International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Sustainability
Volume 5, Print Issue 2 - 2023, Pg. No. 14-17
Peer Reviewed Journal

Review Article

# Indian Agriculture and Sustainable Rural Transformation

Trilok Kumar Jain

Professor, Manipal University, Jaipur India.

## I N F O

**Corresponding Author:**
Trilok Kumar Jain, Professor, Manipal University, Jaipur (India)
**E-mail Id:**
trilokkr.jain@mygyanvihar.com
**Orcid Id:**
https://orcid.org/

**How to cite this article:**
Jain TK. Indian Agriculture and Sustainable Rural Transformation. *Int J Agri Env Sustain* 2023; 5(2): 14-17.

Date of Submission: 2023-11-11
Date of Acceptance: 2023-12-13

## A B S T R A C T

The article explores the imperative for rural transformation in the context of Indian agriculture. Rural transformation signifies comprehensive changes in rural economies, aiming to enhance resilience, diversify income sources, and elevate overall socio-economic status. The need for such transformation is underscored by the prevalent challenges in agriculture, where limited vocational options and dependency on farming contribute to economic vulnerabilities, leading to migration and undue pressure on urban centers.

The article delves into potential solutions, emphasising the role of farmer producer organisations (FPOs) as a means to address issues in collective farming. FPOs offer advantages such as improved crop prices, enhanced farm management, better representation of farmers, and access to market trends. Additionally, the article explores alternative income sources, the importance of local markets, and the potential impact of integrating farmers into value chains through food processing.

Recognising the inadequacies in rural infrastructure, the article highlights the necessity for greater investment in rural development. It emphasises the interconnectedness of urban and rural areas, stressing the need for cohesive development strategies. The article also discusses the role of local markets in improving farmers' access to fair prices and suggests that rural development should prioritise basic amenities.

Furthermore, the article addresses issues related to food security and nutrition, noting the paradox where the primary producers of food in rural areas often face vulnerabilities. It explores innovations and solutions aimed at improving health and life quality in rural communities.

**Keywords:** Rural Transformation, Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs), Income Diversification, Local Markets, Food Security

## Introduction

Rural transformation refers to the dynamic process of comprehensive changes in the overall rural economies, aimed at fostering resilience, diversifying income sources, and enhancing self-reliance to improve the socio-economic status of rural communities. This transformative journey becomes essential in addressing the challenges faced by villages, where limited vocational options, predominantly centred around agriculture and allied activities, lead to dependency and economic vulnerabilities. The absence of

alternative income sources often forces rural populations into migration, thereby exerting unnecessary pressure on urban centres and exacerbating socio-economic disparities. In light of these issues, it becomes imperative to explore and implement sustainable strategies for rural transformation, ensuring the well-being of rural communities and contributing to the overall economic landscape.[1-4]

## Need of Rural Transformation

Villages need transformation. Villages have a few vocations. People are engaged in agriculture and allied activities. Due to a lack of alternative sources of income, there is dependence on agriculture. This dependence often creates problems. If there is some reduction in agriculture income, people are not able to sustain themselves, and they are forced to migrate to cities. This puts unnecessary pressure on cities. It also makes rural society vulnerable to fluctuations in agriculture. Developing countries have inefficiencies in their agriculture systems. These inefficiencies adversely affect the entire rural ecosystem.[5,6]

## FPO: farmer producer organizations

Researchers have found that there is a need for collective farming to generate better returns for farmers. There is a need for innovation with regard to this sector. Farmer-producer organisations are the solutions for solving the problems of farmers. These organisations are associations of farmers to help them operate together. These organisations offer many advantages to farmers[7]:

a. Better price: due to their larger size, these organisations are able to get a better price for the crop.[8]
b. Better management of farms: due to access to better technologies, these organisations are able to improve the management of farms.[9]
c. Better representation of farmers: farmer-producer organisations are able to represent them better due to their influence and reach.[10]
d. Better understanding of the trends and challenges: farmers often fail to understand the trends and challenges. They do not have access to the latest communication tools, and therefore they are not able to understand market trends. Farmer-producer organisations are able to have better access to the latest trends and challenges.[11,12]

## Alternatives to Farming

Rural societies are dependent on family farming. Family farming is the backbone of the rural economy. However, there is a need for alternative sources of income for the farmers.

The farmers can improve their socio-economic status by taking up some additional activities. Many organisations are coming forward to support the farmers. The Jaipur Rugs Foundation in India is helping farmers in their overall development, and they also provide them with an additional source of income in the form of carpet weaving. Researchers have found that wherever such additional sources of income exist, it helps farmers in their income diversification.[13,14]

## Greater impact in value chains

Farmers are the ultimate suppliers in the value chains, and obviously they are the weakest link. They get the minimum share of profits in the entire value chain. The end points, i.e., ultimate retailers, take almost five times the share of profit as compared to farmers. This is due to a lack of adequate food processing and a lack of technological sophistication on the part of farmers. Thus, there is a need for the development of farmers to enable them to acquire a greater share of the income distribution in the value chain.

Farmers can play an important role in the development of finished products if they add food processing to their roles.[15-18]

## Better rural infrastructure

Villages lack infrastructure, and therefore, life is tough in villages. Villages lack basic amenities like electricity, drinking water, health-care facilities, government offices, schools, etc. Most governments invest in urban infrastructure and give secondary treatment to rural infrastructure. Most governments have budgets for urban development but no such plans for rural development. Researchers have found that the approach towards development of urban and rural areas as a dichotomous approach is not a healthy approach towards development. Researchers have emphasised that there should be greater linkages between urban and rural areas. There should be greater connectivity between the two. Therefore, there is a need for greater investment in rural transformation.[19-23]

## Local markets

Researchers have observed that most farmers are not able to get a proper price for their produce. Most farmers are not able to connect to a better market due to infrastructure and other bottlenecks. Most farmers do not have the capacity to hold crops for a long time.

The best alternative here is the development of local markets, where farmers can meet prospective buyers or customers. The development of local market systems can greatly enhance the efficiency of the present systems. Farmers can acquire better prices if local markets are developed, which will help farmers get a ready market nearby.

Farmers can enhance their income by participating in local markets, local trading centres, and local customer points.[24]

### Food security and nutrition

In the entire food chain, farmers have access to the best supplies of food. They are the source of food. The food chain has many links consisting of production, procurement, storage, supply, distribution, and consumption. Rural areas are the source of food in the food chain, and therefore they are at the first stage, i.e., the production stage. Being at the production stage, they naturally have access to the best food. The researchers have found a paradox here. Most rural areas are vulnerable to food insecurity. Nutrition is also a major problem in most of the rural areas. Rural women and rural children are the most affected by malnutrition. This is due to supply inefficiencies and a lack of purchasing power among rural people. Researchers have noticed that rural people are worst affected by food security and nutrition. Researchers have found different solutions for this problem and have documented innovations in villages for ensuring better health and a better life for rural people.[26,27]

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the imperative for rural transformation in Indian agriculture is evident, driven by the pressing need to address economic vulnerabilities, enhance resilience, and diversify income sources in rural communities. The exploration of key facets such as farmer producer organisations (FPOs), alternative income streams, local market development, and rural infrastructure improvement underscores the multifaceted approach required for sustainable rural transformation.

The article advocates for a comprehensive strategy that not only focuses on enhancing agricultural practices but also recognises the significance of interconnected urban and rural development. Investments in rural infrastructure, access to alternative income streams, and the establishment of robust local markets are identified as crucial components to uplift the socio-economic status of rural populations.

Furthermore, the emphasis on food security and nutrition as integral components of rural well-being highlights the need for innovative solutions and community-driven initiatives. The documented innovations in villages underscore the potential for transformative changes that can positively impact the health and quality of life of rural residents.

In essence, the holistic approach to rural transformation presented in this article seeks to bridge the gap between urban and rural development paradigms, fostering inclusivity and sustainable growth. As we navigate the complexities of rural economies, the insights provided by this exploration contribute to a more informed and nuanced understanding, laying the foundation for actionable strategies that can propel Indian agriculture towards a more resilient and prosperous future.

## References

1. Andersen, M. S. (2007). An introductory note on the environmental economics of the circular economy *Science*, *2*(1), 133-140.
2. Brundiers, K., & Wiek, A. (2011). Educating students in real-world sustainability research: vision and implementation. Innovative Higher Education, 36(2), 107-124.
3. FAO/IDB (2007). Policies for family farming in Latin America and the Caribbean – Executive summary (Soto-Baquero, F.; Rodríguez F., M.; y Falconi, C., eds.). FAO, Santiago, Chile
4. FAO (1995). Dimensions of need - an atlas of food and agriculture. Rome, Italy.
5. FAO (2012). Report of the FAO Expert Consultation on Agricultural Innovation Systems and Family Farming. 19-21 March 2012, Rome, Italy
6. Fizri, F. F. A., Rahim, A. A., Sibly, S., Koshy, K. C., & Nor, N. M. (2014). Strengthening the Capacity of Flood-Affected Rural Communities in Padang Terap, State of Kedah, Malaysia. In *Sustainable Living with Environmental Risks* (pp. 137-145). Springer, Tokyo.
7. Jain, Nirupa and Jain T.K. (2018). Infrastructure for Common People : Review and Action Planning, Kindle Edition
8. Kaneko, N., Yoshiura, S., & Kobayashi, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Sustainable living with environmental risks*. Springer.
9. Koohafkan P. and Altieri M. A. (2011). Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems: A Legacy for the Future. SIPAM. FAO. Roma, Italy.
10. Koshy, K. C., Nor, N. M., Sibly, S., Rahim, A. A., Jegatesen, G., & Muhamad, M. (2013). An indicator-based approach to sustainability monitoring and mainstreaming at Universiti Sains Malaysia. In *Sustainability assessment tools in higher education institutions* (pp. 237-258). Springer, Cham.
11. Loorbach, D., & Rotmans, J. (2006). Managing transitions for sustainable development. In Understanding industrial transformation (pp. 187-206). Springer, Dordrecht.
12. Lundvall, B.Å. (ed.). (2010). National Systems of Innovation: Toward a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning, 2nd ed. London: Anthem Press.
13. Murray, A., Skene, K., & Haynes, K. (2017). The circular economy: An interdisciplinary exploration of t application in a global context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *140*(3), 369-380.
14. Nidumolu, R., Prahalad, C. K., & Rangaswami, M. R. (2009). Why sustainability is now the key driver of innovation. *Harvard business review*, *87*(9), 56-64.
15. OECD (1992). Technology and the Economy: The Key Relationships. Paris: OECD.

16. OECD (2015). The Innovation Imperative: Contributing to Productivity, Growth and Well- Being, Oecd Publishing, Paris
17. Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2012). Academic emotions and student engagement. In Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 259-282). Springer, Boston, MA.
18. Pugliese, P. (2001). Organic farming and sustainable rural development: A multifaceted and promising convergence. *Sociologia ruralis*, *41*(1), 112-130.
19. Ralph, M., & Stubbs, W. (2014). Integrating environmental sustainability into universities. Higher Education, 67(1), 71-90.
20. Reid, A., Jensen, B. B., Nikel, J., & Simovska, V. (2008). Participation and learning: Developing perspectives on education and the environment, health and sustainability. In Participation and learning (pp. 1-18). Springer, Dordrecht.
21. Robinson, J. B., Francis, G., Lerner, S., Legge, R., & Robinson,. (1996). Defining a sustainable society. *Life in 2030: Exploring a Sustainable Future for Canada*, 26-52.
22. Shabudin, A. F. A., Rahim, R. A., Sibly, S., & Nor, N. M. (2017). From ad hoc towards the institutionalisation: An assessment of Malaysia's policy evolution on Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. *Marine Policy*, *78*, 1-10.
23. Tilbury, D. (2004). Environmental education for sustainability: A force for change in higher education. In Higher education and the challenge of sustainability (pp. 97-112). Springer, Dordrecht.
24. Vehmaa A, Karvinen M, Keskinen M. (2018). Building a More Sustainable Society? A Case Study on the Role of Sustainable Development in the Education and Early Career of Water and Environmental Engineers. *Sustainability*; 10(8):2605.
25. Wiek, A., Bernstein, M., Foley, R., Cohen, M., Forrest, N., Kuzdas, C., ... & Withycombe Keeler, L. (2015). Operationalising competencies in higher education for sustainable development. Handbook of higher education for sustainable development. Routledge, 241-260.
26. Zhijun, F., & Nailing, Y. (2007). Putting a circular economy into practice in China. *Sustainability Science*, *2*(1), 95-101.