

# An Analysis on Tenant Farmers Condition and Difficulties at Macro and Micro level

K. Kiran Kumar

(Ph.D Scholar, School of Economics, University of Hyderabad, India)

**Abstract:** Agriculture is significantly one of the major sector, it constitutes livelihood for more than half of the nation's population, which mainly includes self-cultivated farmers who are land owners, landless laborers and tenants who do not hold ownership of land. Historically different types of tenancy existed all over the country such as fixed rent tenancy and share cropping tenancy. Agriculture is predominantly the main occupation for tenant farmers, to cultivate the crops they depend on the leased land. To reduce the predominantly existed tenancy and protect the tenants in the country over the period, central and state governments have been taking various policies such as land reforms, tenant protection. But still now tenants are one of the vulnerable and disadvantaged sections in the country. Present study goes on to analyze the current conditions and difficulties of the tenant farmers among the various state in the country.

**Keywords:** Agriculture, Fixed Rent, Share Cropping, Land Tenant, Tenancy, and Farmer.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

In India nearly 49 percent of people still depend on agriculture and other allied activities as the means of livelihood, even though they differ culturally and geographically. More than 70 percent of rural household's prime occupation is agriculture. The total Share of Agriculture & Allied Sectors (Including agriculture, livestock, forestry and fishery logging, and mining quarrying sub sectors) in terms of percentage of GDP is 17.4 percent during 2014-15 (FR) at 2011-12 prices. Agricultural exports constitute 9.6 percent of total exports in 2015-16. In India 253.16 million tonnes of Total food grain production is produced during the 2015-16, it is 1.14 million tonnes higher than the previous year production of food grains such as 252.02 million tonnes. Above all, the achievements of Indian agriculture are not only because of the land holding farmers but also because of the landless tenant farmers. Tenants are majorly land less, marginal and small holding households, they leased in the land for cultivation from the land owners to improve their living standard rather than living as a wage labor. Tenant farming system is not new, it has been existing all over the country over the periods historically to the present. Tenancy is based on two ways one is fixed rent tenancy (in which rent payment by fixed amount of money or fixed produce), second one is share cropping in which Share cropper cultivate the land owner land, and the equipment and inputs items may bear both (land owner and share cropper), then final share cropper get the share from produce by doing all manual works such as ploughing, weeding, transplanting, reaping during the crop period, sprinkle urea and DAP, and spraying pesticide.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

New technology helped tighten the grip of the big farmer on rural economy. Lease market, rental market, credit market, and input market do not function in the interest of poor sections (Parthasarathy, & Prasad 1974). After the independence Indian government adopted the British style of bureaucracy. Then, these bureaucracy retained basic structure of administration even after independence. The tradition was continued, not resisting changes that have occurred meanwhile. It is well known that, major segments of bureaucracy have a class bias as they have direct connection with the rural elite. Though unwanted, it is explicable, that such a bureaucracy would have an additional block against any radical land reform. Bureaucracy, who comes from the urban middle class with no land-relations, it acts the same way (Bandyopadhyay, D. 1986). Even after the finishing of 4 five year plans, the condition of tenants, and mainly of share croppers continues to be apprehensive especially in, Andhra, Punjab, Gujarat, Bihar, Tamil Nadu and Haryana. In according with the policy in the Second Five Year Plan the laws enacted by some states for return of tenanted lands by landowners for personal cultivation (V. C. Koshy. 1974). In Indian villages, the land market operates largely through tenancy rather than through outright sale/purchase (Bardhan and Rudra, 1978). The presence of a strong organization of tenants in rural areas impeded the ejection of tenants and acquisition of their lands by landowners. These progresses along with successive enactment of radical tenural legislations have changed the pattern of landlord-tenant relation in Malabar and other parts of Kerala and converted the erstwhile tenants into landowners (Alexander, K. C. 1980). Contrary to the traditional faith that tenants are always small farmers or landless laborers being exploited by landlords with large holdings, but result of study revealed large farmers leased in and small farmers leased out substantial areas of land. In four of the six villages, large farmers had the largest share (34 to 69 per cent) of total land leased in (Jodha, N. S. 1981). Reduction in the percentage of tenants and an equal upsurge in the percentage of owner-cultivators in all size groups of landholdings between 1961 and

1971 in Dakshina Kannada district. Then essentially during this period there was no improvement in the conferment of ownership rights on the tenants under the 1961 Act.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the decrease in the size of tenants in Dakshina Kannada District between 1961 and 1971 accounts for the uncontrolled eviction of tenants (Damle, C. B. 1989). A programme of assignment of control over land from the big to the small via leasing will also increase overall consumption. Well distribution of land and control over land by sharecroppers and tenants will not be only increased employment per unit of land but it will also increase consumption standards of the rural poor, thus expanding the size of the market for consumer products. Dr. N. C. Saxena (2013) Planning commission.

#### **Objectives of the study**

- To analyze the distribution of operational land holdings and tenant holdings at macro level among the size groups.
- To observe the conditions of tenant farmers at micro level

### **III. DATA AND METHODOLOGY**

Present study mainly based on the primary and secondary data secondary data has been taken from NSSO 70<sup>TH</sup> round to analyze the macro level condition of land holdings and tenant holdings. Primary data collected from the Chalmeda village of Nalgonda district in Telangana to observe the condition of tenant farmers at micro level. To analyze the data used the simple arithmetic such as percentage.

#### **Tenant reforms in India**

Tenancy predominantly existed in Indian agriculture during pre-independence and further prevailed at the time of independence due to this, some important guidelines were placed in the Five Year Plan to fix rent on leased-in land and to give tenure security and protection for tenant ownership. Among the one, rent should not be more than the level of 1/5 to 1/4 of the gross produce. Secondly, the tenants should be accorded permanent rights in the land they cultivate subject to a limited right of resumption to be allowed to land owners; and in respect of non-resumable land, conferring ownership rights on tenants. Based on this guidelines most of state government made legislation to reform tenancy in their states. Various states in the country made legislation regarding tenant ownership, States that allowed tenants to obtain land after disbursing money to original landlord, Hyderabad, Uttar Pradesh, Bombay included with Gujarat, Mysore, Delhi and Madhya Pradesh, States that agreed for tenants to attain land without paying money to original landlord Bengal, Bihar, Bhopal, Orissa, Assam, and Vindhya Pradesh. States that lessened rent of the tenants without confer them ownership rights, Andhra, Rajasthan, Madras, Madhya Bharat, and Hyderabad

#### **Tenure security**

Insecurity of tenure accounted is a big obstacle in the enrichment of agriculture over period in the India, due to this tenant puts less concentration to the soil augmentation by using of less manure, digging of well. Less concentration of tenants on land reduces the production and productivity of various cultivated crops. In regard to this various state government passed laws to provide the tenure security for tenants. Various state governments (West Bengal, Assam, Tamilnadu etc.) mentioned that tenant should not be evicted by landowner without completing at least five years of tenure, but there is one provision that had been given to land lords to take the half of leased in land from tenants for personal cultivation. In this regard, West Bengal state during the 1972-73 has been taken step towards protection of tenants, rent was decided for fixed rent and sharecropping 25 percent of produce on the name of "Operation Barga".

#### **Operational Holding and Operated Area at All India Level**

From the below table it can be observed that, percentage of operational holdings that are being operated by the various size group households at All India level. Land is the important factor for more than 70 percent of rural households across the country to sustain and improve the livelihood, standard of living, education and health. If observed in the 1970-71 marginal operational holding households constitute the 45.80 percent of total operational holdings and area under their control were 9.20 percent of total operated area, while small operational holding households constitutes 22.40 percent of total operational holding and area under their control were 14.80 of total operated area. Semi-medium operational holdings constitutes 17.70 percent and area under their control were 22.60 and medium operational holding households accounted for 11.10 percent of total operational holdings and area under their control were 30.50 percent of total operated area, while large operational holding households accounted for 3.10 percent of total operational holdings and area under their control were 23.0 percent of total operated area. Marginal and small operational holdings constituted 68.20 percent and area under their control were 24 percent, while semi medium, medium and large operational holdings constituted the 31.80 percent of total operational holdings and are under their control were 76 percent of total operated area. It has been shown that unequal distribution of the operated area among the operational holding households. Furthermore, by 2012-13 marginal and small operational holding households constitutes the 88.47 percent and area under their control is 51.15 percent, while semi-medium, medium, and large operational holdings constitutes 11.53 percent of total operational holdings and area under their control is 48.85 percent of total operated area. Over the period percent of marginal and small operational holdings have been escalated, but

area under their not increased as much even after implementation of land ceiling act during the 1971-73 and thereafter all the states. Here it can reveals that, larger percent of operated area is under the small percent of large holdings, due to the not implemented the land ceiling act intensively by the various state government across the country.

**Table1: Percentage distribution of the number of household operational holdings and operated area by category of holding across the last five LHS Surveys of NSS.**

Category of holdings ( land size in ha)	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Land less (< 0.002)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.03 (0)
Marginal (0.002-1.000)	45.80 (9.20)	56.0 (11.50)	62.80 (15.60)	70.0 (21.70)	73.17 (27.71)
Small (2.000 -4.000)	22.40 (14.80)	19.30 (16.60)	17.80 (18.70)	15.90 (20.30)	15.30 (23.44)
Semi – medium (2.000-4.000)	17.70 (22.60)	14.20 (23.60)	12.0 (24.10)	8.90 (22.30)	8.10 (23.50)
Medium (4.000 – 10.000)	11.10 (30.50)	8.60 (30.20)	6.10 (26.40)	4.40 (23.10)	3.04 (19.33)
Large (>10.000)	3.10 (23.0)	1.90 (18.20)	1.30 (15.20)	0.80 (12.50)	0.37 (6.02)
All sizes	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)

Source: 70th NSSO household ownership and operational holding, 2013.

From the below table 2 it can be perceived that, Gini coefficient values on the size distribution of operational holdings each state in the country. According to Gini coefficient values in the 1970-1, highest value was in the Rajasthan state with 0.599, it means highest inequality was existed in this state in the distribution of operated area among the operational holdings and second highest inequality in combined Andhra Pradesh with 0.582 Gini value. Lowest inequality in Assam with 0.388 Gini value compared to other states and followed by the Punjab with 0.398 Gini concentration. But at all India level inequality was also highest with 0.567 Gini concentration. If observed by 2012-13 highest inequality is existed in Punjab with 0.670 Gini concentration value and second highest is Haryana with 0.598 Gini concentration value. Punjab Haryana, These two states were low inequality states in distribution of operated area among the operational holdings during the 1970-71, but two states in 2012-13 are stood up first and second highest inequality states in the country due to the highly implementation of green revolution techniques and HYV. In the Punjab and Haryana states green revolution have given more profits to big farmers and marginal small farmers they are inefficient in using highly improved technology due to this either they sold their land or leased out their land to medium and large farmers. At all India level inequality has been declined very small in 2012-13 compared to 1970-71.

**Table2: Changes in Gini's coefficient on the size distribution of operational holdings across the last five LHS of NSS**

State	Gini's coefficient				
	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Andhra Pradesh	0.582	0.573	0.529	0.543	0.455
Assam	0.388	0.465	0.412	0.366	0.351
Bihar	0.511	0.534	0.525	0.421	0.376
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	0.361
Gujarat	0.518	0.544	0.573	0.605	0.518
Haryana	0.436	0.571	0.645	0.675	0.598
Himachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	0.334
Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	-	-	0.237
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	0.350
Karnataka	0.509	0.562	0.577	0.543	0.509
Kerala	0.483	0.449	0.392	0.348	0.342
Madhya Pradesh	0.508	0.520	0.533	0.527	0.508
Odisha	0.466	0.504	462	0.381	0.316
Punjab	0.398	0.685	0.694	0.706	0.670
Rajasthan	0.599	0.551	0.590	0.610	0.575
Tamil Nadu	0.480	0.555	0.527	0508	0.480
Telangana	-	-	-	-	0.440
Uttar Pradesh	0.471	0.520	0.498	0.450	0.444
West Bengal	0.433	0.494	0.430	0.313	0.223

All India	0.567	0.596	0.591	0.557	0.516
-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Source: 70th NSSO household ownership and operational holding, 2013.

### Tenant Operational Holdings

From below table.3 it can be seen that, the percentages of tenant holdings by category of operational holdings from 1970-71 to 2012-13. Percentage of tenant holdings has been decreasing from 25.7 percent during 1970-71 up to 9.9 percent during 2002-03 and it has been increased to 13.7 percent during 2012-13. During the 1970-71 highest percentage of tenant holdings were marginal and small holdings with 27.0 and 27.8 percentage, but lowest tenant holdings was large holdings with 15.9 percent. If comes to during the 2002-03 and 2012-13 highest percentage of tenant holdings was large holdings with 13.8 percent and 21.8 percent as against marginal and small tenant holdings during 1970-71.

**Table3: Percentage of tenant holdings by category of operational holdings, across last five LHS surveys of NSS**

Category of holdings ( land size in ha)	Percentage of tenant holdings*				
	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Land less (< 0.002)					2.6
Marginal (0.002-1.000)	27.0	14.4	9.3	9.8	13.2
Small (2.000 -4.000)	27.8	17.9	14.9	10.7	13.6
Semi – medium (2.000-4.000)	24.8	15.9	12.2	10.3	18.0
Medium (4.000 – 10.000)	20.0	14.5	13.1	7.8	14.8
Large (>10.000)	15.9	11.5	16.7	13.8	21.8
All India	25.7	15.2	11	9.9	13.7

Source: 70th NSSO household ownership and operational holding, 2013, \*tenant holding' stands for an operational holding with wholly or partially leased-in area

By comparing the 2012-13 with 2002-03 percent of tenant holdings, there has been an increase in all categories. Escalation of tenant holdings for all categories during the 2012-13 as against the decline previously from 1970-71 up to 2002-03 because of growth of the rural population and lack of any employment opportunities outside village or other than agriculture due to after 2008 onwards on rise of global crisis and also increase of the prices of commercial crops like cotton and chilly etc. then it led to people concentration on agriculture caused to increase tenant operational holdings.

From the below table.4 it can be perceived that, the percentage of leased-in area by below enlisted category of holdings from 1970-71 to 2012-13. The prevalence of leased-in to total operated area displays increase over time, the total area leased-in in 2012-13 is very smaller compared to 1970-71, although larger than 2002-03. During the 2012-13 leased in area under the landless is 13.7 percent. It can be seen that, the marginal and the small categories has been shown a stable decline up to 2002-03 and then an increase during 2012-13. Even so, for the semi-medium, medium and large holdings, the percentage of area leased-in reduced from 1970-71 to 1981-82, amplified during 1991-92, lessen during 2002-03 and finally risen during 2012-13.

**Table4: Percentage of area leased-in by category of operational holdings across last five LHS surveys of NSS**

Category of holdings ( land size in ha)	Percentage of area leased in				
	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Land less (< 0.002)					13.7
Marginal (0.002-1.000)	18.9	9.7	8.7	8.6	11.30
Small (2.000 -4.000)	14.6	8.5	8.5	6.8	11.25
Semi – medium (2.000-4.000)	11.7	7.3	7.4	6.3	13.14
Medium (4.000 – 10.000)	8.7	6.6	6.9	4.2	8.64
Large (>10.000)	5.9	5.3	11.4	6.1	12.59
All sizes	10.6	7.2	8.3	6.5	11.30

Source: 70th NSSO household ownership and operational holding, 2013

From the below table.5 it can be seen that, distribution of leased-in operated area by terms of leased across the country through the various NSS surveys. Leasing of land taken place between two parties such as tenant and land owner based on one common agreement or understanding. Whatever agreement has been taken place between two parties, in this tenant (who leased in land) pay the rent in different means, i) fixed money, ii) fixed produce, iii) share produce, iv) others (it includes remaining type of contracts). During the 1970-71, 47.9 percentage of lease in operated area in the form of share of produce were paid by the tenants or leasee and followed by others. During the 2012-13, 41.1 percentage of lease in operated area in the form of fixed money is paid by the tenants or leasee of total lease-in operated area. Over the last five decades, payments from the leasee against share of produce is slowly losing importance, whereas fixed money as payment is significantly gaining importance. Payment of rent on lease in land in the form of fixed money gives the somewhat independence to the tenant, because paying rent in the form share produce is reducing the tenant role in the cultivation of crops.

**Table5: Trends in percentage distribution of leased-in operated area by terms of lease across the last five LHS surveys of NSS**

Terms of lease	Percentage distribution of leased in operated area				
	1970-71	1981-82	1991-92	2002-03	2012-13
Fixed money	15.4	10.9	19.0	29.5	41.1
Fixed produce	11.6	6.3	14.5	20.3	17.0
Share of produce	47.9	41.9	34.4	40.3	28.7
Others	25.1	40.9	32.1	9.9	12.9
All terms	100	100	100	100	100

Source: 70th NSSO household ownership and operational holding, 2013

**Field Study of Chalmeda Village on Tenant Farmer Condition**

Chalmeda is a village of Munugode Mandal of Nalgonda district in Telangana state. In this village agriculture is the prime occupation for people; more than 80 percent of people depend on agriculture as a cultivator and also as an agricultural wage laborers, even though they are engaged in their caste occupation. Earlier in this village people were depending mainly on their caste occupations, but presently these caste occupations are not earning much income to them and have lost the charm due to the liberalization and globalization policies, then they turned into agriculture cultivation by leasing land to sustain in the village and to improve their condition. Moreover, in this village cultivation is mainly depended on the rainfall, due to lack of irrigation facilities. Farmers mainly depend on dry crops for cultivation, their main crop is cotton because of the abundance of black soil (alluvial soil) more in the village total land. Most of the land in the village is in the hands of few rich land owners especially belonging to the upper castes, because of that high incidence of tenancy in the village is prevailing. If observed from the below table.6 in this village 100 tenant farmers are located, out of the hundred tenant farmers SC (Scheduled Castes) tenant farmers are 19 (19 percent), OBC tenants farmers are 77 (77 percent) and other tenant farmers are 4 (4 percent). Out of the total leased in area, SC leased in 80 acres (12.6 percent), OBCs leased in 532 acres (83.8 percent) and others 23 acres (3.6 percent). Overall observation of the tenant farmers, highest percent of tenant farmers and area leased is more in the OBCs and followed by SCs. Highly prevalence of OBCs as tenant farmers due to destruction of their caste occupation in the village, and then they are not trained in any other occupation and less employment opportunities outside village.

**Table6: Social group wise Percentage of tenant farmers and percentage of area leased in by them in village**

Social groups	Number of tenant farmers	% to total tenant farmers	Area leased in (Acres)	% to total leased in area
SC	19	19	80	12.6
OBC	77	77	532	83.8
Others	4	4	23	3.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: field survey

From the below table 7 it can be seen that, class wise percentage of tenant farmers and percentage of area leased in by them during the crop year. Out of total tenant holdings, 20 percent are marginal tenants holdings, 32 percent are small tenant holdings, 34 percent are medium and 14 percent are large tenant holdings. Marginal tenant holders are leased in 38 acres (5.9 percent), small tenant holders are leased in 132 acres (20.8 percent), medium tenant farmers are leased in 245 acres (38.6 percent), and large tenant farmers are leased in 220 acres (34.7 percent) of total leased in land.

**Table7: class wise Percentage of tenant farmers and percentage of area leased in by them in village**

Size groups	Number of tenant farmers	% to total tenant households	Area leased in (Acres)	% to total leased in area
Marginal (0 to 2.5)	20	20	38	5.9
Small(2.6 to 5)	32	32	132	20.8
Medium (5.1 to 10)	34	34	245	38.6
Large (above 10)	14	14	220	34.7
Total	100	100	635	100

Source: field survey data

Here it can be seen that 100 tenant farmers in the village leased in the 635 acres of land, in which medium and large tenant farmers are constituted 48 percent and they leased in 73.3 percent of total leased in area, while small and marginal tenant farmers constituted 52 percent of total tenant farmers and they leased in 26.7 percent of area of total leased in area. We had one notion that, land leased in only small and marginal size,

but here it showing that, tenants are leasing medium and large size of land also. Cultivation of crop by leasing small and marginal area not getting more profits in the dry land area. Instead of doing that, tenants are leasing medium and large size of land to reap the more profits and to fill the previous loss occurred by crop loss. From the below table .8 it can be perceived that, average cost of cultivation and average agriculture income of cotton from leased in area by tenants. In this village more than 90 percent of operated land under the cotton cultivation. All the tenants cultivate cotton, if observed the average cost of cultivation at A2 per acre of cotton cultivation among the size groups is Rs.27912 and average agriculture income per acre cotton produced is Rs. 30376. Average cost of cultivation for marginal tenant farmers is Rs. 26500, small tenant farmers are Rs.27500, and medium tenant farmers are Rs. 28200, and large tenant farmers are Rs. 29450. Average agriculture income from per acre cultivation of cotton, marginal, small, medium and large farmers are getting Rs 28250, Rs.29345, Rs.29400, and Rs. 34500. Except large tenant farmers remaining all size tenant farmers are getting agriculture income per acre less than Rs. 5000 after deducting cost of cultivation per acre from income per acre of cotton. After destroying their traditional occupation most of the people in the village searched their employment in agriculture by taking the leased in land rather than being an agricultural laborer. Finally, tenant farmers at all size groups are not getting minimum wage income from the cultivation of crops by working more than six months on the cultivated field. Here cost of cultivation calculated at A2 Cost, which is not including the family labour in the cost of cultivation.

**Table8: Average cost of cultivation for acre and average agriculture income for leased in cultivated land (Cost A2 = cost A1 + rent paid for leased in land)**

Size groups	Ave. Cost of cultivation per acre (Rs.)	Ave. Agriculture income per acre (Rs.)
Marginal (0 to 2.5)	26500	28250
Small(2.6 to 5)	27500	29354
Medium (5.1 to 10)	28200	29400
Large (above 10)	29450	34500
Total	27912	30376

Source: field survey data.

#### Source of Credit for Tenant Farmers

In this village almost 60 percent of tenant farmers depend on the money lenders for agriculture cost, the remaining 40 percent of tenant farmers are depending on the fertilizer dealers cum traders. Tenant farmers are most vulnerable group of farmers in the farming community not only in this village all over the country. These tenants' farmers do not hold any land, for cultivation they sustain themselves by leasing in land and paying the rent. But normal land holding farmers they are not paid any rent on land as they get money for agriculture needs from the bank loans by putting their land pattas, but not like in the case of tenant farmer. Tenant farmers for agriculture credits approach non-institutional agencies by paying interest rate double rate than institutional interest rate. There is facility for tenant farmer get institutional credit by approaching the banks by taking the land pattas (Xerox copy) from the land owner. But in reality land owners only avail bank loan credit for other expenses without cultivating any piece of land without giving the land patta (legal documents) copy to tenants. So hence the tenants are exploited and are helpless only to avail credit and pay higher interest to money lenders.

#### Conditions of Tenants in the Village

One of the more important and discussable issue is that, in the village more than 70 percent of tenancy is in the form of the oral tenancy and remaining 30 percent is based on the agreement on paper. In the matter of oral lease in lands, land owners play dual role at the time of giving the leasing out the same land to the same tenant for the next crop year under a fake name of someone offering more than now what the landowner gets, if the tenant pays that much amount land will be with tenant or otherwise it will be given to someone else who offered more rent. In this situation tenant farmers should pay whatever amount of rent increased on leased in land to cover the previous year losses.

Land owners continually cheat and evict the tenants from the leased-in before the end of the tenural agreements due to the loopholes and provisions facilitated for landlords in the law.

Tenant farmers they are not getting minimum support price for their products due to the fertilizer cum traders approach them and harass to sell the product to them immediately, or otherwise force the tenant pay whatever amount is due for them. Because of these tenant farmers are losing their minimum income or profit from agriculture.

In the village, at the time of droughts tenant farmers even cannot claim crop failure funds released by government to reduce the crop loss, due to the land owners not issuing the land pattas to tenant and they are ready to give pattas Xerox copy to tenant, if tenant agree to give half of amount from whatever they claimed.

In the village Tenant farmers had to depend on the big land owned farmers for agriculture inputs such as tractor plough at the time of before seeding and cow plough at the time of removing the weeds/grass between plants. If any late in ploughing the fields will lead to low growth of crop and low productivity.

In the village Tenant farmers economic condition reduced to less than agriculture wage labor economic condition.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Other than agriculture people works only, if any occupation give the minimum wage for sustain and do not make them more distress, in the case of agricultural farming, it was against as common people think. In the agriculture either land owning farmers or tenant farmers, they works continually on cropping field irrespective of loss or profits and distress to feed the nation. Especially in the case of the tenant farmers distress is more due to the lack of credit, mechanized input, don not aware about the tenant protected laws. In the case of protection of tenants and provide facilities to tenants farmers are being neglected by the various state governments. Predominately existence of the tenants in the country (13.7 percent) due to the failure of other sectors creates the employment opportunities to the agricultural surplus labour. One of the important reasons is that, highly predominance of tenancy due to the failure of land reform policies across the country and loopholes of policies. Furthermore, governments should take steps towards creation of employment opportunities other than agriculture, protection of tenant from unusual eviction by imposing strict rules on land lords and provide the subsidized inputs and easy access of credit to tenancy farmers. Otherwise increase the dependency of people on agriculture as a wage laborers or tenant farmers.

#### V. REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander, K. C. (1980). *Emergence of peasant organizations in South India. Economic and political weekly*, A72-A84.
- [2] Bandyopadhyay, D. (1986). *Land reforms in India: an analysis. Economic and Political Weekly*, A50-A56.
- [3] Bardhan, P K and Rudra, A. (1978). *Interlinkage of Land Labour and Credit Relations: An Analysis of Village Survey data in East India. Economic and political weekly*. 367-84.
- [4] Damle, C. B. (1989). *Impact of Tenancy Legislation and Changing Agrarian Relations: A Case of Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka. Social scientist*, 83-97.
- [5] Jodha, N. S. (1981). *Agricultural tenancy: fresh evidence from dry land areas in India. Economic and Political Weekly*, A118-A128.
- [6] Koshy, V. C. (1974). *Land Reforms in India under the Plans. Social Scientist*, Vol. 2, No. 12 pp. 43-61.
- [7] NSSO 70<sup>th</sup> round. (2013). *Household ownership and operational holding, ministry of statistics and programme implementation, government of India*
- [8] Parthasarathy, G., & Prasad, D. S. (1974). *Responses to, and impact of, HYV rice according to land size and tenure in a delta village, Andhra Pradesh, India. Developing Economies*, 12, 182-98.
- [9] Saxena N.C. (2013). *Tenancy reforms vs open market leasing, Planning Commission, Government of India*