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ABSTRACT

Out of 20.82 million total population of Sri Lanka, 81.70% of the population lives in rural areas (Quandl, 2015). From 2005 to 2016 government expenditure for agriculture based actions shows the trend of decreasing while the development policy gradually changes the path from agricultural based economy to an industrial based economy over last few decades. However, poverty head count measures in 2006/2007 of Sri Lanka indicate that the percentage of people living in poverty in the rural sector is significant and the percentage of underweight children in rural areas is 38.3%, which is considerably higher than that of urban areas (29.9%). Thus, this status brought about the primary research question of how does the country achieve livelihood security. Thus, the objectives of this research are, to examine the factors affecting livelihood security and to understand the view of rural communities’ population dynamics on livelihood security. The research was carried out in mixed research design. The results show that access to livelihood resources also was not affected by gender, age, education and household income. However, in the analysis, both males and females were dissatisfied with the access to livelihood resources. Thus, in forming and implementation of development policies Sri Lanka needs to ensure community livelihood security.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In the 2014 mission of “Our dream is a World free of Poverty”, the World Bank focuses on eradicating extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity around the globe (World Bank 2014). The World Bank's Millennium Development Goals are to cut the extreme poverty rate by
half in 2015: however, one billion people are still living in extreme poverty (World Bank 2014). They live on less than $1.25 income a day (World Bank 2014). The gap between rich and poor widens the distance between those who can and cannot access opportunities. Gini index which measures the extent to which the distribution of income or consumption of individuals or households deviate from a perfectly equal distribution and illustrates that compared to western countries South Asian countries lie far behind the equal income distribution (Quandl, 2015). Hence access to good education, healthcare, electricity, safe water and other critical services which have an impact on life remain mainly restricted to rich economies. In addition, the impact of global issues such as economic crisis, food insecurity, climatic change and natural disasters also create a struggling situation to vulnerable populations to get consistent access (or any access) to basic critical services.

1.2 Problem statement

King & Murray (2002) have proposed that human security can be defined as the longevity of future life that spend below the threshold of any key domain of human well-being. Moreover, UNDP human development report (1990) has emphasized that the main focus of development is the people of the state and people focused development can be done through improving health, education, and political freedom in addition to economic well-being. Hence, low accessibility to basic human needs of citizens resulted in them becoming marginalized by low access to health facilities, low opportunity to access livelihood resources and high vulnerability to diseases. Sing & Hiremath (2010) posit that sustainable livelihood can be achieved through wealth, food and cash which is utilized to physical and social wellbeing and has ensured the security of becoming poorer. However, unevenly distributed resources that matter the lives of poor has ill-managed over the time (Sing & Hiremath, 2010). With the above information it can be noted that not only poverty but also environmental degradation, drinking water contamination, health risks and war have had a severe effect on the rural villages which is evidently found in Sri Lanka as well. Lindenberg, (2002) (as cited in Bhandari & Grant, 2007) stated that at the family and community level the status of the life of people is addressed by livelihood security. De Sherbinin et al. (2008) further stated that research on population dynamics in household level and the relationships of the phenomena that take place the major
concerns in rural developing world. Further the author emphasizes that micro-demographics of the rural communities are vital in utilizing natural resources, providing foods and other resources and formulating policies on health, livelihood or environment. Thus the research problem raised as how does population dynamics of rural communities affect livelihood security in Sri Lanka?

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of this research are:

- to identify the community specific demographic dynamics that affect the livelihood security of rural communities;
- to understand the community perception on livelihood security.

2 Literature review

2.1 Livelihood security

Chambers & Conway (1992) livelihood security is defined as the individuals' capability, assets or activities required for living. Common understanding livelihood security indicators consist income and consumption level, sense of insecurity or vulnerability, levels of health, literacy and education and access to assets (Chambers 1997).

The notion of development of human security is focusing on downside risks (UN Commission on Human Security 2003). However, the downside risk (e.g., economic growth) does not guarantee human security. For instance, in developed European countries like Greece, people's lives were threatened with economic crisis in 2011. Similarly, the downturn of the world economy also heavily affected East Asian and South East Asian countries like South Korea and Thailand. However, on the other hand human security is concerned with weightier life issues life such as daily survival, maintaining the dignity of men and women and empowerment of people to cope with sudden deprivation.

The people to enjoy freedom in the society, it is not only the GDP or individual income, but also social and economic arrangement; education, health as well as political and civil rights which are equally important. Sen (1999: 27) noted that the trend of economic disciplines are moving away from the values of freedoms which in return undermine the role of market mechanism. However, Shani (2012) argues that the
concept of development is still under the shadow of economics when it focuses on market orientation. In Duffield critique as mentioned by Ramsbotham and Woodhouse (2000), Duffield argues that issues of development such as inequality, economic growth, and resource distribution have a negative effect on the paradigm of “human development”. He further states that human development largely involves securing behavioural and attitudinal changes where people can cope with their situations.

Furthermore, Chandler (2012) argues that the communities, who are in the verge of vulnerability, have no capacities for resilience. Hence vulnerabilities lead to “un freedom” or “material and ideological restrictions”. Thus, Chandler (2012) finally states that paradigm of resilience stemmed with the assistance for most in need through empowerment and capacity building. In accordance with UNDP report (1994: 24), Chandler cited that to make their own living, every individual should have the chance to get most essential needs. Thus the access to livelihood, health, education and other basic requirements fulfilment ensure the community well-being. To prosper in livelihood activities such as farming, fishing or off-farm employment households mobilize the assets at their disposal.

2.2 Livelihood approach and population dynamics as Constructing Conceptual Framework

The paper uses livelihood approach which focuses on demographics and access to livelihood resources. Household becomes a production unit in most of the rural areas of developing region (Sherbinin et al. 2008). Thus Ellis (2000) posits that household is important as it is the place where social and economic interdependencies happen between group of individuals. As Sherbinin et al. (2008) point out that demographics such as age and gender have the effect on household decision to engage in livelihood strategies. Moreover, the financial capital also has the impact on assets accumulation for livelihood strategies.

Conceptual framework

| Demographic Factors       | Livelihood Security |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Gender                    | Accessibility       |
| Age                       |                      |
| Educational Attainment    |                      |
2.3 Hypotheses

H0 There is no relationship between gender and access to livelihood resources
H1 There is a relationship between gender and access to livelihood resources
H0 There is no relationship between age and access to livelihood resources
H2 There is a relationship between age and access to livelihood resources
H0 There is no relationship between educational attainment and access to livelihood resources
H3 There is a relationship between educational attainment and access to livelihood resources
H0 There is no relationship between household income and access to livelihood resources
H4 There is a relationship between household income and access to livelihood resources

3 Methodology

3.1 Research context

The North- Central province of Sri Lanka plays a vital role in the economy of Sri Lanka by producing large portion of rice for the food consumption. And interestingly, according to a household income and expenditure survey from 2009 through 2010, the Poverty Head Count Ratio of the North- Central province has decreased tremendously from 14.2% (2006) to 5.7% (2009) with respect to other provinces such as Sabaragamuwa (2009 PHCR of 10.6%), North- Western (2009 PHCR of 11.3), Uva (13.7%) and Eastern (2009 PHCR of 14.8%) (Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka, 2011). However, the area continues to struggle with poverty.

Another problematic issue for North- Central province is Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) which is a serious health issue for citizens in the North- Central province. According to Siriwardhana et al (2014) North- Central province which belongs to dry and intermediate climatic zones of Sri Lanka, has the highest prevalence of CKD in Sri Lanka. The majority of CKD affected people belong to the low- socio-economic farming.
Chandrajith et al (2010) also point out Madawachchiya in Anuradhapura district is highly affected by CKD. In addition, by also sharing a border with the North Province (which experienced thirty years of war), the normal life pattern of inhabitants in Madawachchiya, has been highly affected by insecurity and underdevelopment. For instance, villages such as Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka in the Madawachchiya region were subjected to terrorist attacks, spilling over from fighting in the North province in 1987 and 1991 respectively.

3.2 Location of the Research

The research was conducted in two villages i.e. Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka in Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat, Anuradhapura District in Sri Lanka.

Among hundred and four villages of Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat, the research was carried out in two villages i.e. Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka which were subjected to annual drought conditions, stricken with poverty, affected by CKD.

3.3 Population and sample

The total population of the research is 968 (280 households) of both Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka. Out of 280 households 79 households (158 individuals) were randomly selected for the research. Moreover, the research sample composed of 39 households (male-39; female-39) from Mahakongaskada and 40 households (male-40; female-40) from Thammenna Elawaka.

The sample representation of Thammenna Elawaka (50.63 %) is higher than Mahakongaskada (49.37 %). This is obvious that because the total population of Thammenna Elawaka (506) is larger than Mahakongaskada (462) (Resource Profile of Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat, 2013). After 42 villagers were killed (when the villagers were sleeping) by terrorists in 1987, the attacked land area was abandoned by the remaining family members and some of the families of the village. After the attack most of the families displaced themselves to other areas and most of them never come back again. According to Informant 1, the area is still uninhabited. However, the incidence of Thammenna Elawaka is same as Mahakongaskada. In Thammenna Elawaka the attack was also nocturnal. It was happened in 1991 and killed 25 villagers who were attending traditional function of one farmhouse of the village. Even
though, infrastructure damage was great in Thammenna Elawaka (i.e. nearly 45 houses were set to fire and 45 families were displaced at that time), the villagers did not abandon the village (Informant 1 and Informant 4).

3.4 Research method

The research was carried out in descriptive and quantitative research design. Quantitative research design was carried out using surveys and questionnaires. The surveys and Questionnaires in Sinhala Language in primarily, to better understand by the household participants on their own. In addition, to have in-depth understanding of the situation descriptive research design was carried out.

Secondary data were collected through website of Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat. The secondary resource materials were in Sinhala language. In addition to Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat resource profile which also in Sinhala language, was also used. Village headmen, grass-root level government officers and middle managers were considered as key informants. The Focal group discussion was carried out with the key informants.

Individual interviews with household headman/ head-woman or both, were carried out by assigned grass-root level government officer. Moreover, the key informants (government officers) carried out interview with household participants were in Sinhala language and recorded the conversations in Sinhala Language too. And key informants' interviews also carried out in Sinhala language.

All the materials of primary and secondary resources and data translated to English later on.

3.5 Data Analysis

The Chi- square Cramer’s V was used to analyze the intercorrelation of two discrete variables.

4 Analysis and discussion

4.1 Demographic factor analysis

The Result is analyzed according to Gender, Age, Educational attributes and Monthly income.
4.1.1 Gender

According to the Resource Profile of Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat (2013), Table 4.1 shows the gender distribution of total population of two villages.

Table 4.1 Gender distribution of Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka

| Village           | No of Families | Females | Males | Total Population |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|-------|------------------|
| Mahakongaskada    | 116            | 238     | 224   | 462              |
| Thammenna Elawaka | 164            | 269     | 237   | 506              |

Source: Madawachchiya Divisional Secretariat (2013)

Similarly, the study sample consists of 48.7% male population and 51.3% female population. In both Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka, female population is higher than male population, i.e. 52.05% of female and 50.63% of female respectively. Even though the gap between female and male population is not that high (Which is more or less similar as total Sri Lankan population), the difference may be due to women headed families in the area not only because of the war but also other factors such as non-commutable diseases and lack of safe portable water. The finding is reasserted by Chandrajith et al. (2010) by stating that Chronic Kidney Disease which is prominent in Anuradhapura District has main influence on male farmers of low socio-economic class. Thus, this is clearly compatible with the non-traditional theory and narrow approach of human security which focus on individual human security.

4.1.2 Age

According to the study the majority of individuals (79.5%) were in between the age of 31 years and 60 years. However, the study sample was varied between 22 years and 78 years of age.

The majority of sample population consists of about 32.35% of male population and 33.78% of female population who are in between age group of 31-40 years (Figure 4.1). However, the community members who are over 60 years and below 30 years occupy the least percentages when compare to other age groups. As the study was carried out with the household husband and wife, population of age 21-30 is low, as the marriage age for both females and males in Sri Lanka is age 18.
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Figure 4.1 Gender Distribution within age groups of sample community

Source: Field Data

Majority of both males and females of Mahakongaskada is in the age group of 31-40 years such as male percentage is 25% and female percentage is 17.57% (Figure 4.2). As Mahokongaskada is occupied by new families, make the village population is occupied by young males and females. Nevertheless, majority male and female population in Thammenna Elawaka shows interesting age distribution, where, 17.65% of males are in the age group of 41-50 years while 16.22% of females are in the age group of 31-40 years. This may be due to the reoccupying of Thammenna Elawaka by the families after terrorist attack in 1990s.
4.1.3 Educational Attainment

Compulsory education of Sri Lanka is up to age 14 (Grade 10). Almost all members in the sample were able to attend the school in their childhood. However, only 4% of the sample was able to attain till Advanced Level (till age 17) and no one was able to get the higher education. Interestingly, 41.33% community members were able to get through the Ordinary Level Examination (education till age 15). However, more than fifty percent (54.7%) of the community were only able to get education up to grade 5 and up to grade 10 (25.33% and 29.33% respectively). The total literacy rate of Sri Lanka is 91.9% (according to the Department of Census and Statistics, 2011, age 15 and over can read and write). Comparing to the national level the literacy rate is much lower in the two villages which may be due to low accessibility to the schools and adult’s attitude of schooling children. Informant 1 mentions that Mahakongaskada has a school up to grade 5 and Thammenna Elawaka has a school up to grade 10. Moreover, Informant 2 states that parents
have negative attitude of sending children to the school as the children are main labor force of the family's livelihood.

The highest percentage of male sample population has attended the school education up to ordinary level (44.44%) while, 38.46%, the highest percentage of females has attended up to ordinary level as well as up to grade 6-10 (Figure 4.3). And among the community members who got through advanced level, the female percentage (5.128%) is higher than male percentage (2.778%). In the national level, the male literacy rate is 93.2% and female literacy rate 90.8%. As mentioned above low rate of educational attainment of both genders can be due to low accessibility to the educational facilities and attitudes. In older generations if there is no safe accessibility facility to the school parents avoid the risk of sending especially girls too far from home. Moreover, girls tend to take care of young siblings of the family when parents away for farming. In addition, large drop out of males during early stage of education can be largely due to engage and assist in livelihood activities of the parents. Anyway females who tend to get higher education up to age 17 can be largely due to their commitments.

**Figure 4.3** Gender Distribution of Educational Attainment of Sample Community

*Source: Field Data*
In Mahakongaskada, the largest percentages of both males and females have got through ordinary level; 30.56% and 26.92% respectively (Figure 4.4). It is interesting that even though Mahakongaskada has a school up to grade 5 and the school with other higher grades is 7 km away from the village, both male and female tend to have at least compulsory education. This may be due to that Mahakongaskada population consists of younger generation who value the education when compared to Thammenna Elawaka population. However, in Thammenna Elawaka, largest population of males has had the education up to grade 1 to 5 and 23.08% of female population has studied up to grade 6 to 10. Surprisingly, none of the men in Thammenna Elawaka has got through advanced level.

**Figure 4.4** Gender Distribution of Educational Attainment of Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka

*Source: Field Data*
4.1.4 Household Income

In 2014 household monthly income of Sri Lanka is around 4875 SLR (Official PL is 1.25 US$; 1 US$ = Approximately 130 SLR in 2014; 130 * 1.25 * 30 = LKR 4875)

One quarter of the population (26.6%) in study community lives with LKR 3000 per month. And 22.8% of the population monthly earns at least LKR 18 000. Nearly, 29.1% of the population has monthly income of LKR 18 000- 20 000.

Interestingly, exactly about 50% of Thammenna Elawaka population has the income of more than 18000 SLR/ month and less than LKR 20000 / month (Figure 4.5). The monthly household income which is less than LKR 3000 and less than LKR15000 comprise of equal percentage of households of Thammenna Elawaka (20%). In Mahakongaskada majority of households (35.9 %) earn more than LKR 21000 monthly. And more or less similar numbers of households (33.33%) live on less than LKR 3000 / month too, which denotes more than 60% of the population is in two extremes i.e. higher and lower income, compared to Thammenna Elawaka where only a few households (7.692%) earn in between LKR 18000 and LKR 20000. However, this income in Thammenna Elawaka is constant as they engage in government related employments.

**Figure 4.5** Household Income Distributions of Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka

![Household Income Distributions](image)

*Source: Field Data*
Furthermore, within case and cross case analysis of income distribution of households reveals that the majority of households in Thammenna Elawaka engage in government connected employment (Table 4.2). And some households have two income generating activities too (Cases 5 and 6). Surprisingly, almost all those households of Thammenna Elawaka do not have intention to mention their income sources which are from agriculture (Farming own land or rented land with paddy and vegetables) or animal husbandry (raising cattle or goats), though they earn some income from them (except Case 6). For these livelihood activities both husband and wife have engaged in income generation. And old aged people who are with grown up children or with a single son or a daughter, the children take care of the parents. In case 7, thirty-three years old son takes care of the parents and once the income was asked, the head of the household mentioned about the son's income as their income.

| Table 4.2 Income Generating Activities of Households in Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Income Source                                              | Mahakongaskada | Thammenna Elawaka |
| Non-pensionable or casual government employment               | 4, 5           | 6, 7, 8, 9, 10   |
| Self-employment- Agriculture based                            | 1, 3, 5        |                  |
| Agriculture and other sources                                 | 2              | 6                |

Source: Field data

4.2 Access to livelihood resources analysis

Only 1.3% of the community members satisfied with opportunities to access to resources for their livelihood. And 20% of the population did not satisfy with their opportunities to access for resources. However, majority (43.3%) of the population has positively responded for accessing resources for livelihood. Access to livelihood resources is one of strategies to get rid from poverty which is one of narrow approach discourse of human security. Thus dissatisfaction of rural community in livelihood aspects means the deprivation of resource accessibility of rural people for their livelihood. On the contrary, Razaak (2007) has mentioned that livelihood aspect of human security in Sri Lanka is relatively better when
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compared with other South Asian countries. According to Informants 1 and 5, the dissatisfaction of people in accessing to livelihood resources, is mainly due to dependency syndrome.

Moreover, according to King and Murray (2002, p. 587) “development was defined broadly as expanding people's choices in almost every relevant way.” And the argument is further enhanced by Sen (1999), by stating the development in the terms of expanding individual's freedom.

Interestingly majority of Thammenna Elawaka population has positively satisfied with access to resources (61.04% or more) (Figure 4.6). And 39.73% of Mahakongaskada population did not satisfy at all for the chances to access the resources. The reason behind the satisfaction of Thammenna Elawaka people may be due to their engagement in government related employments which provide them with constant income. However, as the land extent of Mahakongaskada is smaller than to Thammenna Elawaka also can create dissatisfaction, by possessing limited extent of land for their main livelihood (Informant 1). And Mahakongaskada people engage in agriculture have the threat from drought conditions as the narrow approach of human security mentioned. Thus, uncertainty of livelihood due to natural calamities creates threat to human security in rural communities.

**Figure 4.6 Resource Accessibility of Mahakongaskada and Thammenna Elawaka**

Source: Field Data
In Thammenna Elawaka both males and females have positive view of satisfaction to access resources for the livelihood, 33.33% and 29.5% respectively (Figure 4.7). And 1.28% of females in Thammenna Elawaka satisfied with the access to livelihood resources and same percent of female in Thammenna Elawaka, dissatisfied with opportunities to access the resources. And a phenomenon is similar with male counterparts of Thammenna Elawaka. Zero percent of male either satisfied or dissatisfied with accessibility to livelihood resources. However, in Mahakongaskada only 1.4% of male members satisfied with the opportunities to access the resources. Both females and males in Thammenna Elawaka as a household receive uniform income throughout the year from government service, disregard of environmental conditions (non-traditional theory of human security). The certainty of income ensures human security of livelihood of both males and females.

**Figure 4.7** Gender Distribution of Resources Accessibility of Thammenna Elawaka and Mahakongaskada

Source: Field Data
4.3.3 Relationships of Access to Livelihood Resources

4.3.3.1 Gender and Access to Livelihood Resources

The 1st hypothesis is that there is a relationship between gender and access to livelihood resources.

Table 4.3 shows the result of a cross tabulation analysis between gender and access to livelihood resources in rural communities. According to Table 4.3, gender did not significantly affect opinion on government response to rural issues. The $\chi^2$ value is 0.352, which is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The value of Cramer’s V is 0.048 (also not significant at 0.05 level), which indicates there is no relationship between gender and access to livelihood resources. Table 4.3 shows both males and females dissatisfied with the access to livelihood resources (54.2% and 59% respectively) even though, through government policies the government showed gradual investment on livelihood activities. However, Shah & Shah (1995) put forward that in patriotic society male and female response in livelihood investment is different. Even though, females were reluctant to response in front of males, when the females were separated they took quick and positive response to the investment. However, Sri Lanka also a male centered society, both males and females’ perception are same and negative, due to the dependency syndrome.

| Resources Accessibility | Gender | Total (N) |
|-------------------------|--------|-----------|
|                         | Male   | Female    |           |
| Not Satisfied           | 54.2%  | 59.0%     | 56.7% (85)|
| Satisfied               | 45.8%  | 41.0%     | 43.3% (65)|
| Total                   | 100.0% | 100.0%    | 100.0%    |
| N                       | 72.0   | 78.0      | 150.0     |

$\chi^2$: 0.352 (Observed significance level is 0.553)

Cramer’s V: 0.048 (Observed significance level is 0.553)

Source: The Author (2015)
4.3.3.2 Age and Access to livelihood resources

There is a relationship between age and access to livelihood resources is the 2nd hypothesis of the research.

Table 4.4 shows the result of a cross tabulation analysis between age and access to livelihood resources. Age did not significantly affect access to livelihood resources. The χ² value is 0.983, which is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The value of Cramer’s V is 0.083 (also not significant at 0.05 level), which indicates there is no relationship between age and access to livelihood resources. Lee (2003) has pointed out that maximum level of human security can be achieved by providing equal opportunity to self-fulfillment. Thus, without any age limit anyone can access to the livelihood opportunities in Sri Lankan context.

Table 4.4 Age and Resources Accessibility

| Resources Accessibility | Age Group (Years) | Total (N) |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
|                         | 21-40             | 41-60     | 61-80     | 80          |
| Not Satisfied           | 51.7%             | 59.1%     | 62.5%     | 56.3%       |
| Satisfied               | 48.3%             | 40.9%     | 37.5%     | 43.7%       |
| Total                   | 100.0%            | 100.0%    | 100.0%    | 100.0%      |

N 60.0 66.0 16.0 142.0

χ²: 0.983 (Observed significance level is 0.612)
Cramer's V: 0.083 (Observed significance level is 0.612)

Source: The Author (2015)

4.3.3.3 Educational attainment and access to livelihood resources

The 3rd hypothesis is there is a relationship between educational attainment and access to livelihood resources.

Table 4.5 shows the result of a cross tabulation analysis between educational attainment and access to livelihood resources. According to Table 4.5, educational attainment did not significantly affect access to livelihood resources. The χ² value is 0.044, which is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The value of Cramer’s V is 0.017 (also not significant at 0.05 level), which indicates there is no relationship between educational attainment and access to livelihood resources. And result ensures the non-traditional approach to human security. Informant 4
mentioned, “Although people are educated and do well by their own, they are still expecting the assistance from the government.”

**Table 4.5 Educational Attainment and Resources Accessibility**

| Resources Accessibility | Educational Attainment | Total (N) |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
|                          | Less than Grade 5      | Grade 6-10| Higher than Ordinary Level |
| Not Satisfied            | 55.3%                  | 56.8%     | 57.4%                     | 56.7% (85) |
| Satisfied                | 44.7%                  | 43.2%     | 42.6%                     | 43.3% (65) |
| Total                    | 100.0%                 | 100.0%    | 100.0%                    | 100.0%     |
| N                        | 38.0                   | 44.0      | 68.0                      | 150.0      |

χ²: 0.044 (Observed significance level is 0.978)
Cramer’s V: 0.017 (Observed significance level is 0.978)

*Source: The Author (2015)*

Moreover, in Case 1 who got government assistance for livelihood of LKR 615, both husband and wife had studied up to Ordinary level. And in Case 3 who studied up to only grade 7 also gets double government assistance of LKR 750 and LKR 240.

### 4.3.3.4 Household monthly income and access to livelihood resources

The 4th hypothesis is there is a relationship between household income and access to livelihood resources.

Table 4.6 shows the result of a cross tabulation analysis between household monthly income and access to livelihood resources. According to Table 4.6, household monthly income did not significantly affect access to livelihood resources in rural context. The χ² value is 3.512, which is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The value of Cramer’s V is 0.153 (also not significant at 0.05 level), which indicates there is no relationship between household monthly income and access to livelihood resources. This was further confirmed by Informant 1 and Informant 4. The 1st Informant stated, “People are waiting for the actions of government, even though, they have the ability to well off. For instance, the people are waiting for distributing the fertilizer by the government and taking their harvest by the government, without cultivating the land productively. Moreover, people tend to buy goods
unnecessarily which show off their wealth and which do not assist in well-being of their lives.” And 4th Informant also mentioned that even though people are leading prosperous life, still they are expecting assistance from the government. And he further mentioned that there are some exceptions too. For instance, as she mentioned, some households return the government assistance coupon, when they success in their self-employment. Quandl (2015) also indicates that according to Gini Coefficient, Sri Lanka has risen the equality in income over past few years (2006- 40.3 and 2009- 36.4). However, Nagy (2013b) has also pointed out that financial crisis is also one of non- traditional security threat to human well- being. De Sherbinin et al. (2008) point out that accumulated finance and investment generate the economic opportunities and overcome the constraints. Thus, good income unbalancing and not maintaining expenditure will cause the threat to livelihood security.

Table 4.6 Household Monthly Income and Resources Accessibility

| Resources Accessibility | Household Monthly Income (SLR) | Total (N) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|
|                        | 0- 3000                        | 3500-15000| 18000-20000 | 21000-41500 | |
| Not Satisfied          | 62.9%                          | 63.6%     | 45.7%       | 58.3%       | 56.7% (85) |
| Satisfied              | 37.1%                          | 36.4%     | 54.3%       | 41.7%       | 43.3% (65) |
| Total                   | 100.0%                         | 100.0%    | 100.0%      | 100.0%      | 100.0%     |
| N                       | 35.0                           | 33.0      | 46.0        | 36.0        | 150.0      |

\( \chi^2: 3.512 \) (Observed significance level is 0.319)

Cramer’s V: 0.153 (Observed significance level is 0.319)

Source: The Author (2015)

5. Conclusion

In rural communities, gender, age, education or income of the household do not have an effect on ensuring livelihood security. The research infers that the population demographics do not have the role to play in seizing access to livelihood opportunities and resources except community attitudes.
According to the research, income source variation of two communities reveals that the necessity of assistance of government for economic security for the villages is also different. Nevertheless, majority of household diversify their income to achieve livelihood security, but they still dissatisfy with economic security. Thus, local policy of villages will be more effective in ensuring livelihood security for locally originated threats. Furthermore, income disparities of household can generate life threat to the community. The income inequality is not only because low income earning of the households but because low income management of the households. However, income difference charges livelihood security threats to individuals which leads to human insecurity in broader aspect.

Moreover, in spite of resources and facilities available in the region, exogenous factors such as lack of primary infrastructure facilities such as access roads and mode of transportation trigger the livelihood insecurity of individuals in rural communities. Thus addressing basic common needs of the community can achieve at least minimum level of livelihood security.
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