


**Indian Research Journal of
Extension Education**

ISSN: 0972-2181 (Print), 0976-1071 (e-Print)

NAAS Rating : 5.22

Journal homepage: sea.org.in



RESEARCH ARTICLE https://doi.org/10.54986/irjee/2022/apr_jun/115-122

Attitude of Farmers Towards Farmer Distress - Development and Standardization of Attitude Scale for Farmers

T.V. Kumar¹, V. Sudha Rani² and Suraji Yugender Reddy³

1&2. Res. Scholar, Agril. Ext., 2. Director of Extension, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Corresponding author e-mail : yuvarajbunny6@gmail.com

Received on April 10, 2022, Accepted on June 12, 2022 and Published Online on June 20, 2022

ABSTRACT

The issue of farmer's distress is a vexed one. Distress is the result of a complex interplay of a myriad issues and risks. Because it will not be prudent to address the issue in isolation of the causative factors. Farmer's distress is not due to indebtedness alone. There are several other factors such as farming related, psychological, sociological, situational, government related, Economic and Extension related factors that contribute significantly to this. Due to the non-availability of a proper scale to measure farmer's attitude towards farmer distress, it was thought necessary to construct a scale for the purpose. Keeping this in view, an attempt has been made to develop and standardization a scale for measuring the attitude of farmer towards farmer distress. Method of summated raring scale, by Likert (1932) was used. A total of 60 respondents were selected by random sampling method. Twenty-nine statements were selected from 62 statements for which 't' values were worked out, whose values were highest i.e., t- values more than 1.75 were selected for final scale. Farmers coming under highly favourable group under sustained distress sub head indicate that farmer is more distress and he is feeling helpless that may lead to depression and fatal consequences. Farmers who come under high attitude category of distress coping indicate that farmer has greater tendency to cope from the difficulty situation and farmers willingness to try and develop coping mechanism.

Key words: Farmers distress; Attitude scale; Method of summated raring scale; t-values; Scale standardization.

Recent happenings in the agricultural sector clearly indicate the manifestation of distress in the form of farmers' suicides. However, it is important to recognize the fact that this is the ultimate unfortunate step that a farmer takes. The household possibly goes through extreme stress before the event gets triggered. However, there might be several households where the suicide might not have happened, but still, they might be in a precarious position.

The phenomenon of farmer's suicide is one of the most tragic events in the history of India. India is an agrarian country with about 48.90 percent of its people directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture. In Telangana, about 55.49 percent of the population is dependent on Agriculture farming related activities for the livelihood. Nowadays the problem of farmers' suicides is one of the vital concerns that need to be addressed by the government. According to data of

National Crime Records Bureau's (NCRB), 2014 Telangana was ranked second among the states in suicides rate in the country. Analysis of the regional disparities indicates that the large majority of farmer suicides occur in a geographically contiguous region consists of the Group I state (Maharashtra, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Madhya Pradesh). Combined, these have significantly higher suicide rates of 28.7/100,000 farmers, accounting for 30 percent of India's farming population but over 60 percent of its farmer suicides (Nagaraj, 2014).

Farmers in distress might have become dacoits or rebels, but never did we hear that they committed suicides. Rao *et al.* (2007) stated that for the first time in the known history of India, farmers are taking recourse to suicide as a way out of agrarian distress. If farm ecology and economics go wrong nothing else will go right. This is the principal message of the agrarian

crisis. The high dependence on external inputs, the high cost of inputs on one hand and diminishing returns due to crop loss and low prices on the other have caused havoc in the peasant economy.

Distress in the farm sector is increasing at an alarming rate. Sainath reported that Vidarbha gained little from the 2008 Farm Loan Waiver which addressed only bank debt. The waiver excluded those farmers holding more than five acres, and made no distinction between dry and irrigated holdings. Ground experience shows that price, policy, politics and marketing are affecting farmer's livelihood directly or indirectly. Farmers expressed their views as "everything is going up except their income".

There were surveys and studies on consequences and causative external factors, an effort to study the psychological/mental status of farmers is essential. For this it is necessary to know the attitude of farmers towards distress. With this backdrop an attempt is made to develop and standardize a scale to measure the attitude of farmers towards farmer distress. This scale would facilitate the future extension research to focus on blending extension strategies and counseling for farmer's wellbeing.

METHODOLOGY

To measure the attitude of farmers towards farmers distress a scale has been developed using the following procedure. Method of summated rating scale, by *Likert (1932)* was used to construct the attitude scale of farmers towards farmer distress.

The steps used in construction of attitude scale are as follows:

Sampling procedure : A total of 120 respondents were selected by random sampling method. Respondents were resident farmers of Mahbubnagar district. We have selected four villages; from each village 30 farmers were selected randomly. Reason for selecting this sampling area is that according to the secondary data majority of farmer suicides and farmer's distress is noticed in this district.

Collection and editing of items: A set of 102 statements representing the attitude of farmers towards farmer distress were collected initially from various sources viz., literature and interaction with experts and then edited on the basis of criteria suggested by *Edwards (1957)*. All the statements were collected and framed considering various causative factors namely Farming related, Psychological, Sociological, situational,

Government related. Further broadly all the statements were grouped under two sub heads one is attitude of farmers towards Sustained Distress (SD) and attitude of farmers towards Distress Coping (DC). Finally, sixty-two statements were selected after the editing. Set of edited statements are presented in table number 1. The statements representing the attitude of farmers towards farmer distress were administered to 60 respondents. The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement on five-point continuum ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The scoring pattern adopted was 5 weight to strongly agreed (SA) response, 4 to agreed (A) response, 3 to undecided (UD) response, 2 to disagreed (D) response and 1 to strongly disagreed (SD) response, if it was a favourable attitude statement and for unfavourable attitude statement the scoring pattern was reversed viz. Strongly agree response with 1 weight, agree with 2, undecided with 3, disagree with 4 and strongly disagree with 5 weights in that order.

Their response was recorded and the summated score for the total statements was obtained. For each individual the maximum possible score on 62 statements is 310 and the minimum possible score is 62. The scores of the respondents were arranged in descending order. 25 percent of the highest and 25 per cent of the lowest scorers were taken for the item analysis, meaning 15 respondents from the high group and 15 from the low group. These responses were subjected to item analysis for selection of the items that constitute the final attitude scale.

The critical ratio, i.e., t-value which is a measure of the extent to which a given statement differentiates between the high and low groups of respondents for each statement, was calculated by using the formula suggested by *Edwards (1957)*.

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{S^2_H}{n_H} + \frac{S^2_L}{n_L}}}$$

Where,

\bar{X}_H = the mean score on a given statement for the high group.

\bar{X}_L = the mean score on a given statement for the low group.

S^2_H = the variance of the distribution of the responses of the high group to the statement S^2_L = the variance of the distribution of the responses of the low group to the statement

n_H = the number of respondents in the high group.

n_L = the number of respondents in the low group.

As n_H was equal to n_L (15 each) the modified formula for calculating the t- values of the statements was used. The formula was:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum(X_H - \bar{X}_H)^2 - \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$(X_H - \text{Edwards}) = X_{H^2} - \frac{(X_H)^2}{n}$$

$$(X_L - \bar{X}_L) = X_{L^2} - \frac{(X_L)^2}{n}$$

After calculating the t- values for all the statements of the attitude scale, the values of the statements were arranged in descending order from the highest to the lowest and 29 statements were selected from attitude scale whose values were highest i.e., t- values more than 1.75, for both positive and negative statements. Final set of 29 statements is presented in table no 2 under various factors and sustained distress and distress coping. For example, here we calculated “t” value for statement 1.

High group: frequencies of responses for statement no1(SA-12, A-3, UD-0, D-0, SD-0)				
x	f	x ²	fx	fx ²
4	12	16	48	12×16=192
3	3	9	9	27
2	0	4	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	29	57	219

$$\bar{X}_H = \frac{57}{15} = 3.80$$

$$\Sigma(\bar{X}_H)^2 = 219 - \frac{(57)^2}{15} = 2.40$$

Low group: (SA-4, A-6, UD-4, D-1, SD-0)				
x	f	x ²	fx	fx ²
4	4	16	16	64
3	6	9	18	54
2	4	4	8	16
1	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	30	43	135

$$\bar{X}_L = \frac{43}{15} = 2.86$$

$$\Sigma(\bar{X}_L)^2 = 135 - \frac{(43)^2}{15} = 11.80$$

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_H - \bar{X}_L}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum(X_H - \bar{X}_H)^2 - \sum(X_L - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$t = \frac{3.80 - 2.86}{\sqrt{\frac{2.24 - 11.80}{15(15-1)}}} = 3.91$$

This statement is included in the final scale as it has “t” value (3.91) greater than 1.75

Reliability of attitude scale: According to Kerlinger (1943) “Reliability is the accuracy or precision of measuring instrument”. To know the reliability of the Test-retest method was used.

Test and retest method: The set of 29 statements which represent the attitude of respondents towards farmer’s distress was arranged with the five-point response continuum and was administered to fresh group of 50 respondents in different villages of Mahabubnagar district. After a period of 15 days the scale was again administered to the same respondents and thus a set of score was obtained. The correlation coefficient for both the sets were worked out which was 0.86 respectively indicating that the attitude scale was highly suitable for administration. As the scale was stable and dependable in its measurement Validity of attitude scale.

Validity of the scale:

Content validity: The validity of the test depends upon the fidelity with which it measures what is expected to measure. This method was used in the present scale to determine the “content validity” of the scale. As the scale value differences for almost all statements included had a very high discriminating value, it seemed reasonable to accept the scale as a valid measure of the attitude.

Administration of the scale: The scale thus met the reliability and validity test satisfactorily indicated its ability as an instrument for measuring attitude of farmers towards farmer’s distress. After administering the scale to the respondent farmers attitude score is obtained. Based on the minimum and maximum scores obtained farmers can be grouped or categorized into different categories.

Farmers coming under highly favourable group under sustained distress sub head indicate that farmer is more distress and he is feeling helpless that may lead to depression and fatal consequences. To address this

Table 1. Statements with calculated “t” values

Statements	High group (n=15)					Low group (n=15)					t - value
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD	
<i>Farming related factors:</i>											
<i>Sustained Distress (SD)</i>											
I feel consecutive failure of bore well digging had leads to farmer distress in my village.	12	3	0	0	0	4	6	4	1	0	3.91*
I am really concerned about my family with meager returns from farming.	4	9	1	1	0	5	6	3	1	0	0.20
Though I don't have farm related problems, I feel I am not happy with other aspects in my life.	12	1	1	1	0	5	5	3	1	1	2.10*
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>											
Crop diversification and Integrated farming systems (IFS) would to certain extent help the farmers to come out of distress during crisis situation.	4	8	3	0	0	2	8	3	2	0	1.21
In my view farmers should adopt/ follow coping techniques/ mechanism to manage distress when crop fails.	4	8	3	0	0	7	7	1	0	0	-1.54
I feel confident to overcome the distress by season wise meticulous planning.	6	6	2	1	0	0	7	6	2	0	2.66*
In my view farming is not gambling of monsoon and market but it can be profitable if followed as recommended by the extensionists/ scientists.	10	3	1	1	0	0	11	3	1	0	2.85*
I feel I cannot do anything to mitigate water crisis/monsoon failure during critical crop growth stages-hence I feel distressed.	5	7	2	1	0	3	5	5	1	1	1.47
<i>Psychological factors:</i>											
<i>Sustained Distress (SD)</i>											
I feel helpless as I am unable to meet the basic needs of the family.	8	3	3	0	1	0	4	6	5	0	4.09*
If option is given I want to leave farming as it is leading to lot of distress to me and my family.	2	1	1	11	0	0	0	7	6	2	0.81
As I don't have any option other than farming I feel helpless many a times.	6	6	3	0	0	1	4	6	3	1	3.45*
As I can explore other livelihood options than farming so I don't feel helpless.	0	4	6	3	2	0	6	2	3	4	0.31
I feel more hurt when my neighboring farmers get good yields while I fail.	6	3	1	3	2	0	7	5	2	1	0.73
As a defaulter of crop loan I keep thinking of it all the time how to repay - it hurts me or pains me a lot.	13	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	1	5.92*
Being a farmer I am always afraid of whether I can provide good education to my children or not.	7	5	3	0	0	0	11	2	2	0	2.53*
Even though I plan systematically I don't feel I can overcome the problems of farming and distress.	0	2	6	7	0	0	8	4	2	1	-2
I feel isolated when my family or friends keep questioning me about farming and income.	3	11	1	0	0	5	4	3	3	0	1.29
I am not confident to overcome the distress as I feel all doors are closed for me.	5	3	5	2	0	0	3	8	4	0	2.42*
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>											
I feel counseling for distressed farmers is the need of the hour of today.	7	5	3	0	0	4	7	4	0	0	0.92

Even myself being a member of farmers group, I isolate myself and do not like to interact during in times of distress.	3	7	4	1	0	1	6	8	0	0	1.03
Though people say farming is not profitable, but by planning systematically I feel I can come over the problems.	2	7	4	2	0	12	3	0	0	0	5.00*
<i>Sociological factors:</i>											
<i>Sustained Distress (SD)</i>											
If a person takes birth as a farmer he must be prepared to become victim of distress.	1	8	2	1	3	2	3	7	2	1	0
Men being culturally labeled as bread winners I feel I am unable to meet the expectation, hence I feel distressed.	7	8	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	2.75*
I feel that most of the suicides that occur in and around my village are finally concluded as farmer's suicides irrespective of the cause.	0	2	8	1	4	0	1	7	4	3	-0.38
I feel shameful when someone asks me about my debts.	9	3	1	2	0	2	6	6	1	0	1.94*
I do not want to interact or share with my family members regarding the problems I encounter.	2	2	10	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.84*
In my view suicides is the only option left to the distressed farmer in the present social context.	0	1	0	3	11	1	1	1	2	10	-0.35
I feel helpless as I am unable to educate my children like others do	8	6	1	0	0	3	3	6	2	1	3.42*
No one has any right to end one's own life, instead feel the responsibility towards family.	6	4	3	2	0	4	9	2	0	0	0.64
My inability to meet the financial requirements of family members, (Dowry, marriage expenses of daughter/ sister, education of children etc) make me feel more distressed & pained.	8	6	1	0	0	1	10	4	0	0	3.30*
I feel it is waste of money in spending a lot of money for family functions etc.	1	9	4	1	0	3	6	3	3	0	0.19
I feel more distressed due to continuous pressure of expenditure of daughter marriage, children education and family disputes etc. than the farming related issues.	7	8	0	0	0	3	9	3	0	0	2.30*
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>											
In my view farmer who feeds the nation must feel proud and be strong in facing the challenges in mitigating the distress.	11	4	0	0	0	3	10	2	0	0	3.35*
Myself being a member of farmers group, I never felt isolated instead I got counseling from other member farmers in times of distress.	0	2	7	4	2	0	0	1	10	4	3.07*
In my opinion a regular social interactions, participation in the village cultural activities would be a stress buster for the farmers.	11	4	0	0	0	5	1	8	1	0	3.82*
<i>Situational:</i>											
<i>Sustained Distress (SD)</i>											
I feel many a times farmer take an extreme step due to the harassment of private money lenders.	10	3	2	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	2.57*
I feel pained even if I spend lot of money for inputs of low quality and fail to increase the yields.	8	6	1	0	0	2	4	7	2	0	3.78*
I feel spurious quality of inputs that farmer buys is ultimately resulting in farmer distress.	5	6	3	1	0	5	6	1	3	0	0.37
Rather than farming related problems, my family related problems make me feel more distressed.	5	9	0	1	0	3	6	3	3	0	1.36
Even if I have alternate farm plans for drought/natural calamity, I think they do not work for me.	0	0	3	5	7	0	1	3	7	4	1.10
Climate change problems make me feel that god is also not in my favour.	7	7	1	0	0	3	8	2	2	0	2.14*

I feel that exploitation of poor farmers by private dealers/ middlemen in the market is leading to farmers distress.	4	11	0	0	0	1	6	6	2	0	3.90*
In my view small holdings being less profitable, farmer's distress is more among small and marginal farmers.	9	6	0	0	0	5	8	1	1	0	1.95*
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>											
I don't think that farming in small holdings is less profitable resulting in farmer's distress.	0	0	1	4	10	0	3	5	1	6	2.76*
Natural calamities and climate related problems are not in our hands. So It is better to have always an alternate plan to mitigate the effect.	6	8	1	0	0	5	8	1	1	0	0.76
I don't feel department or research personnel have apathetic attitude in addressing farmer's distress.	0	2	2	2	9	0	2	7	4	2	2.16*
<i>Government related</i>											
<i>Sustained Distress (SD)</i>											
In my view I feel procedures of getting the benefits of various schemes are more complex and inaccessible resulting in helplessness of farmers.	7	8	0	0	0	4	10	1	0	0	1.52
In my view less Minimum Support price (MSP) forcing farmers land in distress most of the times.	6	7	0	2	0	7	5	2	1	0	2.33*
In my view the policies or programmes / schemes meant for farmers are target oriented rather than addressing the distress.	4	9	2	0	0	8	5	1	0	0	-1.50
I feel low market price is the prime cause of farmers distress.	8	6	0	1	0	3	11	1	0	0	1.12
I feel lack of awareness and knowledge to utilize the benefits of Government policies and schemes is leading to farmer distress.	4	10	0	1	0	0	8	4	3	0	3.07*
I don't feel that any extension reform can be an appropriate option to reduce the farmer's distress.	0	2	3	2	8	1	2	5	2	5	1.20
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>											
In my view the policies or programmes / schemes are meant to mitigate the farmer distress.	9	5	0	1	0	4	8	2	1	0	1.53
Growing crops as per market demand would solve the problem of farmer's distress.	7	7	0	1	0	8	6	1	0	0	-0.50
What really worries me is that the benefits of govt. schemes are unduly delayed and are untimely.	4	7	1	3	0	1	10	0	4	0	0.75
Men being culturally labeled as bread winners I feel there are many opportunities/livelihoods to meet that expectation, hence I don't feel distressed.	6	8	0	1	0	4	9	2	0	0	0.54
I feel everyone must plan the family expenditure as per the income which would alleviate the pain of distress to certain extent.	7	8	0	0	0	4	10	1	0	0	1.52
I feel lack of market intelligence is the cause for farmer distress.	4	6	5	0	0	4	4	5	2	0	0.81
I feel market led farming as an appropriate option to reduce the farmer's distress.	9	5	1	0	0	5	8	0	2	0	1.67
In my view crop insurance in no way provides ray of hope to distressed farmer, as distress is a psychological problem.	8	3	3	1	0	3	8	1	3	0	1.30
I feel I can manage risk involved in farming by consulting/ development officers scientists.	6	9	0	0	0	5	7	3	0	0	1.22
I feel that farmer should follow extensionist/Scientist advice to avoid exploitation of poor farmers by private dealers/ middlemen in the market and in turn distress.	10	5	0	0	0	1	7	5	1	1	4.50*

*Statements selected for final attitude scale. **Negative statements, SA = Strongly Agree, A= Agree, UD = Undecided, D= Disagree SD = strongly disagree

Table 2. Final selected Attitude statements

Statements	t-value
<i>Farming related factors: Sustained Distress (SD)</i>	
I feel consecutive failure of bore well digging had leads to farmer distress in my village.	3.91
Though I don't have farm related problems, I feel I am not happy with other aspects in my life.	2.10
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>	
I feel confident to overcome the distress by season wise meticulous planning.	2.66
In my view farming is not gambling of monsoon and market but it can be profitable if followed as recommended by the extensionists/scientists.	2.85
<i>Psychological factors: Sustained Distress (SD)</i>	
I feel helpless as I am unable to meet the basic needs of the family.	4.09
As I don't have any option other than farming I feel helpless many a times.	3.45
As a defaulter of crop loan I keep thinking of it all the time how to repay - it hurts me or pains me a lot.	5.92
Being a farmer I am always afraid of whether I can provide good education to my children or not.	2.53
I am not confident to overcome the distress as I feel all doors are closed for me.	2.42
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>	
Though people say farming is not profitable, but by planning systematically I feel I can come over the problems.	5.00
<i>Sociological factors: Sustained Distress (SD)</i>	
Men being culturally labeled as bread winners I feel I am unable to meet the expectation, hence I feel distressed	2.75
I feel shameful when someone asks me about my debts.	1.94
*I do not want to interact or share with my family members regarding the problems I encounter.	4.84
I feel helpless as I am unable to educate my children like others do	3.42
My inability to meet the financial requirements of family members, (Dowry, marriage expenses of daughter/ sister, education of children etc) make me feel more distressed & pained.	3.30
I feel more distressed due to continuous pressure of expenditure of daughter marriage, children education and family disputes etc. than the farming related issues.	2.30
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>	
In my view farmer who feeds the nation must feel proud and be strong in facing the challenges in mitigating the distress.	3.35
*Myself being a member of farmers group, I never felt isolated instead I got counseling from other member farmers in times of distress.	3.07
In my opinion a regular social interactions, participation in the village cultural activities would be a stress buster for the farmers.	3.82
<i>Situational factors: Sustained Distress (SD)</i>	
I feel many a times farmer take an extreme step due to the harassment of private money lenders.	2.57
I feel pained even if I spend lot of money for inputs of low quality and fail to increase the yields.	3.78
Climate change problems make me feel that god is also not in my favour.	2.14
I feel that exploitation of poor farmers by private dealers/ middlemen in the market is leading to farmers distress.	3.90
In my view small holdings being less profitable, farmer's distress is more among small and marginal farmers.	1.95
<i>Distress Coping (DC)</i>	
*I don't think that farming in small holdings is less profitable resulting in farmer's distress.	2.76
*I don't feel department or research personnel have apathetic attitude in addressing farmer's distress.	2.16
<i>Government related: Sustained Distress (SD)</i>	
In my view less Minimum Support price (MSP) forcing farmers land in distress most of the times.	2.33
I feel lack of awareness and knowledge to utilize the benefits of Government policies and schemes is leading to farmer distress.	3.07
I feel that farmer should follow extensionist/Scientist advice to avoid exploitation of poor farmers by private dealers/ middlemen in the market and in turn distress.	4.50
*Negative statements, coding procedure for these statements was, strongly agree response with 1, agree with 2, undecided with 3, disagree with 4 and strongly disagree with 5.	

Table 3. Distribution of the respondents according to their level attitude towards farming distress (N=300)

Category	No.	%
Least favourable	46	15.33
Less favourable	69	23.00
Favourable	94	31.33
High favourable	57	19.00
Highly favourable	34	11.33
Total	300	100

extension functionaries must focus on reaching out such farmers and providing them primary counseling to the farmers and his family members and facilitate them to seek medical help is necessary. Besides extension agencies may come up with strategies and programmes and schemes involving farmer's participation and facilitates coping the adversities.

Farmers who come under high attitude category of distress coping indicate that farmer has greater tendency to cope from the difficulty situation and farmers willingness to try and develop coping mechanism, diversifying farming activity and opting for sustainable livelihood. In the process farmers would develop resilience if he is helped and advised technically at right time.

With the help of developed attitude scale, we have studied 300 farmers attitude towards farming distress. The farmers were selected randomly from 3 different districts of Telangana state viz. Mancherial, Karimnagar and Jagtial. From each district 100 were selected randomly and administered the developed questionnaire. The responses were recorded and total scores were calculated. According to the total scores of the respondents, the respondents were categorized into

5 categories, viz; Least favourable, Less favourable, Favourable, High favourable and Highly favourable attitude towards farming distress.

The results in the Table 3 indicated that, 31.33 per cent of the respondents had favourable attitude followed by high favourable attitude (19.00%), less favourable attitude (23.00%), least favourable attitude (15.33%) and highly favourable attitude (11.33%). Similar findings were supported by the findings of Arifullah *et al.* (2014), Kaur *et al.* (2014) and Swetha (2017).

CONCLUSION

This study aims at constructing a scale to measure the attitude of farmers towards farmer distress. The affective aspect of attitude scale consisted of 29 items, with high reliability, and more predictive validity. This scale can be used in future studies on perception, attitude and feeling of farmers about the farmer distress. It will be helpful to the policy makers and administrators to develop suitable strategies towards controlling farmer's suicides due to distress by knowing the attitude of farmers towards farmer's distress. Farmer who has favourable attitude towards farmer distress (sustained) primary counseling needs to be provided, and extension scientists need to provide immediate attention and focus.

Extension strategies, policy-based reforms need to be planned for those who get high scores under sustained distress category and low scores under distress coping category. This would facilitate or help in addressing the farmers in distress.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Arifullah, M., Zahan, A., Rana, M.M., Adil, M and Shamsunnaher. 2014. Attitude of therural elite farmers towards extension activities performed by personnel of department of Agricultural Extension. *The Agriculturists*. **12** (1): 96-102.
- Edwards, A.L. (1969). Techniques of attitude scale construction. Vakils, Feffer and Simons private ltd. Bombay.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Kaur, J., Shehrawat, P.S and Ahmed Peer, Q.J. 2014. Attitude of farmers towards privatization of agricultural extension services. *Agri. Sci. Digest*. **34** (2): 81-86.
- Likert, R.A. (1967). A technique for the measurement of attitude. *Arc. Psycho*.
- Nagaraj K. (2014). Farmers' suicides in India: magnitudes, trends and spatial patterns, available at:<http://www.macros-can.org/anl/mar08/pdf/farmers_suicides.pdf>; [accessed 29.11.2014].
- Rao, R., Rao, P. N. and Venkateshwarlu, R. (2007). Farmers Suicides-A Sociological Perspective. *Kurukshetra*, **55** (8); 36-3.
- Swetha, M. 2017. A perceptual study on drip irrigation system in Sugarcane crop in Telangana state. Ph.D Agricultural extension, submitted to PJTSAU, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

