



Occupational Diversification in Andhra Pradesh: A Case Study of Two villages Pothunuru and Malkapuram in West Godavari District

Dr. A. Srinivasa Rao,

Post-doctoral Fellow, School of Economics, University of Hyderabad

Abstract: This study conducted in the village Pothunuru in Denduluru mandal and Malkapuram in Eluru rural these villages are located in agriculturally developed District West Godavari. In total households of the village 35 percent of agricultural workers and 35 percent of nonfarm workers households are taken into study. Agricultural workers are treated as agricultural cultivators and labour. Non-farm workers are divided in to traditional nonfarm and modern nonfarm workers. Pothunuru village total population is 7177, in these 3634 are non-workers and 3543 are workers. Wage employs, self-employs and entrepreneurs point of view, in this village, no wage workers. All most all are self-employs 40 (100) and there is no entrepreneurs. Malkapuram total population is 3461, in these non-workers are 1990 and workers are 1471. Total male workers 209941 (62 %) and non-workers are 13057 (38 %). In female 11199 (32 %) are workers and 23374 (68%) are non-workers. Male agricultural workers (main+marginal) are 10251 (49) and household industry workers are 261 (1.2) in the same way female agricultural workers are 838 (7.5) and household industry workers are 317 (2.8). In agricultural and household industry point of view, agricultural workers are higher than household industry workers in both male and female. Primary and secondary data also use to collect the data. This study explains rural people and their occupation diversified their occupations from farm to nonfarm because of some factors like education, caste, gender, age and assets. This study focused on selected households' of the two villages diversification from farm to non-farm and its reasons.

Key words: Education, Gender, Income, Rural non-farm, Occupational diversification

Introduction

Rural Development is necessary to the country development especially India because it is rural society. Rural society drawbacks are low literacy or illiterates are high. Most of the rural people are depends upon agricultural sector, but agricultural is depend upon rains. Because all most all rural people depends upon agriculture but it is not giving full employment to all. Rural people are landless people, low educates, no skills. This study focus is on rural people livelihood and their life style. Some

suggestions have given by this study how they can improve their livelihoods.

Objectives:

- 1) To come across Agricultural state of affairs in the selected villages Pothunuru and Malkapuram
- 2) To inspect Determinants aspect of Non-farm in chosen villages Pothunuru and Malkapuram

Hypothesis:



1) In workers engage, most of workers are engage in Agricultural sector than Non-farm sector

2) Education important factor to decide occupation

Methodology: In total non-farm households of the village 35% of the households are selected from each caste of that particular village.

Research Questions:

1. Rural workers move from agricultural to non-agriculture?

2 Structural changes occur in villages also?

3. Non-farm generates factors?

Review of Literature

Macherla Prasadarao (2002) studied in Andhra Pradesh two village i.e., Anandapuram and Veeravalli. He is trying to say about relation of non-farm with farm, land size, land productivity, education, age, caste and season in the agriculture (khariff and rabi), migratoin. Moreover, agricultural growth linkage or distress diversification with non-farm also discussed. Both villages (Anandapuram and Veeravalli), one is agriculturally developed and other one is agriculturally backward village. In his results, education has positive impact, land size is negative impact, caste is negative impact, agricultural seasons impact on non-farm. Migration positive impact on non-farm. Either positive or negative in the case of, caste, skills, poor or non-poor.

Lanjouw, Peter Rinku Murgai (2008), attempts to explore relationship

between poverty and diversification. This study was conducted in India based on the National Sample Survey. Casual labour, wage and self-employs are three types of non-farm employs NSS data from 1983-2005 were taken to analyze rural poverty and diversification. Regular non-farm characters are low education, social status, wealth are not good except high consumption levels. But self-employs of non-farm diversify in character. Here, policy makers when making policies concentrate on poverty eradication through non-farm development. To promote non-farm better to remove barriers to enter in to non-farm. Not only increase income levels but also fight with poverty.

Diana Traikova (2005), in her study conducted in Bulgaria, the diversification incomes in rural Bulgaria. For this study, 120 households has been taken basically this is the gender study. Male and female participation is very different in non-agricultural activity. So many female labour are engage in service sector but in the case of male; they are in constructing work. Main occupation the Bulgaria is agricultural sector. Lastly, found there no differences between man and woman in work participation. Women have constrains to do some jobs, social restrictions so most of the female are participating in service sector.

Reardon, Tom. (1997), examines the priority of education as a determinant of Rural Non-farm (RNF). Rural industrialization in Asia and skill acquisition in Taiwan Province of China and the Republic of Korea are explained in this study. In cash-cropping zones, high investment was kept for farmers on education, especially for poor households. Data was taken for 1980s and 1990s in different countries. Educated people can



have chance to get non-farm job than low educated people.

Beneria, Lourdes (2003), study concentrated on work difference between men and women. Female are more obligations than male, she engage in unpaid work. (for example, child care, house management). The obstacles of the women are in the manner of labour force participation, paid employment in both farm and non-farm. Non-markets are leading to low earning, low paid, unstable and poor quality employment. For economic growth and human development long run gender inequalities are not good. Slowly the women fertility rate and participating in unpaid work also decreasing day to day.

RubenR. and Marrit, V. D. Berg (2001), examines the Honduras non-farm income the study is based on the national income and expenditure survey from 1993 to 1994. Non-farm wage, labour is geographically concentrated in small rural towns and in the industrial free zones located in the Northern region. Household is a complex farm unit, the consumer unit. Agricultural and Natural office data has taken. Non-farm income is coming from wage employment as well as self-employment. Females are most likely to be involved on self-employment, while better educated persons tend toward non-farm wage employment. But when making policies concentrate on education and training programmes.

Richard L. Meyer and Donald W. Larson (1978), studied RNFE in East Asian countries. In the low income countries, the development depends upon capital intensive activities in both the agricultural and non-agricultural sector. This study finds the importance of small-

scale firms, rural non-farm enterprises, off-farm work for farm households. Rural non-farm activities may significantly improve the incomes of low income farm families by increasing opportunities for off-farm work like Taiwanese. It is not exactly clear what needs small firms have and how public policy should best address them. The dynamic effects on the farm sector also need to be better understood. Japan's experience suggests an emerging dilemma when increased part-time farming is associated with a decline in agricultural productivity and farm work is increasingly performed by women, children and old people, while young men work in off-farm jobs. A strategy involving small-scale farms and large amounts of off-farm work carried the risk of an unproductive agriculture. Too many labour surplus countries, however, appear to have ignored the successful experience of some Asian countries and thereby have failed to achieve balanced growth. Economic problems at this stage in the development of many low-income countries require abandoning the large-scale, capital-intensive bias, and substituting increased attention on small-scale farm and nonfarm firms. The benefits would include increased employment, reduced chain on capital and foreign exchange markets, and improved interpersonal and interregional income distribution.

Remco H.Oostendorp, R, H Tran Q, Trung, Nguyen T, Tung (2006), this study conducted in Vietnam. Saying about non-farm household enterprises it is a low-productivity sector. But at the same time it is dynamic, flexible and are innovative sector. This study collected information on income and how it can estimate income. They found that NFHE are important for income generate and to



reduce income inequality and income volatility. But it was affected by trade liberalization. The role of the NFHE sector has been diminishing during the period 1993-2002 in Vietnam according to the logic of international comparative advantage. Policy makers have to target appropriate policies to favouring NFHE.

R.R.Biradar and S.T. Bagalkoti (2001), say that in the process of economic development of a country, several changes occur over a period of time. One such change is the diversification of rural employment structure in favour of rural non-farm. India is not an exception to this phenomenon. The declining land frontiers, deteriorating employment elasticity in agricultural and urban organized manufacturing sector and excess supply of labour force on the one hand, and increasing investment opportunities due to globalization. Rural Non-farm activities are providing employment in the rural households particularly to the poor. Economic scenario of the country was changed through the rural non-farm activities. To find out rural non-farm activities change secondary data on employment and unemployment published by National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) from 1972-73 and 1999-2000 are used. Although the share of non-farm workers in rural areas has increased, the annual growth rate seems to have slowed down. Female workers increased continuously only in two states i.e., Kerala and Himachala Pradesh during 1972-73 to 1999-00. The data increased continuously in manufacturing, construction, trade and transport, etc., during 1990-2000. As far as impact of RNFA on rural poverty

is concerned, promotion of male RNFA, followed by increasing rural male literacy, seems to be a better strategy of poverty alleviation in rural areas as compared to an increase in agricultural income and rural per capita public expenditure on rural development and social service.

Denduluru Mandal details

In Denugluru mandal, Pothunuru village has taken into our study. Total rural population of this mandal is 55695 shows (Table-1). Male population is 33425 and female population is 33270. Total male workers 20411 (61 %) and non-workers are 13014 (39 %). In female 12035 (36 %) are workers and 21235 (64 %) are non-workers. In male agricultural labour 13851 (68) percent are working agricultural sector (main+marginal) and household industry 112 (0.5) are working. Female agricultural workers are 1074 (89) percent and 154 (1.3) are working as household industry. In agricultural and household industry point of view, agricultural workers are higher than household industry workers in both male and female. Under food crops 14735 hectare of land are using and under non-food crops 2136 hectare are using in this mandal. Food crops and non-food crops point of view, most of the land using for only food crops in this Denduluru mandal.

Pothunuru village details

This village area in hectare was 1655 and total population of the village is 7177 (2011) shows (Table-2). Total number of households is 2044 and area under non-agricultural is 248. In this village male percent is 70 and female is 30.



Table-1 Denduluru mandal Total Population Workers and Non-workers

Gender	Total Rural Population	Workers and Non-workers		Agricultural and Non-Agricultural workers	
		Total Workers	Non-Workers	Main+Marginal Agricultural Workers	Main+Marginal Household Industry
Male	33425	20411(61)	13014(39)	13851(68)	112(0.5)
Female	33270	12035(36)	21235(64)	10764(89)	154(1.3)
Total	66695	32446	34249	24615	266

Source: Secondary Data 2011: *Note: Figures in brackets are shows percentage*

Table-2 Pothunuru Village Main marginal workers and non-workers

Gender	Main workers			Marginal workers			Non-workers	Total Workers	Total population
	AL	HHI	Total	AL	HHI	Total			
Male	930	8	938	328	0	328	1347	2272	3619
Female	564	2	566	584	0	584	2287	1271	3558
Total	1494	10	1504	912	0	912	3634	3543	7177

Source: Secondary Data 2011

In age point of view, 15-30 years age group are 5 and 31-45 years of age group are 20 and the highest 52.5 percent of the population are 46-60 years of age group people 61 years and above people are 22.5 are existing. Education status of the people is up to 5th class 5 percent are completed and 6th and 7th class completed 10 members are completed. The highest, 67.5 percent of the people are completed

10th class. Intermediate completed 2.5 members are completed. Degree/PG completed 10 percent and illiterates are 5 percent. Rural non-farm employment divided into two types' traditional non-farm and modern non-farm. In this total non-farm employment are 40. In this, traditional non-farm 17 (43) percent are working and remaining 23 (57) percent are working in modern non-farm.

Table-3 Pothunuru Village Traditional and Modern Non-farm Workers

Type of Non-farm Employment	Traditional Non-farm Employment	Modern Non-farm Employment	Total
No. of RNE	17	23	40
Percent (%)	(43)	(57)	(100)

Source: Primary Data 2015: *Note: Figures in brackets are shows percentage*



In traditional occupation one household is working in Public distribution system (PDS) or dealer. Working in tailoring in 3 households and kirana (grocery) workers are 8 households. Vegetable vendor working household 1 pujari 1 household are working. Washer man working household are 3 in total 17 traditional non-farm households. In modern non-farm 23 households are there in this village Pothunuru. In these modern non-farm 2 households is from each occupation of hotel workers and registered medical Practitioner (RMP). One household is there from each occupation of Medical shop, electric repair, photographer, worker in rice mill, fancy shop, tent house and fertilizers shop. Butcher households are 4 and petty trade is 5 households are working and medical business households are 3. Main and marginal agricultural workers are 1258 and female workers are 1148 same way main and marginal household industry workers male are 8 and female are 2. Male non-workers are 1347 and female non-workers are 2287.

Wage employs, self-employs and entrepreneurs point of view, in this village, no wage workers. All most all are self-employs 40 (100) shows (Table-3) and there is no entrepreneurs. In caste point of view, forward caste 10 (25) percent and the highest 17 (43) percent Scheduled caste (SC) are 11 (28) percent and 1 (1) percent from each caste Scheduled Tribe (ST) and Minority. Out of selected 40 households of the village 34 (85) percent are land less and remaining 6 (15) percent are very less hectare of the land cultivating. In Pothunuru village out of 40 self-employ non-farm households only 6 have cultivating land and remaining 34 have no cultivating land. In Pothunuru village out 40 households are engage in

self-employ non-farm in that 17 households are backward caste. Forward caste households are 10, scheduled caste are 11 households. One household is there from each caste of scheduled tribe and minority. In Pothunuru village out of 40 households and their educational status was explained. Up to 5th class standard completed households are 2. 6th to 7th completed households are 4. 8th to 10th completed households are 27 and Intermediate completed households are only 1. Degree/pg completed households are 4 and illiterates are 2 out of 40 households.

Few Findings of Pothunuru village

In total workers the highest are male and lowest are female workers irrespective of agricultural or household industry. In non-workers the highest are male and the lowest are female. Comparing with male and female agricultural workers are highest female and lowest males. Household industry workers are low percent males are 0.5 percent and female are 1.3 percent. In compare main and marginal works main workers are high than marginal workers. In main and marginal workers agricultural workers are high than household industry workers. There is no marginal worker in household industry in this village. Non-workers are high than workers in total population. In non-workers the highest are female and lowest are males. In total workers males are high than female workers. Traditional non-farm employs are lower than modern non-farm employs in this village. Most of the nonfarm workers in these villages are tailors and second place occupied by *kirana* or grocery shop holders. Female tailors are high compare with male. Dry gross business is very famous in this village



and tractor drivers are highest. It is agriculturally developed village. Non-farm development is dependence upon agricultural development. Both farm and non-farm are interlinked and educated persons are working private jobs in eluru

town. This village is famous for rice produce so here related businesses tractor owners high, pesticide shops, harvesting instruments like *Palugu, Paara, Kodavali* etc., shops are developed.

Table-4 Eluru rural Total Population Workers and Non-workers

Gender	Total Rural Population	Workers and Non-workers		Agricultural and Non-Agricultural workers	
		Total Workers	Non-Workers	Main+Marginal Agricultural Workers	Main+Marginal Household Industry
Male	38715	22651(59)	16064(41)	12893(57)	421(1.9)
Female	37774	9472(25)	28302(75)	6508(69)	194(2)
Total	76489	32123	44366	19401	615

Source: Secondary Data 2011: *Note: Figures in brackets are shows percentage*

Eluru rural mandal details: In Eluru rural, Malkapuram village has taken into our study. Total population of the village is 68571 shows (Table-4) in this male are 33998 and female are 34573. Total male workers 209941 (62 %) and non-workers are 13057 (38 %). In female 11199 (32 %) are workers and 23374 (68%) are non-workers. Male agricultural workers (main+marginal) are 10251 (49) and household industry workers are 261 (1.2) in the same way female agricultural workers are 838 (7.5) and household industry workers are 317 (2.8). In agricultural and household industry point of view, agricultural workers are higher

than household industry workers in both male and female. Food crops and non-food crops point of view, most of the land using for only food crops in this Denduluru mandal. Under food crops total area is 6465 hectare and under non-food crops 256 hectare of land are cultivating in this Malkapuram village.

Malkapuram village details: In this village male percent is 38.5 and female is 61.5. This village area in hectare was 938 and total population of the village is 3461 shows (Table-5) according to the census of 2011. Total number of households of Malkapuram is 806 and area under non-agricultural is 149 hectare of land.

Table-5 Malkapuram Village Main marginal workers and non-workers

Gender	Main workers			Marginal workers			Non-workers	Total Workers	Total population
	AL	HHI	Total	AL	HHI	Total			
Male	52	6	58	421	0	421	683	874	1557
Female	1	11	12	381	1	382	1307	597	1904
Total	53	17	70	803	1	803	1990	1471	3461

Source: Secondary Data 2011

In the age group 31-45 years are 34.6 percent and the highest 57.7 percent of

the population are 46-60 years of age group people are existing. 61 years and



above age group are 7.7 percent. In education point of view, up to 5th class completed are 23.1 percent and 6th and 7th completed are 19.2 percent. 50 percent of people are completed up to 10th class and

intermediate 3.8 percent. Professional degrees completed are 3.8 percent and there are no members in illiterates and degree/pg completed in this village.

Table-6 Malkapuram Village Traditional and Modern Non-farm Workers

Type of Non-farm Employment	Traditional Non-farm Employment	Modern Non-farm Employment	Total
No. of RNE	17	9	26
Percent (%)	(65)	(35)	(100)

Source: Primary Data 2015; **Note:** Figures in brackets are shows percentage

Types of non-farm employment there are two types one is traditional non-farm and second one is modern non-farm employment. In this village total non-farm employs are 26 shows (Table-6) in this traditional non-farm employs are 17 and modern non-farm employs are 9 members. In traditional non-farm 17 (65) percent are working and remaining 9 (35) percent are working in modern non-farm. Out of 17 traditional non-farm households, the highest 9 households are working as vegetable vendors and 4 households are kirana shop (groceries) runners. Tailoring workers 2 households one household from each occupation of PDS and Pawn shop runners.

Modern 9 non-farm households, the highest 3 households are meat business households and 2 households factory workers. Butcher 2 households from each occupation and one household from each occupation of worker in rice mill, petty trade. In this village Malkapuram (Palagudem) male agricultural workers are 473 and female agricultural workers are 382 and household industry male workers are 6 and female household industry workers are 12. Male non-workers in this village are 683 and female

non-workers are 1307. Wage employs, self-employs and entrepreneurs point of view there is no entrepreneurs in this village. Only 3 (12) members are working as wage employs and 23 (88) percent are self-employs. In this village, 12 percent of the workers are wage workers, 88 percent are self-employ.

In caste point of view, forward caste are 2 (8) percent, the highest 11 (42) percent the highest BC's are working in non-farm. Scheduled caste is 13 (50) percent and there is no scheduled tribe and minorities in this village. In this village total 26 households are selected but no household have cultivating land all most households are land less households. In malkapuram out of 3 wage households no household have own cultivated land. In Malkapuram (Palagudem) there are 3 households are engage in wage non-farm all are belongs to backward caste and no other caste wage non-farm in this village. In Malkapura (Palagudem) village, out of 23 self-employs of non-farm no house have own cultivating land. In Malkapuram (Palagudem) village there are 23 households the highest 13 households are scheduled caste and 8 households and 2 households are forward caste. In



Malkapuram (Palagudem) village out of 23 households and their educational status was explained. Up to 5th class standard completed households are 6. 6th to 7th completed households are 3. 8th to 10th completed households are 12 and Intermediate completed households are only 1 household. Professional degree holders' only one household. No illiterates out of 23 households in the selected households.

Few Findings of Malkapuram village

In total population males are high and in total workers males are higher than females. In non-workers females are higher than males. In main and marginal agricultural workers males are high. In household industry workers females are higher than males. In main and marginal workers, agricultural workers are higher than household industry workers. In main agricultural workers males are high but in household industry workers females are high. In marginal agricultural workers males are high but there are no male household industry workers. In non-workers females are high and total workers males are high. In traditional non-farm and modern non-farm, traditional non-farm employs are higher than modern non-farm employs. Malkapuram village is very nearby Eluru town and nobody which is selected for the study was no cultivating land. So almost all who selected for this study are only non-farm workers and Asram hospital is located in this village so educated people of this village working in this hospital. This village is famous for nonfarm workers like, lemons selling, water melon selling, ground nut selling like small pet businesses. In this village no selected household have cultivated land and almost all are depend upon only non-farm

work. So this village is very near to Eluru rural and nearby by railway station. Compare with Malkapuram and Pothunuru, Malkapuram is high non-farm holders.

Both villages Pothunuru Denduluru mandal and Malkapuram Eluru rural are famous for non-farm but difference is there both villages non-farm. Pothunuru nonfarm work is related to farm and Malkapuram non-farm is not related to farm. It is only seasonal business related works. Malkapuram non-farm workers are only small petty businesses because they are landless people. But Pothunuru people are except some caste higher castes are own cultivating land and not depend upon any other activity. In comparing literacy Malkapuram village is developed than Pothunuru village. Two villages are famous for both farm and nonfarm but Malkapuram is higher nonfarm workers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beneria, Lourdes (2003), *Globalization, Women's Work, and Care Needs: The Urgency of Reconciliation Policies*, Cornell University.

Biradar, R.R. and S.T. Bagalkoti (2004), "Growth of Rural Non-Farm Activities in India: A Spatio-Temporal Analysis", in P. Purushotham (ed), *Rural Non-Farm Employment*, National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad.

Lanjouw, Peter and Rinku Murgai (2008), *Poverty Decline, Agricultural Wages, and Non-Farm Employment in Rural India*, The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 4858.

Prasadarao, Macherla (2002), *The Determinants of Rural Non-Farm*



Employment in Two Villages of Andhra Pradesh, *University of Sussex*, Prus Working Paper No.12.

Reardon, Tom(1997), Using evidence of household Income Diversification to inform study of the rural non-farm labour market in Africa, *World Development*, 25 (5), 735-47.

Remco H.Oostendorp, Tran Quoc Trung, Nguyen Than Tung(2006), The Changing Role of Non-Farm Household Enterprises in Vietnam, *University of Amsterdam*.

Reuben Adeolu Alabim (2008), *Income sources diversification: Empirical Evidence from Edo State*, University Bremen, Nigeria.

Richard L. Meyer and Donald W. Larson (1978), Rural Non-farm Employment: The Recent East Asian Experience, *Journal of Economic Development*, Vol. 3, No.1.

Traikova Diana (2005), Gender differences in nonfarm rural employment – The case of Bulgaria, *University of Hohenheim*, Bulgaria.