ~~The investigation was carried out only in the selected districts.~~
2. ~~Being a single student's project, it has all those limitations which are common in such cases i.e. small sample, limitation of time, money and other resources.~~

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Pradhan et al. (2021) depicted that 45.83 per cent of the respondents had medium risk orientation and (48.33%) percent of the farmers had a medium farming experience.[4]

Jodha and Dahiya (2018) revealed that 41.67 per cent of the respondents were educated up to secondary followed by up to primary graduate (33.33%), illiterate (15.00%) and graduate & above (10.33%).[5]

Preeti (2018) observed that 79.33% of respondents reported farming is their main occupation, followed by farming service (14%) and that only 6.67% of respondents were working as farmers + business/caste in Bhiwani. While farming is their main occupation in Hisar 60.67% of those respondents, farming + service (32%) and labour (04.67%) followed. Farming and business/caste were only 2.67% of the respondent's work. The majority (69.67%) of them were medium-sized, while 17% had a small family and 13% had large family groups. Over half (57.33%) farm families were in the class of OBC caste, followed by the general caste (34.33%), the remaining 8.34% were in the class of SC / ST caste.[6]

Singh (2017) depicts that 27% of respondent belong to the 20 to 30 years of age group, followed by 50 % of respondent belonging to the age group of 31 to 50 years were in the old group only 10%.[7]

Eqbal (2015) concluded that most of the respondents (41.25%) were marginal farmers, followed by those who were small farmers (34.58%), farmers (13.75%) possessing semi-medium category of

Commented [ES6]: There is too much focus on the dependent variable (livelihood security without explanation on providing clear and concise definitions of the socio-personal, economic, communicational, and psychological variables under investigation. Ambiguity in variable definitions can lead to confusion and inconsistency in data interpretation.

Commented [ES7]: Explain how the factors undermine livelihood security in the study area. Provide a picture of inadequacies caused by these factors which has culminated in undermining the farmers' livelihood security

Commented [ES8]: Did not capture all the variables in the title

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

land-holdings, landless (8.33%) and farmers (2.09%) possessing medium category of land-holdings. The majority (68.75%) of respondents had no social participation, a significant percentage (18.33%) of respondents were in one organization, and a number (12.92%) of respondents participated in two organizations.[8]

~~3.~~1. METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted inRewa district M.P. in 2021 because it comes under the jurisdiction of the College of Agriculture, Rewa.National Rural Livelihood Mission project has been running in the district since 2015 to improve the livelihood of small and marginal farmers under NRLM project. Rewa block consists of 211 villages. Out of which 10 villages namely, , Karhiya, Ataria, Bisar, Bhitwa, Rithi, Jori, Lohi, Bansi, Kitvariya and Khajua of Rewa block were selected randomly. A village-wise list of small and marginal farmers adopting various occupations along with farming was prepared. From this list of small and marginal farmers, 6 small and 6 marginal farmers were selected from each selected village to give a total sample size of 120 respondents (60 small and 60 marginal farmers). ~~Rewa District comprises 9 blocks namely Rewa, Raipur Karchuliyan, Sirmour, Teonthar, Jawa, Gangeo, Mauganj, Hanumana, and Naigarhi. Out of these blocks Rewa block was selected on the basis of higher number of small and marginal farmers as compared to other blocks. Rewa block consists of 211 villages. Out of which 10 villages namely consisting of ten villages viz, Karhiya, Ataria, Bisar, Bhitwa, Rithi, Jori, Lohi, Bansi, Kitvariyaand khajua of Rewa block were selected based on higher concentration of small and marginal farmers. A village-wise list of small and marginal farmers adopting various occupations along with farming was prepared. Form this list of small and marginal farmers 6 small and marginal farmers from each selected village through random sampling method to make a sample of 60 small and 60 marginal farmers. Thus the sample for the study consisted of 120 farmers.~~ A well-designed questionnaire ~~interview schedule~~ was used~~prepared for~~in the collection of basic information with the help of selected farmers and officials from KVK, block office and educational institutions. For the ~~present~~ study, primary and secondary data were also used. The overall data were categorized into three groups depending on the theoretical range of scores as low, medium and high groups.

Commented [ES9]: Are you sure? Which table has the secondary data; you have to indicate the source of the data and year under the result table.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Socio-Economic Variables

4.1.1Age

The data of Table1 indicate that out of 120 respondents, the majority i.e. 43.33 percent belonged to the middle age group, 37.50 percent belonged to young age and the remaining 16.66 percent belonged to old age group. The reason for the above findings is that respondents of the middle age group who possessed the needed skills and experience could efficiently and actively participate in farming activities in comparison to other age groups. The findings are in concurrence with the findings of an earlier study conducted byRajpoot et al.(2023)[9]

4.1.2 Education

It is observed from Table 1 that out of 120 respondents, 26.66 percent were found to be educated up to primary, 25.83 percent had high school & above education level, 25.00 were found to be illiterate and the remaining 22.50 percent were educated up to middle level. In the light of the above result, lack of awareness of need for education. improper and inadequate educational facilities in the rural areas, etc. might be the starting reasons for the above findings. Also, poor marginal and small farmers could not go for higher studies Recent findings are in line with the findings of The outcome of the research are similarArya (2018).[10]

4.1.3 Caste

The data of Table 1delineate that out of 120 respondents, 30.83 percent belonged to the OBC category, 29.16 percent were found to be in schedule caste category, 21.66 percent belonged to schedule tribe and 18.33 percent were found to be in general category.The caste composition is mostly based on their previous local generation of ancestors. Similar results were also revealed by Bodakeet al. (2019).[11]

4.1.4 Family Size

The data in Table 1 depicts that out of 120 respondents, 40.00 percent had medium family size, 32.50 were belong to large family size, while only 27,50 percent had small family size. This might be due tothe fact that after getting married, the son used to be separated from theparental family and builds new kitchen shed for him. The findings are in conformity with the results of Sudhakarrao (2020) who observed that more than half of the respondents were having more than five members in their family.[12]

4.1.5 Land Holding

The data in Table 1 revealed that out of the 120 respondents,In case of land holding, Fifty percent respondents had up to 2.5 acer land holding as well as same percent of respondents had up to 5 acer land holding.. The possible reason of this finding is that inherited deviation of land from generation to generation leads to reduction in size at every generation. Similar as Rawat et al. (2012) and Meshram et al. (2020).[13][14]

4.1.6 Livestock holding

It is clear from the Table 1 that out of the 120 respondents, maximum respondents i.e. 49.16 percent had less livestock holding, 33.33 percent had moderate livestock holding, while 17.50 percent had high level of livestock holding.The core probable reason for less livestock holding is that more respondents were involved in agriculture as their main occupation. The results of Nesari *et al*. (2013) support this finding.[15]

4.1.7 social participation

It is observed from the Table 1 that out of 120 respondents, a maximum of 50.83 percent of respondents had medium social participation, 27.50 percent had low social participation, while only 21.86 percent possessed higher social participation. This might be due to there were less number of opportunities for participating in different Social activities; it seems that more social participation by elders has greater influences on family members.The results of Rai (2015) support this finding.[16]

4.1.8 Farming Experience

Table 1 embellished that 40.83 percent respondents had medium farming experience,30.00 percent had low farming experience, and 29.16 percent had high farming experience. This study is similar to finding of Swathi (2016) [17]

4.1.9 Occupation

The data of Table 1 reveals that out of 120 respondents, 30.00 percent had agriculture only,25.00 percent had agriculture + other activities status, 25.00 percent had agriculture + dairy and only 20.00 percent had agriculture + farm labor. This might conclude that respondents are giving more importance to farming rather than other occupations This finding is supported by Bodake et al. (2019).[11]

4.1.10 Family income

The data in Table 1 shows that, out of 120 respondents, 41.66 percent had medium family income, 31.66 percent had low family income, while 26.66 percent had high family income.The core probable reason forfarmers majority of were the solely dependent on farming income come and might they be don't due have to a the fact diversified thatsource of income. Moreover, most of the respondents are marginal and smallfarmers in the study study area. The findings conform with the findings inthe study ofJethi et al. (2020).[18]

4.1.11 Cropping system

It is evident from the table 1 that maximum number of respondents *i.e.* 43.33 percent had low cropping system, followed by medium 35.00 percent and the remaining 21.67 percent had high cropping system.It can be inferred that the majority of farmers had low cropping system due to the problem ofgrazing by cattle and unavailability of fencing and water the percentage oftaking a third crops as a leguminous crop in zaid/summer was very less.These results are in conformity with the results of Kumar et al., (2011).[19]

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic and communicational variables

Characteristics	**Measurement ~~Attributes~~**	**Respondents**	
		Frequency	**Percentage**
Age	Young	45	37.50
	Middle	52	43.33
	Old	23	19.16
Education	Illiterate	30	25.00
	Up to primary	32	26.66
	Up to middle	27	22.50
	High school & above	31	25.83
Caste	Scheduled Tribe	26	21.66
	Scheduled Caste	35	29.16
	Other Backward class	37	30.83
	General	22	18.33
Family size	Small	33	27.50
	Medium	48	40.00
	Large	39	32.50
Land holding	Marginal	60	50.00
	Small	60	50.00
Livestock holding	Less	59	49.16
	Moderate	40	33.33
	High	21	17.50
Social participation	Low	33	27.50
	Medium	61	50.83
	High	26	21.86
Farming experience	Low	36	30.00
	Medium	49	40.83
	High	35	29.16
Occupation	Agriculture only	36	30.00
	Agriculture + Dairy	29	25.00
	Agriculture + Farm labor	25	20.00
	Agriculture + Other activities	30	25.00
Family income	Low	38	31.66
	Medium	50	41.66

Commented [ES10]: What did you use as basis for the classification

	High	32	26.66
Cropping system	Low	52	43.33
	Medium	42	35.00
	High	26	21.67

Source of data should be stated here

4.2 Communicational Variable

Table 2. Distribution of respondents based on their communicational variables

Characteristics	Attributes	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
Mass media exposure	Low	43	35.66
	Medium	50	41.66
	High	27	22.50
Level of exposure	Low	42	35.00
	Medium	48	40.00
	High	30	25.00

Source of data should be stated here

Commented [ES11]: You need to explain the basis of this classification. If you used the percentage you have to explain how you arrived at the classification

4.2.1 Mass media exposure

Table 2 shows that 41.66 percent of respondents had medium mass media exposure, 35.66 percent belonged to low mass media exposure group and 22.50 percent of them had high mass media exposure. Mobile and television were the most frequently used mass media exposure medium to the farmers these two mediums were easily available in all households as they are part of life nowadays. This conclusion was supported by Pradhan *et al.* (2021).[4]

4.2.2 Level of exposure

The data in table2 depict that, out of 120 respondents, 40.00 percent had medium level of exposure, 35.00 percent had low, and 25.00 percent had high level of exposure. This is bBecause they had low to medium social participation in any social activities.

4.3 Psychological Variable

Table 3. Distribution of respondents based on their Psychological Variable

Characteristics	Attributes	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
Achievement motivation	Low	54	45.00
	Medium	45	37.50
	Highs	21	17.50
Risk orientation	Low	45	37.50
	Medium	46	38.33
	High	29	24.16
Economic Motivation	Low	44	43.33
	Medium	51	30.83
	High	25	25.84

Commented [ES12]: See my comments earlier

4.3.1 Achievement motivation

The data in Table 3 revealed that out of 120 respondents the majority of the respondents i.e. 45.00 percent of respondents had low achievement motivation, 37.50 percent had medium-level

achievement motivation, whereas 17.50 percent hadhigh-level achievement motivation.Medium to low income from agriculture were the most likely causes of medium to low achievement motivation. Similar results were also revealed by Priyanka et al.2023. [20]

4.3.2 Risk orientation

The data in Table 3 shows that out of 120 respondents, 38.33 percent of respondents had medium risk orientation, 37.50 had low level of risk orientation, where the only 24.16 percent had high level of risk orientation. Because majority of the respondents had no or less amount of additional income to take risk. This finding is collated with the findings in the study of Pradhan *et al.* (2021).[4]

4.3.3 Economic motivation

The data of Table 3 indicate that out of 120 respondents, 42.50 percent belonged to medium economic motivation, 36.66 percent belonged to low economic motivation group, and remaining 20.83 belonged to high economic motivation group. The probable reason for above result might due to the fact that majority of the respondent might have considered the agriculture is more remunerative as compare to the occupation. Chandrasekar *et al.* (2017) observed similar results.[21]

5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed that, the majority of respondents ~~of the respondents~~ were from middle age group, having education up to primary level, majority of them were belongs to other backward class category, medium family size, equal percent of respondents were found marginal as well as small size of land holding, possessed less livestock holding, medium social participation, had medium level of experience in farming, majority of the respondents were involved in agriculture + other activities, had low family income, most of the respondents had low cropping system. Further in psychological variables study shows that the majority of the respondents had medium mass media exposure, had a medium level of exposure, low achievement motivation, most of the respondents had medium risk orientation, and medium economic motivation.

Commented [ES13]: Generally revisit your result discussion and ensure that you link your discussion to livelihood security. You have only presented the result and cross-referenced the result without relating the discussion to your dependent variable "Livelihood security". How do these variables positively or negatively determine or influence livelihood security?

Commented [ES14]: Break into different sentences using the full-stop.

Commented [ES15]: Include recommendations of the study

REFERENCE

1. Frankenberger T. Measuring household livelihood security: an approach for reducing absolute poverty. Food Forum, No. 34. Washington, DC, USA, 1996.
2. Chambers R, Conway G. Sustainable livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Institute of Development Studies: Brighton, 1992.
3. Maxwell S, Smith M. Household food security: a conceptual review. In S. Maxwell and T. Frankenberger, eds. Household food security: concepts, indicators, and measurements: a technical review. New York, NY, USA and Rome, UNICEF and IFAD, 1992.
4. Pradhan, S., Naberia, S., Harikrishna, Y. V., & Jallaraph, V. (2021). Socio-Economic Correlates of Livelihood Security of Small Farmers in Jabalpur District of Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, *57*(3), 57-59.
5. Jodha R. and Dahiya M. 2018. Livelihood Problems of Small and Marginal Farm Families in Rural Areas of Haryana State, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. ISSN: 2319-7706, Volume 7 Number 01: 1626-1629.
6. Preeti (2018) in her study on Livelihood Security of Small and Marginal Farm Families in Hisar Division of Haryana State. Unpublished Ph.D thesis; CCSHAU, Hisar.
7. Singh, P. (2017) livelihood security through lac cultivation among tribal farmers of simdega district" Unpublished ABM.thesis: BAU, Rachi

8. Eqbal Md. S (2015) An Assessment of Livelihood Security through Dairying among Tribal of Jharkhand. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis; NDRI, Karnal.
9. Rajpoot, A. S., Rajan, P., Raut, A., Srivastava, A., & Singh, R. B. (2023). Profile of National Rural Livelihood Mission (NRLM) beneficiaries in Madhya Pradesh. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, *41*(11), 249-257.
10. Arya S. 2018. in his study on livelihood security of small and marginal farm families of Ambala division of Haryana state. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. CCSHAU, Hisar.
11. Bodake, T. A., Nair, R. G., Shende, S. S., & Rathod, M. K. (2019). Perception Of Rural Youth Towards The Agriculture As An Occupation. *Journal of Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences*, *8*, 64-70.
12. Sudhakarrao RM. (2020) Vegetable nutrition garden: Effectual Method to improve Nutritional Security in Rural Areas of Nanded District, International Journal of Research And Review (7): 7.
13. Rawat A., Sathwane RA, Singh S, Dhakad KS and Niranjan HK. 2012. Pattern of sustainable livelihood diversification among small and marginal farmers in Shahdol distt, of M. P. Life Science Bulletin, Vol.9(2): 399-401.
14. Meshram, M., Khare, N. K., & Singh, S. R. K. (2020). Socio-economic profile of integrated farming system practicing farmers in Madhya Pradesh state. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, *9*(4), 155-159.
15. Naseri, S.; Hossein, B. and Govinda, G. V. (2013). The personal, sociopsychological and economic characteristics of Iranian farm women participated in agricultural activities. LJ.A.B.R., 3(1): 2123.
16. Rai S.K (2015) Agricultural diversification for livelihood security of rural people of south Gujarat. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
17. Swathi G. (2016) A study on Livelihoods of tribal farmers in Andhra Pradesh. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis; ANGRAU, Bapatla.
18. Jethi R, Nautiyal P, Jalal A, Singh K, Arya M, Josh pand Chandra N. 2020. Food and Nutritional Security through Nutrition-Sensitive Interventions in the Hills of Uttrakhand, India. Anthropologist39(1-3): 17-25.
19. Kumar S, Singh SS, Shivani and Dey A.2011.Integrated farming systems for Eastern India.Indian Journal of Agronomy 56 (4):297-304.
20. Priyanka, V., Singh, V. K., Singh, L. B., Singh, D. K., Singh, B., & Prajapathi, C. (2023). Relation between Personal Profile Characteristics of the Staff and their Attitude towards the Farmer Producers Organization. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, *41*(10), 53-60.
21. Chandrasekar, G. K., Satyanarayan, K., Jagadeeswary, V., & Shree, J. S. (2017). Relationship between socio-economic and psychological factors of dairy farmers with days open–A study in rural Karnataka. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Bioscience*, *5*(1), 171-177.

Commented [ES16]: You mixed up the referencing format. Use APA 7th Edition