

Chapter 2

About the Study

2.1 Secondary Data

This study is based on both secondary and primary data. The secondary data on area production and yields was collected from government websites. The data for international comparison was collected from various websites—the FAO data bank was particularly useful. The price data was also collected by similar means. Data was usually collected for 10 years. We could not find district level data beyond 2011–2012 for some districts; for other districts it was available till 2013–2014. This data was used to decipher the trends in area, production, and yield as well as the extent of volatility in prices.

2.2 Primary Data Collection

In addition to the secondary data, farmers' responses were collected from 11 districts. Surveys were carried out by 11 B.Tech students of DAIICT in their own home districts. Six districts were from Gujarat (where the Institute is located): Anand and Kheda from central Gujarat (known as prosperous regions), Valsad and Surat from South Gujarat (favorable agricultural factors: soil, rains, etc.), Sabarkantha from Northern Gujarat (traditionally a backward region but developing fast in some parts), and Junagadh from west Gujarat (agriculturally advanced region).

Five districts were from other states: Indore (a semi-arid region), Simla (a hilly region), Jodhpur (arid region), Goa (a coastal region with good rains and soil; also more educated), and East Godavari (agriculturally advanced region). A limited amount of information was available for Kanpur and Ahmedabad that is included here and there but the main findings are from the 11 districts mentioned above.

The main methods used for survey was focused group discussions (FGDs) and individual interviews. Usually the FGDs had seven–eight participants, not more. It is true that such discussions are usually dominated by a few but that does not mean that others are not participating. They show their agreement or disagreement by either nodding or looking slightly uncomfortable. So a pointed question can be asked to them to understand their view point. Also, they would generally discuss the responses among themselves and then the vocal one would voice these opinions. The only thing that we ensured was to hold the discussions of the large and small farmers separately to take care of the social dominance problem. The questionnaires were all semi-structured.

The individual interviews helped in getting further insights into the farmers' experiences wherein the farmers shared their beliefs and problems in more details.

2.3 Sample Size and Villages Surveyed

Three main crops from each sample districts were identified (the area under each crop was noted and the crops were ranked based on the area cultivated) and taken up for the study. Totally 18 crops were analyzed for this study.

The villages were selected based on two criteria: (a) where some of these major crops were grown and (b) where some known link person could be found to facilitate the survey. However, the methodology differed a little in Jodhpur. Farmers from various villages had gathered for some function. All the interviews and FGDs were conducted there. In Surat, a group of 10 farmers from different villages was interviewed when they had come for Krishi Sabha. The rest were interviewed from the villages, using the above criteria.

514 farmers were surveyed from the 11 districts. Out of these, 371 were small and marginal and 118 were large farmers (The land size of 25 was missed out during the group discussions). In addition, 72 farmers from Kanpur and 57 farmers from Ahmedabad district had participated in group discussions held by other two student researchers. Thus totally 643 farmers contributed their views for this study.

The villages surveyed were as follows:

Anand (26 farmers): Chikhodra, Rasnol, Boriyavi, Samarkha

Simla (58 farmers): Sarahan, Mashobra, Adyeog, Rohru, Ghannati

Sabarkantha (51 farmers): Chhadarda and Hadiyol from Prantij Tehsil, Juna Chamu and Kothan from Vadali tehsil

Indore (49 farmers): Sitapar, Jamli, Naded, Rau

Surat and Tapi (45 farmers): In Surat: Haripura, Kadod and Bhatlav (Bardoli tehsil), Kharoli and Naren (Mandavi Tehsil)

In Tapi: Andhatri, Vadiya, Bhajipura, Delvada and Mordevi (Valod Tehsil), Kelkui, Palasiya, Ambia, Khutadiya, Vandardevi and Dhajamba (Vyara tehsil)

Valsad (27 farmers): Umarsadi, Kanjan, Samarpada, Khaprada

Jodhpur (68 farmers): Virawas, Rupawas, Birawas, Hariara

Junagadh (57 farmers): Ambecha (Maliya Hatina Taluk) Jhinjhuda and Kenedipur (Mendarda Taluk)

Goa (61 farmers): Chimbhel, Talaigaon and Nerul (Tiswadi Taluk), Calangute and Assagao (Bardez Taluk), Benaullim (Salcete Taluk)

East Godavari (35 farmers): Amalapuram, Sannavilli (Uppalaguptam Mandal), Kakinada and Fakruddinpalem (Pithapuram Mandal)

Kheda (37 farmers): Khumarvaad, Umiya Farm, Bavaraalat.

2.4 Limitation of the Study

This paper undertakes quantitative analysis for the secondary data only. The primary data has been analyzed mainly using qualitative parameters. This is because the primary data is based on projects done by different students. There are differences in data contents that make it difficult to undertake quantitative analysis.

Risks in Agriculture

Farmers' Perspective

Parikh, A.

2017, XI, 104 p. 48 illus. in color., Softcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-6270-4