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Abstract

Present investigation conducted in Nanded district in Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. From this district four talukas were selected based on considerable farmer suicide cases. Twenty seven villages were selected randomly based on considerable farmer suicide cases. Forty victims were selected randomly for the study. The ex-post facto research design was used for the study. The data were collected with help of pretested interview schedule from the victim’s households as per their convenience at their home. The statistical methods and test such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and correlation of coefficient were used for analysis of data. It is noticed that most of the 65.00 per cent victims were from middle age group, total selected 40 sample were male gender, 97.50 per cent victims got married, 27.50 per cent victims were having primary school level education, 52.50 per cent victims belong to open category, 65.00 per cent victims were from nuclear family, 60.00 per cent suicide were concentrated in medium size family, more than half 57.50 per cent victims had farming experience between 11 and 33 year, 47.50 per cent victims were possessing small (1.01 to 2.00 ha) land holding, 60.00 per cent were found to be engaged in agriculture / labour as subsidiary occupation, 55.00 per cent were had medium annual income between Rs. 31589 to 74747, 75.00 per cent victims had low socio-economic status, 50.00 per cent victims had light soil type of land, 87.50 per cent victims had no source of irrigation, 67.50 per cent victims had high agriculture infrastructure, 57.50 per cent victims had cotton and soybean based cropping pattern, 85.00 per cent victims were founded indebted. Livelihood pattern shows that all victims depend on agriculture for their livelihood on an average majority of victim’s net earnings was very merge. Majority of 87.50 per cent victim’s expenses was on the children education and 100 per cent health treatment of family. Majority of 92.50 per cent victims were having responsibility of children education and 92.50 per cent health treatment of family member, 60.00 per cent victims had bad habits, 20.00 per cent victims suffered by severe health problem, 42.50 per cent victims family had severe health problem and 7.50 per cent victims had dispute with the family member.
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Introduction

Farmer suicide has turned out to be a major socio-economic concern in India that has resulted in profound implications on the quality life of farmers. According to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), one farmer committed suicide for every 32 minutes between 1997 and 2005 in India (Table 1). India’s suicide rate of 11 per lakh people is roughly the global average. The highest rates are in Greenland (83 per lakh), Lithuania (38 per lakh) and South Korea (28.5 per lakh). China’s rate (22.2 per lakh) is double India’s. The Indian rate is lower than in rich countries with big welfare systems and very few farmers: Belgium (19), France (14.7), US (12.6), Japan (12.3), Germany (12.5) and the UK (11.8).

Total of 319026 have committed suicide in India since 1995 to 2016. Suicide incidence were reported from Maharashtra, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Panjab, kerala, Chhattisgarh, M.P., west Bengal and also other but Maharastra is leading state according to NCRB report. The highest suicide cases was noted (18241) in year 2004, lowest suicide cases was noted (8295) in year 1995.

In Maharashtra the number of farmers who committed suicide in various districts is not same. Despite of Raigad, Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg districts of Konkan region, all other districts of Maharashtra are facing issue of farmers suicide.

According to NCRB in Maharashtra state during last twenty one year’s period the incidences of suicide of farmers were increased tremendously. Since from January 1995 to December 2016 total 69053 farmers committed suicide. It is also observed that in total number of suicides figure there is slight variation was noted.

Below table of farmers suicide of Maharashatra, shows an increasing trend. The highest (4453) suicide cases were noted in year 2006, whereas lowest (1083) suicide cases noted in year 1995 (Table 2).

Farmer suicide in Marathwada region has gone exponentially in the last eight year. Total of 4516 farmers committed suicide in Marathwada since 2010 to 2017. In the year 2018 (221) farmers committed suicide between 1 January and 25 March.

The highest suicide cases were noted (1133) in year 2015, lowest suicide cases noted (169) in year 2011. Maximum suicide incidence were reported from Beed district it contribute 27.30 percent out of total suicide in Marathwada. Brief profile of farmer’s suicide in Marathwada is given below (Table 3).

A largest number of farmers had committed suicide in Nanded district. Out of total suicide in Marathwada, Nanded district contributing 18.02 per cent (814) suicide. The highest suicide cases were noted (190) in year 2015, lowest suicide cases were noted (33) in year 2011. Maximum suicide incidences were reported from Kinvat, Kandhar, Loha, and Mukhed talukas. Brief profile of farmer suicide in Nanded district given below (Table 4).

Materials and Methods

Sample and sampling plan

The sample and sampling procedure to be adopted for this research study was given below;

Selection of district

Out of eight districts from the Marathwada region, the present study was conducted in Nanded district for considerable suicide cases of the farmers.
Selection of talukas

The present study was conducted in four tahsils namely Kandhar, Loha, Mukhed, and Kinvat were selected randomly from Nanded district of Marathwada region.

Selection of villages

Twenty seven villages were selected from four tahsils of Nanded district based on considerable suicide cases of the farmers. The list of villages along with no. of victims is presented in Annexure –II.

Selection of respondents

In this study respondents were the households of selected victim those who committed suicide during 2015 to 2017 and had declared as a legal victims by district level committee headed by Collector of the Nanded district. The time period 2015 to 2017 was selected purposively as in this period maximum numbers of suicides were occurred in Nanded districts of Marathwada.

Before sampling researcher had contacted personally to the Collector Office of Nanded district and obtained the complete list of farmers those who committed suicide during 2015 to 2017. In all, there were 523 total suicide cases in Nanded district. From the list of 523 suicide cases, researcher had selected 40 victims by proportionate method of random sampling. Name of selected victims along with their village and tahsils presented in Annexure III.

Development of interview schedule

Interview schedule was prepared as per the objectives set in for the investigation. Every case regarding construction of statement, purpose, content and sequence was considered while preparing the interview schedule. In first part of the interview schedule questions related to primary information, personal, socio-economic, situational and socio-psychological variables were included and in second part, questions related to socio-psycho risk factors of suicide, consequences and suggestion for avoiding suicides were included.

Pre testing of interview schedule

The interview schedule developed was pre-tested for accuracy, simplicity and predictability. Considering all aspect of objective, interview schedule was pre-tested with household who lost their family member and who were belonging to other than selected sample. The data were observed and the difficult questions were modified for interview schedule as per experience of pre-test. In this way after pre-testing interview schedule was finalized.

Collection of data

As suicide is a sensitive social issue and thus the investigation has to be made with very guarded and careful manner, and without hurting the sentiments of the family. Data were collected by personal interview method with the help of structured interview schedule. Interview was conducted at residence of victims so as to review overall situation of the family by researcher. In addition to personal interview, observations, discussions with family members and key informants of the respected village such as Police Patil, Sarpanch, local leaders, other farmers etc and also reviewing victims’ actual records of institutional debts etc. were some used for data collection.

The data collection from those households who lost their family head or member was a very difficult and challenging task was performed by the researcher during the 21
January to 29 January 2018. While collecting information/data, researcher first collected all general information and lastly turns toward some specific responses. Total 40 victims’ households were interviewed from 27 villages of four tehsil in Nanded district.

Results and Discussion

Age

Age was an important factor as suicide rate differs dramatically by age. In addition age-related psycho-social stressors and family or developmental issues might influence suicide risk (Jacob, 2006). The distribution of the victims according to their age has been presented in Table 5.

It was observed from Table 5 majority of the victims 65 per cent were under middle age category, followed by 17.50 per cent were young and remaining 17.50 per cent victims were found under old age category.

Gender

Gender analysis of the selected victims is given in Table 6.

It is observed from Table 6 that out of 40, majority of victims 100 per cent were in male category. Generally male is head of household and he is point towards economic distress. Therefore, economic distress of family is heavily loaded by male. Consequently, large number of male farmers committed suicide.

Marital status

Marital status of the selected victims has been given in Table 7.

It is observed from Table 7 that out of 40, majority of victims 97.50 per cent were married, while rest of victims 2.50 per cent were unmarried. Non-cordial marginal relations were also found responsible for suicide. The married farmer spoiled there relation due to the dispute with spouse, love affairs and social stigma.

Education

The education level of the victims was studied and the result has been presented in Table 8.

It is observed from Table 8 that out of the total sample 15 per cent were illiterate. Within the literates 27.50 per cent victims were having education up to high school level and 27.50 per cent were educated up to primary level. While 17.50 per cent victims had higher secondary school level education. Only 07.50 per cent possessed UG level education and 05.00 per cent had middle school level education.

Iliteracy and traditional education system is largely responsible for increasing economic distress in Maharashtra. An uneducated people do not get knowledge of global changes and educated person is apathy to play role as a farmer in farm business due to absence of skill and educational fatigue. Any single suicide victim and respondents were not found taken formal education of agriculture science during visit.

Caste

Caste of an individual denotes the occupational status in the society. The distribution of the selected victims according to their respective caste was done in nine caste category as per the Maharashtra Government Resolution No. CBC-10/2006/PK-94/Ma and K-5, dated 25th May 2006 and presented in Table 9. From the table 9 it is observed that majority 52.50 per cent suicide cases were belonged to open category from all selected four tahsil (Maximum 17 cases from Maratha
caste and 4 cases from wani caste). This was followed by Vimukta Jati (VJ-A) category were 15 per cent (Maximum from Banjara caste from Kinvat tahlisil). The victims belonging to SC category (7.50 per cent) and among SC category mostly Budha from Loha tahlisil. While 7.50 per cent comes under Schedule Tribe (ST) group (Maximum ‘Gond’ from only Kinvat tahlisil). Whereas 7.50 per cent victim’s were belonging from Nomadic Tribe-D group (Wanjari from Kinvat tahlisil).

While 5.00 per cent victim’s were observed from Other Backward Class (OBC) group (Kumbhar from kinvat tahlisil), while 2.50 per cent victim’s were observed from Special Backward Class (SBC) group (Koshti from Loha tahlisil) and Nomadic Tribe (NT- B) (Bhoi from Mukhed tahlisil).

Caste structure plays a significant role in determining the occupational structure of Maharashtra. Predominantly the Marathas are the agriculturist community.

Marathas have higher land holding as compare to other caste. Therefore, if there is any crisis in the agriculture then society has to face subsequent apathy.

Family type

The distribution of the selected victims as per the family type has been presented as under in Table 10.

From Table 10 it is observed that maximum 65.00 per cent victims were from nuclear type of families and 35.00 per cent victims’ belonged to joint family.

Suicide is always of the higher degree in the nuclear family. Because when a person is in trouble or under a strain, finds an outlet for his worries, in the form of suicide.

Family size

The data in Table 11 revealed that majority 60.00 per cent suicides were concentrated in medium size family having 4 to 6 family members. While 20.00 per cent victims were having large family size (7 to 9 members), followed by 10.00 per cent victims having small family size (up to 3 members). Whereas only 10.00 per cent victims were from very large family group having 10 or more than 10 family members.

In medium and large size of family the income level of them is not sufficient so as to allow them to obtain basic commodities such as food and clothing, shelter, education and medical facilities for consumption on the one hand and to maintain cultivation expenditure on the other. Thus, it is inferred that majority of the suicides were concentrated between medium and large family size.

Farming experience

The distribution of the victim’s according to their farming experience has been presented in Table 12 as follows.

From Table 12, it was observed that victims 57.50 per cent had medium farming experience between 11 to 33 years, followed by 22.50 per 7cent of the victims had high farming experience 34 and above years. While 20.00 per cent victims had less farming experience up to 10 years. Thus it is observed from the above findings that more or less in all categories of farming experience, suicides were happened. Secondly it was also noticed that as the farming experience is increased the suicides rates were declined.

Land holding

Table 13 shows that majority 47.50 per cent of the victim’s were small farmers having land
holding between 1.01 to 2.00 hectares, followed by 32.50 per cent victims were marginal farmers possessing land up to 1.00 hectare. Whereas 12.50 per cent and 7.50 per cent of the victims had semi medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha) and medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha) land holding, respectively.

The average size of holding in marginal, small, semi-medium and medium groups were 0.58 ha, 1.44 ha, 2.6 ha and 6.22 ha respectively. The overall size of holding was worked out to 1.67 hectares.

Large number of selected suicide victim farmers was reported small and marginal farmers in Maharashtra. Small and marginal farmers often lack access to major agricultural services, such as credit, extension, insurance, and market. Small and marginal farmers were unable to meet the basic needs income generated from farm business. Therefore, size of farm land is also responsible for increasing farmers suicide in Maharashtra.

**Subsidiary occupation**

The distribution of victims according to their subsidiary occupations has been depicted in Table 1.

The data presented in Table 1, indicates that majority of victims 60 per cent were engaged in farm labour for wages earning as a supportive endeavor to farming and majority of them were marginal and small farmers. Whereas 15 per cent deceased farmers were doing either caste related or other non-professional business with farming. Out of 15 per cent 12.50 per cent victims were have only farming as their main occupation and they did driving. Only one deceased farmer 2.50 per cent were possessed hotel as an allied occupation. While 12.50 per cent victims were have only farming as their main occupation and they did not have a any back up system, mostly they were medium (4.01-10.00 ha.) land holders. Monthly income from salary/pension was noted in 10.00 per cent victims; out of these three were holding teacher and one are Krishi sevak. Only one deceased farmer 2.50 per cent were possessed dairy as an allied occupation through buffalo rearing in addition to farming.

Lack of farm employment has created the excess burden on agriculture. Excess burden of workforce has not only created pressure on agriculture but also increased the cost of cultivation and thereby resultant decline in returns from cultivation. Sometimes, excess supply of labour causes a decline in the wage rate below the subsistence level of living and increases the headcount of rural poverty among agricultural labourers.

**Annual income**

Income is a major determinant of the economic status of an individual. Every individual’s style of living is decided to a great extent by his income. His expenditure on farming, allied occupations, household matters, indebtedness, and fulfillments of family responsibilities is decided by the income he earns. Everything can be adjusted but not the money. Low income creates very difficult for an individual to manage affairs of the family.

Such people become discouraged and cannot perform their functions properly (Madan, 1980). Keeping this in view, the annual income was considered for the study. The distribution of selected victim’s according to their annual income has been presented in Table 15.

From Table 15 it is observed that majority of the victims 55.00 per cent had annual income between Rs. 31589 to 74747 and 37.50 per
cent had annual income above Rs. 74748. This was followed by 7.500 per cent respondents belonged from income group with annual income up to Rs. 31588.

The average annual income of all victims’ households was Rs. 74747 which includes cultivation, wages, non-professional business income, service/ pension and income from allied occupations.

Marathwada regions of the state are far away from industrial development that’s why they could not get opportunity of employment. Level of income generated through farm business is lower than non-farm sector. Therefore, farmers are unable to meet the basic needs of our household.

Socio-economic status

The socio-economic status shows the position of the individual and his family members occupied with reference to prevailing average standard of cultural position, effective income, material possession and participation in the group activities of the community (Bertrand, et al., 1958). The results pertaining to socio-economic status of the victims have been presented in Table 16.

It could be noted from Table 16 that most of the deceased farmers were categorized in small level 75.00 per cent and high level 15.00 per cent of socio-economic status. While remaining only 10.00 per cent victims were in medium level.

Thus the present research study accepted that the 75 per cent suicides were concentrated low of socio-economic status group. Mass poverty and illiteracy combined with caste system, religious beliefs, etc. adversely affect the course of economic development Hence low SES is the one of the cause of suicide of farmers in Marathwada Region.

Type of land

Crops yield depends on various factors, out of which type of land is one of the important prerequisite for better yield of the crops. The data regarding the type of land of the selected victim’s households has been presented in Table 17 revealed that half of the deceased farmers 50 per cent were having light soil type of land, followed by 47.50 per cent respondents having medium soil type of land. While 2.50 per cent possess heavy soil type of land.

Thus, it is concluded that 50.00 per cent of the deceased farmers holds the land having light soil type of land. Similarly more or less in all type of land holder’s suicides was happened.

Irrigation facilities

Availability of irrigation facilities and their irrigation potential significantly affect the cropping pattern, production, productivity and ultimately income level of farmers by many folds (Shivappa, 2006). Hence irrigation facilities available with the selected victim have been ascertained and data in this regard is presented in Table 18.

It is observed from Table 18 that three fourth 87.50 per cent victims have not having any source to access the irrigation. They solely depend on monsoon rains. Nearly 5.00 per cent deceased farmers having only open well as irrigation source.

Whereas remaining 5.00 and 2.50 per cent victims have canal and river respectively. It is also noticed that most of the well were either dry or not have sufficient water for irrigation due to depletion of groundwater and less rains in recent years. In addition to this for using available water for irrigation load shading of electricity was also the main hurdle was mentioned by family members.
It is also noticed that most of the well were either dry or not have sufficient water for irrigation due to depletion of groundwater and less rains in recent years. In addition to this for using available water for irrigation load shading of electricity was also the main hurdle was mentioned by family members.

It is therefore concluded that majority 87.50 per cent suicide cases were not having any source to access the irrigation. They were mostly depending on monsoon rains only; secondly due to lack of irrigation facilities their cropping intensity and frequency of crop failure among rainfed farmers have been more. Hence lack of irrigation facility is also the one of the cause of farmers’ suicides in Marathwada Region.

**Agricultural infrastructure**

The respondent households have been analysed according to infrastructure and data is presented in Table 19.

The data presented in Table 19 revealed that nearly 42.50 per cent deceased farmers were found to have medium input infrastructure, followed by 30 per cent had high input infrastructure and 27.50 per cent deceased farmer had low input infrastructure.

While considering availability of credit sources it is found that victims’ households 52.50 per cent had medium availability of credit sources infrastructure, followed by 40.00 and 7.50 per cent had low and high credit sources infrastructure respectively.

Regarding availability of information infrastructure it is noted that majority of the respondents 52.50 per cent had medium availability of information infrastructure, followed by 37.50 and 10.00 per cent having low and high information infrastructure respectively.

The availability of transport facilities as infrastructure when studied it was observed that half 50.00 per cent households had low availability of transport facilities, followed by 42.50 per cent had medium availability of transport facilities while only 7.50 per cent had high availability of transport infrastructure.

While considering total infrastructure availability of five components, majority 67.50 per cent respondents was having high infrastructure availability for there farming business, and 32.50 per cent had medium infrastructure availability. It is also noticed that not a single household was found, having low infrastructure availability in totality.

Seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and technology are major inputs of farm business. Farm saved seeds were replaced by corporate seeds which needed fertilizers and pesticides. Consequently, cost of production has been increasing and agriculture became a costly affair. The Indian small farmers have failed to adjust with these changes. Managing finance for the agricultural work became a difficult task. Some small farmers leave farming and shifted other occupations due to lack of ability to understand the problems arise and grown in farm sector.

Roads, electricity, market, warehouses, communication means and processing industries are weak in Marathwada. Most of the high value crops are perishable and damaged during the travelling. Therefore, wastage of agriculture produces is found more and damaged produce could not get higher prices in market.

**Productivity**

Productivity is the agricultural production per unit area. The average crops yield of victims’ households in qts /ha during 2015-2016 and
2016-2017 has been computed along with number of households who cultivate that particular crops and has been presented at a glance in Table 20.

It was observed from Table 20 that, the average yield of cotton cultivated by victims was 11.91 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of cotton was 22.50 qtl/ha and an minimum and yield of cotton was 7.50 qtl/ha.

Followed by average yield of soyabean crop cultivated by victims was 9.55 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of soyabean was 20 qtl/ha and an minimum yield of soyabean was 10 qtl/ha. In case of red gram average yield was 11.11 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of red gram was 10 qtl/ha and an minimum yield of 6.25 qtl/ha.

In case of wheat average yield was 15.50 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of wheat was 20 qtl/ha and an average yield of wheat was 12 qtl/ha.

In case of gram average yield was 8.75qtl/ha. A maximum yield of gram was 12.50 qtl/ha and an minimum yield of gram was 7.50 qtl/ha.

In case of jowar average yield was 12.85 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of jowar was 17.50 qtl/ha and a minimum yield of jowar was 7.50 qtl/ha.

In case of turmaric average yield was 20.83 qtl/ha. A maximum yield of turmaric was 10 qtl/ha and an average yield of turmaric was 7.50 qtl/ha.

In case of sugarcane average yield was 50 tons/ha. A maximum yield of sugarcane was 40 tons/ha and a minimum yield of sugarcane 25 tons/ha.

Thus a perusal of the results it was concluded that almost in all crops productivity is very low hence here lower production and productivity on the farms of the victims has been proved as one of the cause of farmers’ suicides in Marathwada region. Due to the less productivity of crop the victim were not get enough return from farm sector. Hence farmers unable to meet their daily needs income obtains from farm business.

**Cropping pattern**

Cropping pattern of selected victims household during the year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 has been worked out in terms of percentage share of individual crops in gross cropped area and presented in Table 20.

It was observed from Table 21 majority of 57.50 per cent victims had fair cropping pattern, followed by 30.00 per cent victims had inferior cropping pattern and only 12.50 per cent victims had superior cropping pattern.

It observed from Table 22 that majority of victims were growing cotton and soyabeen 57.50 per cent, followed by Sorghum 35.00 per cent, Tur 20.00 per cent, and turmeric 2.50 per cent.

In rabi season majority of victims were found growing jawar and Gram 5.00 per cent, followed by wheat 2.50 per cent.

In annual / perennial crop only 2.50 per cent, victims growing sugarcane crop.

In selected victims 92.50 per cent, had taken mono cropping, 7.50 per cent had taken intercropping.

Cotton and Soyabeen dominate the cropping pattern of suicide hit Marathwada region of Maharashtra. Soyabeen and cotton is a crop which has featured non-significant crops in Maharashtra in the recent past for khariff season.
Indebtedness position of the victims

It can be seen from the Table 23 that the out of 40 victims 85 per cent victims were found indebted, that mean majority of the victims have an obligation to pay debts to borrowed agencies/sources, whereas only 6 victims 15 per cent were not found indebted.

Indebtedness is one of the important responsible factors to increase suicidal tendency among farmers. There are many causes of increasing inability to repay the loans among farmers i.e. high rate of interest, low rate of return, crop failure, low level of income and so on.

Livelihood pattern

The data with regards to the livelihood pattern have been furnished in detail through various angles in subsequent Table 24.

It is observed from the Table 24 all over 95.00 per cent victims and his family had got the average total income Rs.41871 from agriculture, followed by 90 per cent victims and his family had got the average total income Rs. 38811 from wages, 12.50 per cent victims and his family had got the average total income Rs.39000 from any professional and non-professional business, 4.00 per cent victims and his family had got the average total income Rs. 36850 from service/pension, 2.50 per cent victims and his family had got the total average income Rs. 12000 from allied occupation such dairy, goat farming etc.

In case of expenditure overall 100 per cent victims had the average expenditure on food has largest share contributing nearly Rs.25750, Followed by 100 per cent victims had the average expenditure on clothing Rs.7850, 100 per cent victims had the average expenditure on health Rs. 11250, 100 per cent victims had the expenditure on other things such as home maintenance, travel, religious functions, animal husbandry, light bill and marriages Rs.19005, 95 per cent victims had the average expenditure on agriculture Rs.27039 and 87.50 per cent victims had the average expenditure on education Rs.5248.

Thus it could be concluded that among the present livelihood sources it is found that only agriculture is the major livelihood source of overall deceased farmers. If there is any crisis in the agriculture then society has to face subsequent apathy.

Extent of family responsibility fulfilled

Extent of family responsibilities fulfilled by an individual victims related to six major type of family responsibilities namely children's education, daughters/sister marriages, health treatment of family members, rituals after death in family, male children’s marriages and to perform the responsibility of widow/divorced/disputed daughter or sister in family has been studied and the results are depicted in Table 25.

A perusal of the data in Table 25 indicates that out of total 40 victims’ majority 37 (92.50%) victims holds the children’s education responsibility in family; out of this 13 (35.13%) victims had fulfilled this responsibility to some extent. This was followed by 11 (29.72 %) victims fulfilled it to little extent. This was followed by 9 (24.32%) victims fulfilled it to a great extent. This was followed by 3 (8.10%) victims fulfilled it to a very great extent and remaining 1 (2.70%) victim had not fulfilled any Children’s education of family members.

Daughter/ sister marriages is an important obligation of family members, which holds by 27 (67.50 %) victims, out of this majority 18 (66.66%) victims had fulfilled the daughter/sister marriages to a great extent. Whereas 5
(18.51%) victims had fulfilled it to some extent. While 4 (14.81%) victims had fulfilled the daughter/sister marriages to a very great extent.

Responsibility of male child marriages has been hold by 9 (22.50%) victims; out of this 5 (55.55%) victim each had fulfilled it to a great extent. This was followed by 2 (22.22%) and 2 (22.22%) victim each had fulfilled it to a very great and to some extent.

Responsibility of health treatment of family members has been hold by 37 (92.50%) deceased farmers, out of this majority 17 (45.94%) victims each had fulfilled it to great extent. While 9 (24.32%) victims had fulfilled it to a very great extent. This is followed by 6 (16.21%) victims had fulfilled it to some extent and 5 (13.51%) victims had fulfilled it to little extent.

While meager 1 (2.50%) victims holds the responsibility of widow/divorced/disputed, daughter/sister in family, out of this 1 (100%) victims each has fulfilled it to a very great extent.

**Ability to perform the family responsibility**

It is observed from Table 26 out of the total 40 victims 92.50 per cent victims had holds the responsibility of children’s education. Out of this 48.64 per cent victims were able partially to fulfilled the responsibility of children’s education, followed by 43.24 per cent victims were able to fulfilled it completely and 8.10 per cent victims was unable to fulfill their children’s education.

Responsibility of daughter/sister marriages in family hold by 67.50 per cent victims, out of this majority of 66.66 per cent victims were able to fulfilled completely the responsibility of daughter/sister marriages. Followed by 25.92 per cent victims were able to fulfill partially and 7.40 per cent were found unable to fulfilled responsibility of marriages of their daughter/sisters in family.

Responsibility of marriages of their male child in family hold by 22.50 per cent, out of this 44.44 per cent victims were able to fulfill partially, and 44.44 per cent victims was found able to fulfilled completely the responsibility of male child marriage. Only 11.11 per cent victims unable to fulfilled the responsibility of marriage of their male child.

Responsibility of health treatment of their family member has been hold by 92.50 per cent victims, out of this majority 48.64 per cent of the victims were able to fulfill partially, followed by 40.54 per cent victims were able to fulfilled completely and very few 10.81 per cent cases were found unable to fulfill the responsibility.

Responsibility of widow/divorced/disputed, daughter/sister in family has been hold by 2.50 per cent victim out of this 2.50 per cent victim were found able to fulfilled completely the responsibility of divorced daughter.

**Victim’s habits**

Habits are of two types, good and bad habits. Good habits of an individual promote health, wealth and everything, but bad habits may ruin everything. Once person becomes addicted to any habit, it becomes difficult to leave it.

In various psychological autopsy research studies it was observed that bad habits like alcohol abuse or dependence were present in 25 per cent to 50 per cent cases those who died by suicide. Hence it is an important aspect to collect the information of alcohol addicted deceased farmers, with their other bad habits like smoking, chewing of tobacco, gambling etc.
### Table 1: No of farmers’ suicides in India between 1995-2016

| Year | Male   | Female | Total  | Year | Male   | Female | Total  |
|------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1995 | 8295   | 2425   | 10720  | 2006 | 14664  | 2396   | 17060  |
| 1996 | NA     | NA     | NA     | 2007 | 14509  | 2123   | 16632  |
| 1997 | 11229  | 2393   | 13622  | 2008 | 14145  | 2051   | 16196  |
| 1998 | 12986  | 3029   | 16015  | 2009 | 14951  | 2417   | 17368  |
| 1999 | 13278  | 2804   | 16082  | 2010 | 13592  | 2372   | 15964  |
| 2000 | 13501  | 3102   | 16603  | 2011 | 12071  | 1956   | 14027  |
| 2001 | 13708  | 2576   | 16284  | 2012 | 11951  | 1803   | 13754  |
| 2002 | 15308  | 2663   | 17971  | 2013 | 10489  | 1283   | 11772  |
| 2003 | 14701  | 2463   | 17164  | 2014 | 11028  | 2417   | 13754  |
| 2004 | 14026  | 2158   | 16284  | 2015 | 10026  | 1432   | 11458  |

Source: ncrb.nic.in (2017)

### Table 2: Number of farmer’s suicide in Maharashtra 1995-2016

| Year | Male   | Female | Total  | Year | Male   | Female | Total  |
|------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1995 | 978    | 105    | 1083   | 2006 | 4111   | 342    | 4453   |
| 1996 | 1767   | 214    | 1981   | 2007 | 3968   | 270    | 4238   |
| 1997 | 1600   | 317    | 1917   | 2008 | 3573   | 229    | 3802   |
| 1998 | 1938   | 1471   | 2409   | 2009 | 2692   | 180    | 2872   |
| 1999 | 2050   | 373    | 2423   | 2010 | 2947   | 194    | 3141   |
| 2000 | 2492   | 530    | 3022   | 2011 | 3093   | 244    | 3337   |
| 2001 | 2945   | 591    | 3536   | 2012 | 3483   | 303    | 3786   |
| 2002 | 3155   | 540    | 3695   | 2013 | 3020   | 126    | 3146   |
| 2003 | 3381   | 455    | 3836   | 2014 | 3726   | 278    | 4004   |
| 2004 | 3799   | 348    | 4147   | 2015 | 2492   | 392    | 3228   |
| 2005 | 3638   | 288    | 3926   | 2016 | 2050   | 1002   | 3052   |

Source: ncrb.nic.in (2017)

### Table 3: District wise number of farmers’ suicides in Marathwada during 2010-2017

| Dist. | Year 2010 | Year 2011 | Year 2012 | Year 2013 | Year 2014 | Year 2015 | Year 2016 | Year 2017 | Total |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Beed  | 79        | 73        | 91        | 98        | 152       | 301       | 222       | 207       | 1223  |
| Jalana| 04        | 06        | 06        | 08        | 32        | 83        | 76        | 91        | 306   |
| Nanded| 55        | 33        | 39        | 46        | 118       | 190       | 180       | 153       | 814   |
| Latur | 04        | 04        | 00        | 03        | 44        | 106       | 116       | 94        | 371   |
| Aurangabad | 02   | 00       | 02       | 04       | 56        | 144       | 151       | 139       | 498   |
| Parbhani | 22        | 23        | 35        | 17        | 70        | 104       | 98        | 125       | 494   |
| Hingoli| 02        | 05        | 03        | 02        | 31        | 41        | 49        | 56        | 189   |
| Osmanabad| 23        | 25        | 22        | 29        | 71        | 164       | 161       | 126       | 621   |
| Total | 191       | 169       | 198       | 207       | 574       | 1133      | 1053      | 991       | 4516  |

Source: Divisional commissioner office, Auragabad.
### Table 4: Year wise number of farmers’ suicides in Nanded district during 2010-2017

| Year | Eligible cases | Ineligible cases | Total |
|------|----------------|------------------|-------|
| 2010 | 32             | 23               | 55    |
| 2011 | 20             | 13               | 33    |
| 2012 | 19             | 20               | 39    |
| 2013 | 20             | 26               | 46    |
| 2014 | 78             | 40               | 118   |
| 2015 | 146            | 44               | 190   |
| 2016 | 118            | 62               | 180   |
| 2017 | 116            | 37               | 153   |
| Total| 549            | 265              | 814   |

Source: Divisional commissioner office, Aurangabad

### Table 5: Distribution of victims according to their age

| Sr. No. | Category                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | Young (Up to 31)          | 07        | 17.50      |
| 2       | Middle (32 to 55)         | 26        | 65.00      |
| 3       | Old (56 and Above)        | 07        | 17.50      |
| Total   |                            | 40        | 100.00     |

### Table 6: Distribution of victims according to their gender

| Sr. No. | Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|--------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | Male   | 40        | 100        |
| 2       | Female | 00        | 0          |
| Total   |        | 40        | 100.00     |

### Table 7: Distribution of victims according to their marital status

| Sr. No. | Marital status | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | Married        | 39        | 97.50      |
| 2       | Unmarried      | 01        | 02.50      |
| Total   |                | 40        | 100.00     |

### Table 8: Distribution of selected victims on the basis of educational level

| S. N | Educational level | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1    | Illiterate        | 06        | 15.00      |
| 2    | Primary school (1st to 4th) | 11 | 27.50 |
| 3    | Middle school (5th to 7th)   | 02 | 05.00 |
| 4    | High school (8th to 10th)    | 11 | 27.50 |
| 5    | Higher secondary school (11th to 12th) | 07 | 17.50 |
| 6    | Graduate (level UG)      | 03        | 07.50      |
| 7    | Post graduate          | 00        | 00.00      |
| Total|                    | 40        | 100.00     |
**Table 9** Distribution of selected victims according to their caste

| Sr. No. | Caste category               | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.      | Schedule Caste (SC)          | 03        | 07.50      |
| 2.      | Schedule Tribe (ST)          | 03        | 07.50      |
| 3.      | Vimukta Jati (VJ- A)         | 06        | 15.00      |
| 4.      | Nomadic Tribe (NT- B)        | 01        | 02.50      |
| 5.      | Nomadic Tribe (NT- C)        | 00        | 00.00      |
| 6.      | Nomadic Tribe (NT- D)        | 03        | 07.50      |
| 7.      | Other Backward Class (OBC)   | 02        | 05.00      |
| 8.      | Special Backward Class (SBC) | 01        | 02.50      |
| 9.      | Open                         | 21        | 52.50      |
| Total   |                              | 40        | 100.00     |

**Table 10** Distribution of victim’s according to their family type

| Sr. No. | Family type | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.      | Nuclear     | 26        | 65.00      |
| 2.      | Joint       | 14        | 35.00      |
| Total   |             | 40        | 100.00     |

**Table 11** Distribution of victims according to their family size

| Sr. No. | Family Size               | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|---------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.      | Small (Up to 3)           | 04        | 10.00      |
| 2.      | Medium (4 to 6)           | 24        | 60.00      |
| 3.      | Large (7 to 9)            | 08        | 20.00      |
| 4.      | Very large (10 and Above) | 04        | 10.00      |
| Total   |                           | 40        | 100.00     |

**Table 12** The distribution of the selected victims according to their farming experience

| Sr. No. | Farming experience (years) | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | Less (Up to 10)            | 08        | 20.00      |
| 2       | Medium (11 to 33)          | 23        | 57.50      |
| 3       | High (34 and Above)        | 09        | 22.50      |
| Total   |                            | 40        | 100.00     |
Table.13 Distribution of selected victims according to land size

| Sr. No. | Holding group            | Number of victims | Total area (ha.) | Average size of holding (ha.) |
|---------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1.      | Marginal (Up to 1.00 ha.) | 13 (32.50%)       | 7.6 (11.67%)     | 0.584                        |
| 2.      | Small (1.01 to 2.00 ha.)  | 19 (47.50%)       | 27.4 (41.01%)    | 1.442                        |
| 3.      | Semi-medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha.) | 05 (12.50%) | 13 (19.46%)     | 2.6                          |
| 4.      | Medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha.) | 03 (7.50%)       | 18.8 (28.14%)    | 6.226                        |
| 5.      | Big (10.01 and above)     | 00 (00%)         | 00 (00%)        | 00                           |
| Total   |                           | 40 (100%)        | 66.8 (100)       | 1.67                         |

(Figure in bracket indicate the percentage)

Table.14 Distribution of selected victim’s households according to their subsidiary occupations

| Sr. No. | Subsidiary occupation                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.      | Agriculture (only farming)              | 05        | 12.50      |
| 2.      | Agriculture + Labour                    | 24        | 60.00      |
| 3.      | Agriculture + Dairy (Buffalo)           | 01        | 02.50      |
| 4.      | Agriculture + Driver                    | 05        | 12.50      |
| 5.      | Agriculture + Hotel                     | 01        | 12.50      |
| 6.      | Agriculture + Service/ Pension          | 04        | 10.00      |
| Total   |                                        | 40        | 100        |

Table.15 Distribution of victims according to their annual income

| Sr. No | Annual income                  | Number of victims | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1.     | Low (Up to 31588)              | 03                | 07.50      |
| 2.     | Medium (31589 to 74747)        | 22                | 55.00      |
| 3.     | High (74748 & above)           | 15                | 37.50      |
| Total  |                                | 40                | 100        |
| Mean=  | 74747                          | SD = 43188        |            |

Table.16 Distribution of victims according to their socio-economic status

| Sr. No | Socio-economic status | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.     | Low                   | 30        | 75.00      |
| 2.     | Medium                | 04        | 10.00      |
| 3.     | High                  | 06        | 15.00      |
| Total  |                       | 40        | 100.00     |
Table 17 Distribution of victims according to their type of land

| Sr. No. | Type of land   | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| 1       | Light soil    | 20        | 50.00      |
| 2       | Medium soil   | 19        | 47.50      |
| 3       | Heavy soil    | 01        | 02.50      |
| **Total** |             | **40**    | **100.00** |

Table 18 Distribution of victims according to their available irrigation sources

| Sr. No | Irrigation sources | Number of victims | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1      | No source          | 35                | 87.50      |
| 2      | Canal              | 02                | 05.00      |
| 3      | Well / Tube well   | 02                | 05.00      |
| 4      | River              | 01                | 02.50      |
| **Total** |                  | **40**           | **100.00** |

Table 20 Average productivity of major crops of selected victims household

| S. N | Particulars   | Frequency | Productivity (qtl /ha) | Average | Maximum | Minimum |
|------|---------------|-----------|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1    | Cotton        | 23        | 11.91                  | 22.50   | 07.50   |
| 2    | Soyabean      | 23        | 09.55                  | 20.00   | 10.00   |
| 3    | Red Gram      | 08        | 11.11                  | 10.00   | 06.25   |
| 4    | Wheat         | 01        | 15.50                  | 20.00   | 12.00   |
| 5    | Gram          | 02        | 08.75                  | 12.50   | 07.50   |
| 6    | Jowar         | 02        | 12.85                  | 17.50   | 07.50   |
| 7    | Turmaric      | 01        | 20.83                  | 10.00   | 07.50   |
| 8    | Sugar cane    | 01        | 50.00                  | 40.00   | 25.00   |

(Yield of sugarcane mention into tons /ha)

Table 21 Distribution of victims according to their cropping pattern level

| Sr. No | Cropping pattern | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Inferior         | 12        | 30.00      |
| 2      | Fair             | 23        | 57.50      |
| 3      | Superior         | 05        | 12.50      |
| **Total** |              | **40**    | **100**    |
Table 22 Cropping pattern of selected victims’ last three years

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| A. Kharif |             |           |            |
| 1.       | Soyabean    | 23        | 57.50      |
| 2.       | Cotton      | 23        | 57.50      |
| 3.       | Sorghum     | 14        | 35.00      |
| 4.       | Tur         | 08        | 20.00      |
| 5.       | Turmaric    | 01        | 2.50       |
| B. Rabi  |             |           |            |
| 6.       | Wheat       | 01        | 02.50      |
| 7.       | Gram        | 02        | 05.00      |
| 8.       | Jowar       | 02        | 05.00      |
| D. Annual/Perennial | | | |
| 10.      | Sugarcane   | 01        | 02.50      |
| 1.       | Mono cropping | 37  | 92.50 |
| 2.       | Intercropping| 03        | 07.50      |

Table 23 Distribution of victims’ households according to Indebtedness

| Sr. No. | Particulars          | Number of victims | Percentage |
|---------|----------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1.      | Indebted victims     | 34                | 85.00      |
| 2.      | Free from debts      | 06                | 15.00      |
| **Total** |                       | **40**            | **100.00** |

Table 24 Livelihood sources of the victims and their share in income

| S. N | Source                                      | Frequency | Average / House Hold |
|------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| A. Income |                                               |           |                      |
| 1.    | Agriculture                                 | 38 (95.00)| 41871               |
| 2.    | Allied occupation                           | 01 (2.50) | 12000               |
| 3.    | Wages earning                               | 36 (90.00)| 38811               |
| 4.    | Business (professional/non-professional)    | 05 (12.50)| 39000               |
| 5.    | Service / pension                           | 04 (10.00)| 36850               |
| **Total Income (A)** |                               | **83297**  |                      |
| B. Expenditure |                                             |           |                      |
| 1.    | Food                                        | 40 (100)  | 25750                |
| 2.    | Clothing                                    | 40 (100)  | 7850                 |
| 3.    | Education                                   | 35 (87.50)| 5248                |
| 4.    | Health                                      | 40 (100)  | 11255                |
| 5.    | Agriculture                                 | 38 (95.00)| 27039               |
| 6.    | Other                                       | 40 (100)  | 19005                |
| **Total Expenditure (B)** |                                   | **94002**  |                      |
| **Surplus/deficit (+/-) (A-B)** |                            | **-10705** |                      |

(Figure in bracket indicate the percentage)
**Table.19** The distribution of the selected victims and his households according to their agriculture infrastructure availability infrastructure

| S. N | Agricultural Infrastructure | Input | Availability of Agriculture infrastructure | Post-harvest | Total |
|------|-----------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------|--------------|-------|
|      |                             | No.   | No. per cent | No. per cent | No. per cent | No. per cent | No. per cent |
| 1.   | Low (39.22 & below)         | 11    | 27.50 | 16 | 40.00 | 15 | 37.50 | 20 | 50.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.   | Medium (39.23 to 47.81)    | 17    | 42.50 | 21 | 52.50 | 21 | 52.50 | 17 | 42.50 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 32.50 |
| 3.   | High (47.82 & above)       | 12    | 30.00 | 03 | 7.50  | 04 | 10.00 | 03 | 7.50  | 0 | 0 | 27 | 67.50 |
| **Total** |                       | 40    | 100   | 40 | 100   | 40 | 100   | 40 | 100   | 0 | 0 | 40 | 100.00 |
| Mean |                            | 47.81 |       |    |       |    |       |    |       |    |    |    | 8.58 |

**Table.25** Distribution of the victims according to the responsibilities holds and their extent of fulfillment.

| S. N | Family Responsibilities | Holds | Extent of fulfillment |
|------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
|      |                         | No per cent | To extent | little extent | To some extent | To a great extent | To a very great extent |
| 1    | Children’s education   | 37 (92.50%) | 1 | 02.70 | 11 | 29.72 | 13 | 35.13 | 9 | 24.32 | 3 | 8.10 |
| 2    | Daughter / sister marriages | 27 (67.50%) | 0 | 00.00 | 0 | 00.00 | 5 | 18.51 | 18 | 66.66 | 4 | 14.81 |
| 3    | Male child marriages   | 09 (22.50%) | 0 | 00.00 | 0 | 00.00 | 2 | 22.22 | 5 | 55.55 | 2 | 22.22 |
| 4    | Health treatment of family members | 37 (92.50%) | 0 | 00.00 | 5 | 13.51 | 6 | 16.21 | 17 | 45.94 | 9 | 24.32 |
| 5    | Responsibility of widow / divorced / disputed, daughter/ sister in family | 01 (2.50%) | 0 | 00.00 | 0 | 00.00 | 0 | 00.00 | 00 | 00 | 1 | 100 |
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Table 26 Distribution of the victims according to the responsibilities holds and their ability to perform the family responsibilities

| S. No | Family responsibilities                                      | Holds      | Ability to perform |          |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|
|       |                                                             |            | Able to Fulfill    |            |
|       |                                                             |            | Partially          | Completely |
|       |                                                             | No. | %                | No. | %                | No. | %                |
| 1     | Children’s education                                       | 37 (92.50)| 18 (48.64)         | 16 (43.24) | 03 (8.10)         |
| 2     | Daughter / sister marriages                                | 27 (67.50)| 07 (25.92)         | 18 (66.66) | 02 (7.40)         |
| 3     | Male child marriages                                       | 09 (22.50)| 04 (44.44)         | 04 (44.44) | 01 (11.11)        |
| 4     | Health treatment of family members                         | 37 (92.50)| 18 (48.64)         | 15 (40.54) | 04 (10.81)        |
| 5     | Responsibility of widow / divorced / disputed, daughter/sister in family | 01 (2.50) | 00                  | 01 (2.50)  | 00                |

(Figure in bracket indicate the percentage)

Table 27 Distribution of victim’s according to their bad habits

| Sr. No | Particulars              | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------|--------|------------|
| 1      | Victim’s with bad habits | 24     | 60.00      |
| 2      | Victim’s free from bad habits | 16 | 40.00      |
|        | Total                    | 40     | 100.00     |

Table 28 Particulars about the existence of bad habits among victims

| Sr. No | Habits                              | Number of victims | Percentage |
|--------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1      | Chewing of tobacco                  | 18                | 45.00      |
| 2      | Alcoholism                          | 16                | 40.00      |
| 3      | Smoking i. Bidi - 2 ii. Cigar - 5 iii. Ganja - 1 | 08 | 20.00      |

Table 29 Distribution of victims according to their health status

| Sr. No | Particulars                      | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Victims having health problem    | 08        | 20.00      |
| 2      | Victims having free from health problem | 32 | 80.00      |
|        | Total                            | 40        | 100.00     |
Table 30 Distribution of victims according to their health problems

| Sr. No | Name of diseases    | Number of victims suffered | Percentage out of 40 |
|--------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1.     | Brain Tumor         | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 2.     | Fever               | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 3.     | Operation of Vertebra | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 4.     | Operation of Head   | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 5.     | Hernia              | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 6.     | Cramp               | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 7.     | Breaking the hand   | 1                          | 2.50                 |
| 8.     | Breaking the leg    | 1                          | 2.50                 |

Table 31 Distribution of victims according to their family member’s health

| Sr. No | Particulars                                | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| 1.     | Family members having health problem       | 17     | 42.50      |
| 2.     | Family members were free from health problem | 23     | 57.50      |
|        | Total                                      | 40     | 100.00     |

Table 32 Distribution of victim’s family members according to their health problems

| Sr. No | Name of diseases    | Numbers |
|--------|---------------------|---------|
| 1.     | Heart Attack        | 1       |
| 2.     | Physically Handicapped | 3       |
| 3.     | Blood Pressure      | 2       |
| 4.     | Sizar               | 1       |
| 5.     | Delivery            | 1       |
| 6.     | Operation of leg    | 3       |
| 7.     | Breaking the hand   | 1       |
| 8.     | Appendix            | 1       |
| 9.     | Stomachache         | 1       |
| 10.    | Slow witted         | 1       |
| 11.    | Blindness           | 1       |
| 12.    | Pneumonia           | 1       |
| 13.    | Anomia              | 1       |
|        | Total               | 18      |

Table 33 Distribution of victims according to their presence of dispute / Quarrel with family members

| Sr. No | Victims                              | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| 1.     | Having dispute / quarrel with family members | 03     | 7.50       |
| 2.     | Free from dispute / quarrel           | 37     | 92.50      |
|        | Total                                | 40     | 100.00     |
Table 34  Particulars about presence of dispute / quarrel among victims and their family members

| Sr. No. | Dispute with       | Frequency | Percentage | Reasons  |
|---------|--------------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| 1.      | With his wife      | 02        | 66.66      | Domestic |
| 2.      | With his brother   | 01        | 33.33      | Domestic |
| Total   |                    | 03        | 100        |          |

Table 35  Distribution of victims according to their identified number of socio-psycho risk factors of suicides

| Sr. No. | Category of risk factors | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.      | Low (1 to 3)             | 06        | 15.00      |
| 2.      | Medium (4 to 7)          | 31        | 77.50      |
| 3.      | High (8 and above)       | 03        | 07.50      |
| Total   |                          | 40        | 100.00     |

It is obvious from Table 27 that 24 (60 %) deceased farmers were possessed either one or more bad habits with them, like chewing of tobacco, smoking, alcohol addiction or gambling. Whereas 16 (40%) per cent were free from bad habits. The detailed information about bad habit behaviours of the selected victims has been presented in Table 27.

It was apparent from Table 28 that relatively higher proportion 18 (45%) of the deceased farmers possessed regular tobacco-chewing habit, followed by 16 (40.00%) having regular alcohol drinking habit. While 8 (20.00%) victims were observed under smoking habits.

Out of this smoke cigarettes 5 (40.00%) and 2 (25.00%) being smoke bidies and ganja 1 (12.50%). It was also observed that majority alcohol addicted victims also possessed additional likening of tobacco through chewing or smoking.

An addiction of alcohol creates dispute among family member, increases unproductive expenses, create health issues on one hand, and absence of productive work on the other hand. It leads to economic distress.

Victim’s health

According to past research studies on suicide by various social scientists physical illness has been proved an important contributing risk factor of suicide in 10 to 51 per cent cases. Hence this is also important aspect of the present study. Here health status of suicide farmers during last five years before the incidence has been considered. The information on health status of the victims has been collected and present in Table 29.

It is observed from Table 29 majority of 80.00 per cent was free from health problems remaining 20.00 per cent victims had health problem.

The details of the obvious diseases of selected deceased farmers have been presented in Table 30.

It is observed from Table 30 that 2.50 percent victims had Brain Tumor, followed by 2.50 percent had fever, 2.50 percent victims did operation of vertebra, 2.50 percent did Operation of head, 2.50 per cent had Hernia, 2.50 per cent had Cramp, 2.50 per cent occur injury on leg and hand.
Victims’ family health

The result pertaining to the health status of victims’ households has been depicted in Table 31.

A perusal of Table 31 revealed that in 23 (57.50%) victims family health was not the problem. While 17 (42.50%) deceased farmers, ill health of his family members has been observed. The detailed about the family members’ health problem has been given in Table 28.

It is observed from Table 32 that among the ill health family members of the victims physically handicap by accidents /injury was observed prominently each in 3 family members, followed by Heart Attack, Blood Pressure, Sizar, Delivery, Appendix, Stomachache, Slow witted, Blindness, Pneumonia, Anomia diseases were noted in family members of the deceased farmers.

Family dispute

Family disputes indicate the presence of dispute/ quarrel between victim and his family members. As per the past research studied on suicides, presence of quarrel/ disputes has been proved as the specified cause of suicide.

Hence in present study family disputes of the victims have been studied and data presented in Table 33.

From the Table 33 it is seen that in 92.50 per cent victims were free from any domestic disputes/ quarrel with their family members. While 7.50 per cent victims disputes/ quarrel was noticed with their family members due to domestic reasons. The detailed particulars about the presence of disputes/ quarrel among victims and his family members have been presented in Table 34.

A perusal of Table 34 reveals that out of the 3 victims in majority 2 victims (66.66%) dispute/ quarrel were noticed with his spouse due to domestic reasons. This was followed by quarrel with brother in 1 victim (33.33%) due to domestic reasons only. Family dispute among the members of family has been also found immediate cause of farmers” suicide among selected suicide victim. This dispute may be caused by addiction of alcohol, economic distress, love affairs and social stigma.

Distribution of selected victims according to their identified number of risk factors associated for suicide has been given in Table 35.

It is observed from Table 35 that in maximum percentage of the victims 77.50 per cent four to seven numbers of risk factors were associated. Followed by 15.00 per cent one to three and 7.50 per cent eight and above risk factors were associated.

Thus it is concluded that in 31 (77.50%) of the cases were associated with 4 to 7 factors to divert his aggression upon himself in the form of suicide.

It is concluded as follows

Age

From the study it is found that mostly 65.00 per cent middle age group farmers were committed suicide. This is the age group farmers have lot of family responsibilities on their shoulder. Therefore, they went in economic distress. That’s why they took extreme step. So it is necessary to create awareness among the youngster by encouraging them to read the newspapers, watch the news, or watch the video clips on social issues. It is also necessary to encourages younger professionals to participate in farming activity.

Gender

Generally male is head of household and he is point towards economic distress. Therefore, economic distress of family is heavily loaded by male. Consequently, large number of male farmers committed suicide.
Martial status

It is observed from study that mainly victims 97.50 per cent victims were married. They committed suicide due to the non-cordial marginal relations.

Education

It is observed from study that mainly illiterate persons committed suicide. Illiteracy and traditional education system is largely responsible for increasing economic distress. So it is necessary to educate this section of society so that they would be more aware of scientific knowledge.

Caste

It is reveled from study majority 52.50 per cent suicide cases were belonged to open category. Caste structure plays a significant role in determining the occupational structure of Maharashtra. Predominantly the Marathas are the agriculturist community. Marathas have higher land holding as compare to other caste. Therefore, if there is any crisis in the agriculture then society has to face subsequent apathy.

Family size

From the study it is found that 60.00 per cent suicides were concentrated in medium size family having 4 to 6 family members. In medium and large size of family, the income level of them is not sufficient so as to allow them to obtain basic commodities such as food and clothing, shelter, education and medical facilities for consumption on the one hand and to maintain cultivation expenditure on the other. So it is necessary create awareness among the people about family planning.

Family type

Suicide is always of the higher degree in the nuclear family. In present study 65.00 per cent victims were from nuclear type of families.

When a person is in trouble or under a strain, finds an outlet for his worries, in the form of suicide.

Farming experience

In present study the 57.50 per cent victims’ had medium farming experience between 11 to 33 years.

It is observed from the study that farmer had more or less farming experience. Secondly it was also noticed that as the farming experience increased, the suicides rates were declined.

Land holding

In present study it is found that the large number of selected suicide victim farmers 47.50 per cent was reported small and marginal farmers. Small and marginal farmers were unable to meet the basic needs income generated from farm business. So Small and marginal farmer should be encouraged to pool their farmland to leverage the advantages associated with bigger land holding, such as use of modern and mechanized farming techniques.

Subsidiary occupation

It is observed from study that 60.00 per cent victims were engaged in farm labour. Whereas 12.50 per cent victims were have only farming as their main occupation and they did not have a any back up system, mostly they were medium (4.01-10.00 ha.) land holders. Lack of subsidiary occupation has created the excess burden on agriculture. So it is necessary to provide training for secondary rural investments in dairy farming, animal husbandry, poultry farming, sericulture and other activities.

Annual income

In present study it is observed that the majority of the victims 55.00 per cent had annual income between Rs. 31589 to 74747 because Marathwada region of the state are far away
from industrial development that’s why they could not get opportunity of employment. So it is necessary to discourage the financially wasteful expenditure arising from the unnecessary and harmful social practices like addiction of alcohol, dowry and large wedding spending. It is also necessary to encourage the people for saving.

**Socio-economics status**

Most of the deceased farmers 75.00 per cent were categorized in medium level of socio-economic status due to the mass poverty and illiteracy.

**Type of land**

In present study 50.00 per cent victims were having light soil type of land. This is major reason of less productivity and production of crops in Nanded district. So it is necessary to provide scientific knowledge for adopting practices to improving soil fertility.

**Irrigation facilities**

In present study it is found that 87.50 per cent victims do not have any source to access the irrigation. They solely depend on monsoon rains. It is also noticed that most of the wells were either dry or not have sufficient water for irrigation. Due to lack of irrigation their cropping intensity and frequency of crop failure among rainfed farmers have been more. So harvesting of rainwater must be necessary.

**Agricultural infrastructure**

Seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and technology are major inputs of farm business. Nearly 42.50 per cent deceased farmers were found to have medium input infrastructure. In case transport facilities it was observed that 50 per cent households had low availability of transport facilities. Most of the high value crops are perishable and damaged during the travelling. So government should be provide sound infrastructure facilities for agriculture.

**Productivity**

It is observed from present study that the productivity almost in all crops was very low hence here lower production and productivity on the farms of the victims has been proved as one of the cause of farmers’ suicides in Marathwada region.

**Cropping pattern**

It was concluded that the over 57.50 per cent area were cultivated by only rainfed cotton and soyabean crops in kharif season, by selected deceased farmers. While very negligible area was under rabi and horticultural crops it might be due to lack of irrigation facilities.

**Indebtedness**

Out of 40 victims 85.00 per cent victims were found indebted. Thus it is clear that the victims had utilized both institutional and non-institutional credit sources for fulfilling their credit need.

Non-institutional sources like moneylenders, friends and relatives have to return it at the promised date. When farmers were not able to repay the money borrowed from friends and relatives or money lenders on time, it created tension and family problems as the creditors are very familiar and seen every day. Thus, important suggestion for preventing suicides were complete waiving of old loans and provide new loan with low interest.

**Livelihood pattern**

In present study it is found that the 95.00 per cent victims and his family had got the average total income from only agriculture. Thus it could be concluded that among the present livelihood sources it is found that only agriculture is the major livelihood source of overall deceased farmers. So it is necessary to provide irrigation facility and subsidiary occupation and sound infrastructure facility for agriculture.
Extent of family responsibility fulfilled

It is observed from the study the large number of farmers unable to fulfill the family responsibility due to the lack of farm income. So it is necessary motivate the farmers towards mass marriage system.

Victim’s habits

It is found that the nearly 60.00 per cent deceased farmers were possessed either one or more bad habits with them, like chewing of tobacco, smoking, alcohol addiction or gambling. An addiction of alcohol creates dispute among family member, increases unproductive expenses, create health issues on one hand, and absence of productive work on the other hand. It leads to economic distress. It is concluded the mass awareness among farmers about bad habits consequences should be promoted.

Victim’s health

It is found that the nearly 80.00 per cent victims was free from health problems remaining 20.00 per cent victims had health problem.

Family health

Out of total sample 57.50 per cent victims family health was not the problem. While 42.50 per cent deceased farmers, ill health of his family members has been observed.

Family disputes

Out of total sample 92.50 per cent victims were free from any domestic disputes/ quarrel with their family members. While 7.50 per cent victims disputes/ quarrel was noticed with their family members due to domestic reasons. An addiction of alcohol creates dispute among family member, increases unproductive expenses, create health issues on one hand, and absence of productive work on the other hand. It leads to economic distress.
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