



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## IMPACT OF FARM MECHANIZATION ON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR

Damodar Pulicharla

Research Scholar

Department of Economics

Acharya Nagarjuna University, Andhra Pradesh

Prof. K. Madhu Babu

Department of Economics

Acharya Nagarjuna University, Andhra Pradesh

### ABSTRACT

Agriculture plays a pivotal role in global food security and economic development. However, the advent of farm mechanization has introduced significant changes to traditional farming practices, raising questions about its impact on agricultural laborers. The study aims to investigate the impact of farm mechanization on agricultural laborers. The study has examined the major agricultural operations under mechanization in the study area affecting employment loss. The study has discussed the number of days of employment lost due to farm mechanization. Further, the study has analyzed the effect of farm mechanization on the living conditions of laborers, increasing poverty levels, food security levels, impact on mental health, loss of bargaining power and loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices passed down through generations. By addressing these questions, the study aims to provide insights into the nuanced ways in which farm mechanization shapes the experiences and livelihoods of agricultural labor. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing targeted interventions and policy measures that promote gender equity, economic empowerment, and sustainable development within agricultural communities.

Keywords: Farm Mechanization, Agricultural Labor, Impact

Agriculture is the backbone of many economies worldwide, providing livelihoods for billions of people and serving as a vital source of food security and economic development. In recent decades, the agricultural sector has witnessed significant transformations driven by technological advancements, including the adoption of farm mechanization technologies. The global trend towards farm mechanization has revolutionized agricultural production systems, leading to increased efficiency, productivity, and scale of operations. While mechanization holds promise for enhancing agricultural output and rural livelihoods, its impact on women agricultural laborers remains a critical area of inquiry. The advent of farm mechanization has the potential to exacerbate existing gender disparities, as mechanized farming methods may favor male-dominated tasks and overlook the diverse roles and responsibilities of women in agriculture. Understanding the gendered dimensions of mechanization is crucial for promoting gender equity, economic empowerment, and sustainable development in rural communities worldwide.

In India, agriculture is a cornerstone of the economy, employing over half of the country's workforce and serving as a primary source of livelihood for millions of rural households. Women constitute a significant proportion of the agricultural labor force in India, contributing to various tasks across the agricultural value chain, from sowing and weeding to harvesting and post-harvest processing. The rapid pace of mechanization in Indian agriculture presents both opportunities and challenges for women agricultural laborers. While mechanization has the potential to improve productivity and income generation, it also poses risks of job displacement, income insecurity, and social marginalization for women engaged in traditional farming practices.

Understanding how farm mechanization impacts women's employment dynamics, socio-economic status, health and well-being, and access to agricultural knowledge and resources is essential for informing policies and interventions that promote gender equity and women's empowerment in Indian agriculture. In agricultural communities worldwide, the introduction and proliferation of farm mechanization technologies have significantly transformed traditional farming practices. While mechanization offers potential benefits in terms of increased productivity and efficiency, its impact on women agricultural laborers remains a critical area of concern. Women play a vital role in agricultural production, contributing substantially to tasks such as planting, weeding, harvesting, and post-harvest processing. However, the adoption of mechanized farming methods has the potential to disrupt traditional gender roles and exacerbate existing gender inequalities within the agricultural sector.

The study addresses an important gap in research by focusing specifically on the impact of farm mechanization on women agricultural laborers. Understanding the gendered dimensions of mechanization is crucial for promoting gender equity within the agricultural sector and ensuring that women's contributions are valued and recognized. Examining how farm mechanization influences women's employment opportunities is essential for promoting inclusive and sustainable development. Investigating the impact of mechanization on women's mental health provides critical insights into the health risks and challenges associated with operating mechanized farming equipment. This knowledge can inform the development of targeted interventions to safeguard women's health and well-being in agricultural settings. The study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing a deeper understanding of the diverse challenges and opportunities faced by women agricultural laborers. The findings of the study have implications for policy and programmatic interventions aimed at promoting gender equity and women's empowerment in agriculture. By identifying key areas for intervention, the research can inform the design and implementation of policies that prioritize the needs and interests of women agricultural laborers.

## Review of Literature

Agbonlahor and Phillip (2015) conducted research investigating the factors impacting the choice of rural migrants to settle in rural areas as agricultural laborers in southern Nigeria. Their findings showed that migrants hailed from both local and international origins, with around 76 percent opting for farm labor in the destination community, while wage employment made up approximately 80 percent of overall employment. Logistic regression analysis highlighted that prior migration experiences, along with socio-economic and developmental conditions of households and communities, reduced the inclination of migrants to settle in the receiving rural community, among other factors.

Noor Memon et al. (2015) conducted research on the participation of women in agricultural labor in Mirpurkhas, Sindh, in 2013. Their study found that women were primarily engaged in agricultural activities during both the kharif and rabi seasons, averaging 120 days of employment per year. Weeding emerged as the predominant task, followed by harvesting and post-harvest operations. During the summer off-season, women encountered significant unemployment, affecting their income, family expenses, savings, and debt levels. Despite earning less during the rabi season, their expenditure on both food and non-food items decreased. This seasonal unemployment prompted women to explore alternative sources of employment.

Singh et al. (2017) conducted an extensive investigation into the issue of indebtedness among farmers and agricultural labor households in rural Punjab, exploring several previously unexplored dimensions. Their analysis uncovered that more than four-fifths of farming and agricultural labor households in rural Punjab are burdened by debt. The magnitude of debt per household rises with farm size, with indebted agricultural labor households averaging Rs. 68,329.88, whereas farming households average Rs. 5,52,064.16 in debt. Notably, the study found that institutional agencies serve as the primary source of

loans for farming households, likely due to greater awareness, easy loan accessibility, and better bank accessibility in rural areas. In contrast, agricultural labor households predominantly rely on non-institutional sources, often entailing exorbitant interest rates.

Baliyan's (2017) research delves into evaluating the economic contribution of women in cultivating households within a agriculturally prosperous region. The study reveals that women in these households contribute roughly 20 percent of the agricultural income and a significant 61 percent of the income generated from animal husbandry activities. Despite variations in farm size categories, the contribution of female workers to family income remains significant, albeit displaying a negative correlation with farm size.

Kundu and Das (2019) set out to examine the factors influencing the decline in labor force participation in Indian agriculture. Their findings indicate that the gradual decrease in per capita land holdings is the foremost factor driving down the participation rate in the agricultural labor force. Moreover, other factors pushing individuals away from agricultural labor include rising real agricultural wage rates and advancements in the education level of agricultural households. Additionally, pull factors such as higher non-farm real wages and employment prospects in construction and other non-agricultural sectors are identified as significant contributors to the decline in labor force participation in Indian agriculture.

Singh et al. (2019) conducted a study to assess the living standards of farmers and agricultural laborers in rural Punjab. Their findings revealed stark differences in income and consumption expenditure levels among various farm-size categories. Agricultural laborers, marginal, small, and semi-medium farmers experienced significantly lower income and consumption expenditure levels compared to medium and large farmers. Consumption patterns varied accordingly, with smaller farms allocating a larger proportion of expenditure to non-durable items, suggesting a subsistence-oriented approach. Conversely, larger farms allocated more expenditure to durable items, followed by socio-religious ceremonies, non-durables, and services. Moreover, the study underscored a notable level of indebtedness among farm and agricultural labor households in Punjab, with smaller farm-size categories bearing disproportionately higher debt burdens compared to larger ones.

Yoganandham's (2021) study conducted in Gudiyattam Block of Vellore district aimed to gather comprehensive information on farming laborers, scrutinize their income and expenditure patterns, analyze their social conditions, and propose viable solutions to address their issues. The findings revealed that among the 90 sampled households, 47 respondents earned up to Rs. 20,000 monthly, 24 earned between Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 30,000, and 19 earned between Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000. In terms of occupational status, 49 respondents were affiliated with the service sector, 22 with the professional sector, and 19 with the business sector. Furthermore, the study highlighted that 88.75 percent of respondents were actively engaged in activities such as sowing, transplanting, and irrigation, while 80 percent expressed agreement with the notion of hard work.

Malik et al. (2022) conducted a study to explore the determinants of agricultural labor supply in the irrigated area of Khushab District, Punjab. The findings underscored the significant influence of socio-economic factors on agricultural labor dynamics in such areas. Notably, off-farm employment was found to have a negative correlation with agricultural labor supply, suggesting inter-sectoral labor migration. Conversely, factors such as family size, farm size, and farming experience exhibited a positive correlation with agricultural labor supply.

## **Objectives and Methodology**

The study aims to investigate the impact of farm mechanization on agricultural laborers. The study has examined the major agricultural operations under mechanization in the study area affecting employment loss. The study has discussed the number of days of employment lost due to farm mechanization. Further, the study has analyzed the effect of farm mechanization on the living conditions of laborers, increasing poverty levels, food security levels, impact on mental health, loss of bargaining power and loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices passed down through generations. By addressing these questions, the study aims to provide insights into the nuanced ways in which farm mechanization shapes the experiences and livelihoods of agricultural labor. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing targeted interventions and policy measures that promote gender equity, economic empowerment, and sustainable development within agricultural communities.

The study is based on primary data. The data is collected from 560 agricultural labourers in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh using interview schedule. Frequency tables are used to analyze the data. The study is limited to paddy cultivation.

## Results and Discussion

### Major agricultural operation impacted

Sample respondents are asked to state which agricultural operation of paddy cultivation in which they lost employment due to farm mechanization. Table – 1 shows the distribution of the respondents by their opinion on agricultural operation mostly impacted due to farm mechanization resulting in loss of employment to the sample agricultural labourers. It is revealed from the table that harvesting and threshing emerged as the predominant agricultural operation affected by mechanization, with 50.50 per cent of respondents indicating its impact on employment loss. This underscores the substantial shift towards mechanized methods in these operations, potentially reducing the need for manual labor. The second most affected operation is sowing and transplanting, with 28.60 per cent of respondents acknowledging its impact on employment loss. This suggests that the adoption of mechanized techniques in planting processes has also led to a reduction in employment opportunities in the study area. Paddy straw bundling, although less prevalent compared to harvesting and sowing, still accounts for a considerable portion of employment loss, with 20.90 per cent of respondents highlighting its impact. This implies that even ancillary activities like bundling are not immune to the effects of mechanization, further contributing to employment challenges in the agricultural sector.

Table - 1

TABLE SHOWING MAJOR AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS UNDER MECHANIZATION IN THE STUDY AREA AFFECTING EMPLOYMENT LOSS

Frequency	Agricultural operation			Total
	Harvesting & Threshing	Sowing and Transplanting	Paddy Straw bundling	
Number of respondents	283	160	117	560
Percentage	50.50	28.60	20.90	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data indicate a clear trend towards mechanization across various agricultural operations in the study area. While mechanization offers several benefits in terms of output and cost-effectiveness, its impact on employment cannot be overlooked. The widespread adoption of mechanized techniques has led to a reduction in the demand for manual labor, particularly in labor-intensive operations like harvesting and sowing. This has significant implications for rural livelihoods, as agriculture is often a primary source of employment in these areas. Moreover, the displacement of labor due to mechanization may exacerbate existing socio-economic challenges, including rural unemployment and migration.

### Number of days of employment lost due to farm mechanization

Sample respondents are asked to state the number of employment days they lost in agriculture due to farm mechanization. Table-2 illustrates the distribution of respondents based on the number of days of employment lost due to farm mechanization. The majority of respondents (38.00 per cent) reported losing between 60 to 70 days of employment due to mechanization, indicating a substantial disruption in traditional labor patterns. This suggests that mechanization has led to a significant reduction in seasonal employment opportunities in the agricultural sector, affecting livelihoods dependent on manual labor. Following closely, 26.80 per cent of respondents reported losing above 70 days of employment, further emphasizing the magnitude of the impact. This indicates a prolonged period of reduced employment opportunities,

highlighting the long-term implications of mechanization on rural livelihoods. Additionally, 26.80 per cent of respondents reported losing between 50 to 60 days of employment, reflecting a substantial portion of the workforce experiencing moderate to significant disruptions in their employment patterns. A smaller proportion of respondents (8.40 per cent) reported losing less than 50 days of employment, suggesting that while some individuals may have experienced minimal impact, the overall trend points towards a significant reduction in employment opportunities.

Table - 2

TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF DAYS OF EMPLOYMENT LOST DUE TO FARM MECHANIZATION

Frequency	Number of employment days lost				Total
	<50 days	50-60 days	60-70 days	Above 70 days	
Number of respondents	47	150	213	150	560
Percentage	8.40	26.80	38.00	26.80	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table-2 underscore the profound impact of farm mechanization on employment duration in the study area. The loss of employment days across various segments of the workforce reflects the widespread nature of this phenomenon and its implications for rural livelihoods. The substantial number of respondents reporting 50 to 70 days of employment lost highlights the seasonal nature of agricultural employment and the challenges posed by mechanization in disrupting traditional labor patterns. This not only affects individual workers but also has broader socio-economic ramifications for rural communities dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods.

### Adverse effect of farm mechanization on the living conditions of laborers

Sample respondents are asked to state their opinion on the statement that farm mechanization adversely affects their living conditions. Table-3 outlines the opinions of respondents regarding the adverse effects of farm mechanization on their living conditions. A significant majority of respondents (57.90 per cent) strongly agree that farm mechanization has had adverse effects on their living conditions. This suggests that mechanization has led to tangible challenges that have directly impacted the quality of life for laborers in the study area. Additionally, 23.00 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that mechanization has negatively affected their living conditions, further corroborating the widespread perception of its adverse effects. A smaller proportion of respondents (15.00 per cent) remain neutral on the issue, indicating a degree of uncertainty or variability in their experiences with mechanization's impact on living conditions. Only 4.10 per cent of respondents disagree with the assertion that farm mechanization has adverse effects on their living conditions, suggesting a minority viewpoint.

Table -3

TABLE SHOWING ADVERSE EFFECT OF FARM MECHANIZATION ON THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF LABORERS

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents				Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	
Number of respondents	324	129	84	23	560
Percentage	57.90	23.00	15.00	4.10	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.



The data presented in Table-3 highlight the pervasive perception among laborers regarding the adverse effects of farm mechanization on their living conditions. The majority of respondents express strong agreement with this sentiment, indicating the severity of the challenges faced by laborers in adapting to the changing agricultural landscape.

### Impact of farm mechanization on increasing poverty levels

Sample respondents are asked to state whether farm mechanization results in increasing poverty levels of agricultural labourers. Table-4 presents the opinions of respondents regarding the impact of farm mechanization on increasing poverty levels. It became evident from the table that a significant majority of respondents (55.90 per cent) strongly agree that farm mechanization has contributed to increasing poverty levels in the study area. This suggests a widespread belief among the respondents that mechanization has exacerbated existing poverty challenges within agricultural communities. Additionally, 22.70 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that mechanization has contributed to increasing poverty levels, further indicating a substantial portion of the population recognizing this trend. A smaller proportion of respondents (19.30 per cent) remain neutral on the issue, suggesting a degree of uncertainty or variability in their perceptions of mechanization's impact on poverty. Only 2.10 per cent of respondents disagree with the assertion that farm mechanization has contributed to increasing poverty levels, representing a minority viewpoint.

Table - 4

TABLE SHOWING IMPACT OF FARM MECHANIZATION ON INCREASING POVERTY LEVELS

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents				Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	
Number of respondents	313	127	108	12	560
Percentage	55.90	22.70	19.30	2.10	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table - 4 highlight the prevalent perception among respondents regarding the role of farm mechanization in exacerbating poverty levels within agricultural communities. This perception likely stems from the complex interplay between mechanization, employment dynamics, and income distribution. Farm mechanization can lead to a concentration of wealth and resources in the hands of large-scale farmers or agribusinesses, while marginalizing smallholder farmers and laborers. This widening gap in wealth distribution can contribute to increased poverty levels among vulnerable populations reliant on agricultural income.

### Adverse impact of farm mechanization on food security levels

Sample respondents are asked to state their opinion on whether farm mechanization results in reducing food security levels of agricultural labourers. Table-5 presents the opinions of respondents regarding the adverse impact of farm mechanization on food security levels. It is striking to note from the table that merely a negligible proportion of respondents (0.20 per cent) strongly agree and only 1.20 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that mechanization has adverse effects on food security. This suggests a marginal acknowledgment of the issue among a small subset of the population. The majority of respondents (67.30 per cent) disagree with the assertion that farm mechanization has adverse effects on food security, indicating a prevailing belief that mechanization has not significantly compromised food security levels in the study area. Additionally, 31.20 per cent of respondents strongly disagree with the assertion, further emphasizing the widespread perception that farm mechanization has not negatively impacted food security.

Table - 5

TABLE SHOWING THE ADVERSE IMPACT OF FARM MECHANIZATION ON FOOD SECURITY LEVELS

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents				Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Number of respondents	1	7	377	175	560
Percentage	0.20	1.20	67.30	31.20	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table-5 highlight a notable disparity in the perceptions of respondents regarding the adverse impact of farm mechanization on food security levels. While a small proportion of respondents express concerns about mechanization's effects on food security, the majority view it as having minimal to no adverse impact.

### Negative impact of job displacement due to farm mechanization on mental health

The impact of farm mechanization extends beyond economic and food security dimensions; it also has implications for the mental health and well-being of individuals affected by job displacement. This study explores the perceived negative impact of job displacement due to farm mechanization on mental health in the study area. Table-6 presents the opinions of respondents regarding the negative impact of job displacement due to farm mechanization on mental health. It is divulged from the table that a significant proportion of respondents (43.00 per cent) strongly agree that job displacement caused by farm mechanization has had a negative impact on mental health. This suggests a widespread recognition of the psychological toll associated with losing employment due to mechanization. Additionally, 36.80 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that job displacement has negatively affected mental health, further emphasizing the prevalence of this sentiment among the population. A smaller proportion of respondents (9.50 per cent) remain neutral on the issue, indicating a degree of uncertainty or variability in their perceptions of the relationship between job displacement and mental health. Only a minority of respondents disagree with the assertion that job displacement has negative effects on mental health, with 4.80 per cent expressing disagreement and 5.90 per cent strongly disagreeing.

Table - 6

TABLE SHOWING THE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF JOB DISPLACEMENT DUE TO FARM MECHANIZATION ON MENTAL HEALTH

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents					Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Number of respondents	241	206	53	27	33	560
Percentage	43.00	36.80	9.50	4.80	5.90	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table - 6 underscore the significant impact of job displacement due to farm mechanization on mental health within the study area. The majority of respondents express concerns about the adverse effects of losing employment on psychological well-being, highlighting the emotional distress and uncertainty experienced by affected individuals.

## Loss of bargaining power due to farm mechanization

Farm mechanization not only affects employment and socio-economic conditions but also influences the bargaining power of laborers within the agricultural sector. This study explores the perceived impact of loss of bargaining power due to farm mechanization in the study area. Table - 7 presents the opinions of respondents regarding the impact of loss of bargaining power due to farm mechanization. A significant proportion of respondents (35.50 per cent) strongly agree that farm mechanization has led to a loss of bargaining power among laborers. This suggests a widespread recognition of the erosion of negotiating power and agency among workers in the agricultural sector. Additionally, 34.60 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that mechanization has contributed to the loss of bargaining power, further emphasizing the prevalence of this sentiment among the population. A smaller proportion of respondents (7.00 per cent) remain neutral on the issue, indicating a degree of uncertainty or variability in their perceptions of the relationship between mechanization and bargaining power. However, 15.00 per cent of respondents disagree with the assertion that farm mechanization has led to a loss of bargaining power, suggesting a minority viewpoint.

Similarly, 7.90 per cent of respondents strongly disagree with the assertion, indicating a subset of the population that does not perceive mechanization as negatively impacting bargaining power.

Table - 7

TABLE SHOWING THE IMPACT OF LOSS OF BARGAINING POWER DUE TO FARM MECHANIZATION

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents					Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Number of respondents	199	194	39	84	44	560
Percentage	35.50	34.60	7.00	15.00	7.90	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table - 7 highlight the perception among respondents regarding the impact of farm mechanization on the bargaining power of laborers within the agricultural sector. The majority of respondents express concerns about the erosion of negotiating power and autonomy among workers, reflecting broader socio-economic shifts driven by mechanization.

## Negative impact of mechanization on the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices passed down through generations

Table-8 presents the opinions of respondents regarding the negative impact of mechanization on the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices. A significant majority of respondents (65.90 per cent) strongly agree that mechanization has led to the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices. This indicates a widespread recognition of the erosion of cultural heritage and agricultural wisdom accumulated over generations. Additionally, 31.60 per cent of respondents agree with the notion that mechanization has contributed to the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices, further emphasizing the prevalence of this sentiment among the population. Only a small proportion of respondents (2.50 per cent) remain neutral on the issue, suggesting a minority viewpoint that may reflect uncertainty or variability in their perceptions.



TABLE SHOWING THE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF MECHANIZATION ON THE LOSS OF TRADITIONAL FARMING KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES PASSED DOWN THROUGH GENERATIONS

Frequency	Opinion of the respondents			Total
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	
Number of respondents	369	177	14	560
Percentage	65.90	31.60	2.50	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in Table 8 highlight the perceived impact of mechanization on the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices within the study area. The majority of respondents express concerns about the erosion of cultural identity and agricultural heritage as mechanized techniques supplant traditional farming methods. Traditional farming knowledge encompasses a wide range of practices, including seed selection, crop rotation, and soil management, which are often deeply rooted in local ecological and cultural contexts. Mechanization can disrupt these practices by favoring standardized, input-intensive approaches that prioritize efficiency and productivity over sustainability and cultural continuity. Moreover, the loss of traditional farming knowledge can have broader implications for ecological resilience, as indigenous practices are often adapted to local environmental conditions and contribute to biodiversity conservation and natural resource management.

## Conclusion

The findings of this research shed light on the multifaceted impact of farm mechanization on various aspects of agricultural practices, employment dynamics, socio-economic conditions, and mental health within the study area. Majority of the sample agricultural labourers are found to be lost employment in harvesting and threshing operation of paddy cultivation due to farm mechanization. Mechanization has led to significant job displacement across various agricultural operations, resulting in a reduction in employment opportunities and income stability for laborers. Majority of the sample agricultural labourers reported losing of more than 60 days of employment due to farm mechanization. The majority of respondents perceive adverse effects on living conditions due to mechanization, highlighting challenges related to income insecurity, social dislocation, and reduced access to essential resources. There is widespread recognition of mechanization's contribution to increasing poverty levels within agricultural communities, reflecting concerns about socio-economic inequalities and livelihood vulnerabilities. While some respondents express concerns about mechanization's impact on food security, the majority view it as having minimal to no adverse effects, underscoring the need for nuanced analysis considering contextual factors. Job displacement due to mechanization is perceived to have a significant negative impact on mental health, emphasizing the emotional distress and uncertainty experienced by affected individuals. Mechanization has led to a loss of bargaining power among laborers, highlighting concerns about inequitable power dynamics and limited agency within the agricultural sector. The majority of respondents recognize the negative impact of mechanization on the loss of traditional farming knowledge and practices, indicating concerns about the erosion of cultural heritage and ecological resilience.

Policymakers should prioritize initiatives aimed at promoting inclusive growth and equitable distribution of benefits within the agricultural sector. This may involve implementing policies that support smallholder farmers, protect labor rights, and incentivize sustainable farming practices. Investment in skills development programs is essential to equip workers with the expertise needed to adapt to changing labor requirements and capitalize on emerging opportunities in mechanized agriculture. By implementing these suggestions, policymakers, stakeholders, and local communities can work together to navigate the challenges and opportunities presented by farm mechanization, promoting inclusive and sustainable development in agricultural landscapes.

**References**

1. Agbonlahor, M. U., & Phillip, D. O. A. (2015). Deciding to Settle: Rural-Rural Migration and Agricultural Labour Supply in Southwest Nigeria. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 49(1), 267-284.
2. NoorMmemon, I., Noonari, S., Kalroo, M. A., Memon, Z., Pathan, A., Manzoor, A., & Pathan, M. (2015). Women Labour Participation of Agricultural Production in Sindh, Pakistan. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 10, 87-97.
3. Singh, G., Anupama, Kaur, G., Kaur, R., & Kaur, S. (2017). Indebtedness among Farmers and Agricultural Labourers in Rural Punjab. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 53(6), 51-57.
4. Baliyan, K. (2017). Economic Valuation of Female Family Labour in Agriculture and Animal Husbandry: A Study in a Prosperous Agricultural Region. *Journal of Rural Development*, 36(2), 203-212.
5. Kundu, A., & Das, S. (2019). Push and (or) pull? Drivers of labour force participation in Indian agriculture. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 62, 413–430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41027-019-00182-9>
6. Singh, G., Anupama, Kaur, R., Kaur, G., & Kaur, S. (2019). Levels of living of farmers and agricultural labourers in rural Punjab. *Journal of Rural Development*, 38(1), 78–101. <https://doi.org/10.25175/jrd/2019/v38/i1/144920>
7. Yoganandham, G. (2021). Problems and Constraints of Agricultural Labourers in Gudiyattam Block of Vellore District in Tamil Nadu. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(3), 1984-1992. DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.03.245
8. Malik, A. M., Hussain, N., & Akhter, N. (2022). Agriculture Labour Supply in Irrigated Plains of Punjab: Options for Small Rural Household. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 38(4), 1246-1253.