

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF MAIZE CONTRACT FARMERS OF NAVSARI DISTRICT

M. V. Dalvi ¹ and C. D. Pandya ²

1 P.G. Student, Department of Extension Education, NMCA, Navsari - 396450

2 Scientist, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, NAU, Vyara - 394650

Email : mahendradalvi111@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to assess the personal characteristics and Socio-economic status of contract farmers in Maize contract farming of Navsari district of South Gujarat, India. The results of the study revealed that most of the respondents were in middle age group and had middle school education. Majority of the respondents belonged to Schedule tribal caste and medium size of land holding. Majority of respondents had animal husbandry along with agriculture as their occupation. Majority of respondents belonged to low annual income and had low material possession. Majority of respondents belonged to nuclear family and had medium size of family. Majority of the respondents had no socio-political participation and had brick wall type house. Medium level of economic motivation and scientific orientation were observed among majority of the respondents. Majority of contract farmers had medium level of socio-economic status.

Keywords: contract farming, SES scale

INTRODUCTION

Contract farming can be defined as an agreement between the farmer and processing marketing firms for the production and supply of agricultural products under agreement and providing the produce with a degree of production support (FAQ, 1999). The basis of such arrangement is commitment on both the parts of producer-farmer and purchaser. In general contract farming is helpful to farmer in getting assured and higher net income per unit area and to increase resource use efficiency through the principle of economics of scale and the availability of package of superior marketing facilities. It is a two-way benefactor in terms of farmer getting assured price and assured market, while, the contracting agency getting assured quality and quantity of raw materials at a preconceived price. Further, it improves the managerial skills of the farmer and inculcates the concept of commercial cultivation. If proper infrastructure in the form of post harvests technology, transportation, storage and processing facilities are available then this can be found to be an added advantage to the farm economy contracts as practiced in India range from relatively loose, one time, oral arrangements between the farmer and the buyer to formal registered contracts, which specify the duties and obligation of the parties to the contracts as also deliverable and penalties for defaults. The study was conducted with specific objective

to know the SES of the contract farmers of Navsari district.

OBJECTIVES

- (a) To know the Personal profile of the respondents
- (b) To know the socio-economic status of maize contract farmers

METHODOLOGY

“Ex-post facto research design” was used for investigation. The present study was conducted in Navsari district of south Gujarat. Navsari district were purposively selected for the study. From Navsari district Chikhli, Vansda and Khergam talukas were selected randomly in which contract farming being practiced. From the selected talukas, 17 villages were selected simple random sampling method. From 17 villages 100 respondents were selected randomly. The interview schedule was constructed by formulating relevant questions in accordance with objectives of the study. The information from the respondent was collected by personal interview methods and their responses were considered for the purpose of present study. The SES scale developed by Pandya (2010) was used with slight modification for knowing SES. For the analysis of collected data statistical tools like Mean and S.D were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Personal profile of the respondents

n=100

| Sr. | Profile of respondents | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------|--|-----------|---------|
| 1 | Age | | |
| | Young (Up to 35 years) | 13 | 13.00 |
| | Middle (Between 35 to 55 years) | 59 | 59.00 |
| | Old (Above 55 years) | 28 | 28.00 |
| 2 | Education | | |
| | Collage/Post graduation | 16 | 16.00 |
| | High school | 14 | 14.00 |
| | Middle school | 32 | 32.00 |
| | Primary school | 15 | 15.00 |
| | Functionally literate | 23 | 23.00 |
| | Functionally literate | 00 | 00.00 |
| 3 | Caste | | |
| | General | 00 | 0.00 |
| | Other backward caste | 00 | 0.00 |
| | Schedule Tribal | 93 | 93.00 |
| | Schedule Caste | 07 | 7.00 |
| Migrate caste | 0 | 0.00 | |
| 4 | Land holding | | |
| | Big (above 10 ha) | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Medium (4.01 to 10 ha) | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Semi medium (2.01 to 4 ha) | 24 | 24.00 |
| | Small (1.01 to 2 ha) | 54 | 54.00 |
| | Marginal (0.01 to 1 ha) | 22 | 22.00 |
| Landless | 00 | 00.00 | |
| 5 | Annual income | | |
| | Above Rs. 2,00,000 | 21 | 21.00 |
| | Rs. 1,50,001 to 2,00,000 | 03 | 3.00 |
| | Rs. 1,00,001 to 1,50,000 | 05 | 5.00 |
| | Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000 | 20 | 20.00 |
| Up to Rs. 50,000 | 51 | 51.00 | |
| 6 | Material possession | 87 | |
| | Low material possession | 13 | 87.00 |
| | Medium material possession | 00 | 13.00 |
| | High material possession | | 00.00 |
| 7 | Family type | 43 | 43.00 |
| | Joint family | 57 | 57.00 |
| | family Nuclear | | |
| 8 | Family size | 35 | |
| | Small (up to 4 members) | 48 | 35.00 |
| | Medium (5 to 8 members) | 17 | 48.00 |
| | Large (more than 8) | | 17.00 |
| 9 | Socio-Political participation | | |
| | No socio- political participation | 43 | 43.00 |
| | Participation in one organization | 17 | 17.00 |
| | Participation in more than one organization | 18 | 18.00 |
| | Official position in one or more social and political organization | 02 | 2.00 |
| | Official position in one social and political organization | 04 | 4.00 |
| | Financial contribution for community | 16 | 16.00 |

Extension Plus: Expanding the Horizons of Extension for Holistic Agricultural Development

| | | | |
|-----------|--|----|-------|
| 10 | House holding | | |
| | Concrete double storied | 15 | 15.00 |
| | Concrete | 12 | 12.00 |
| | Tiled and brick wall | 58 | 58.00 |
| | Mud wall and metal sheet roof | 05 | 5.00 |
| | Thatched shed | 00 | 0.00 |
| 11 | Occupation | | |
| | Professional/ services in govt. | 05 | 5.00 |
| | Farming with other enterprise | 65 | 65.00 |
| | Skilled occupation | 16 | 16.00 |
| | Service in private | 14 | 14.00 |
| | Unskilled Occupation | 00 | 00.00 |
| 12 | Scientific orientation | 14 | 14.00 |
| | Lower level of scientific orientation | 80 | 80.00 |
| | Moderate level of scientific orientation | 06 | 6.00 |
| | Higher level of scientific orientation | | |
| 13 | Economic motivation | | |
| | Lower level of economic motivation | 20 | 20.00 |
| | Moderate level of economic motivation | 70 | 70.00 |
| | Higher level of economic motivation | 10 | 10.00 |

The data portrayed in Table 1 revealed that more than half (59.00 per cent) of the contract farmers were found under middle age group of 36 to 55 years and 28.00 per cent in age group of above 55 years only 13.00 per cent farmer belongs to the age group of up to 35 years. Nearly one third (32.00 per cent) of contract farmers had education up to middle school, functionally literate (23.00 per cent), Collage/ Post graduated (16.00 per cent); Primary school (15.00 per cent), High school (14.00 per cent). Majority (93.00 Per cent) of farmers were from Schedule tribal while only 7.00 per cent of the contract farmers were from Schedule Caste. More than half of the contract farmers (54.00 per cent) had small size of land holding, Semi medium (24.00 per cent) land holding and marginal land holding (22.00 per cent). Nearly half (51.00 per cent) of the contract farmers belonged to annual income of up to 50,000, followed by 21.00 per cent of the farmers belonged to income level of above 200,000, followed by 20.00 per cent farmers belonged to income level of 50,001 to 100,000. Majority (87.00 per cent) of contract farmers belonged to low material possession and only 13.00 per cent medium material possession. Majority (57.00 per cent) of farmers belonged to joint family and 43.00 per cent farmers belonged to nuclear family. Nearly half (48.00 per cent) of respondents had medium size of family, whereas 35.00 and 17.00 per cent of respondents had small and large size of family respectively. Majority (18.00 per cent) of farmers are belonged to Participation in more than one organization while 17.00 per cent of the farmers are belonged to Participation in one organization and only 16.00 per cent of the farmers are belonged to financial contribution for community. More than half (58.00 per cent) of contract farmers had tiled and brick wall type house, 15.00 per cent of the farmers had concrete double storied type house and only 12.00 per cent farmers

had concrete type house. Main occupation of 65.00 per cent contract farmers Farming with other enterprise. Majority (80.00 per cent) of the contract farmers had medium level of scientific orientation and 70.00 per cent of contract farmers had medium level of economic motivation. The results are in line with Vinaya et al (2015), Kumbhani et al (2011) and Pandya (2010).

Table 2: Socio-economic status of respondents n=100

| Sr. No. | Socio-economic status | Frequency | Per cent |
|---------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1 | Low socio-economic status | 18 | 18.00 |
| 2 | Medium socio-economic status | 70 | 70.00 |
| 3 | High socio-economic status | 12 | 12.00 |

The data presented in Table 2 indicated that majority (70.00 per cent) of contract farmers had medium level of socio-economic status followed by 18.00 per cent and 12.00 per cent of contract farmers had low and high level socio-economic status respectively.

CONCLUSION

From above discussion, it can be concluded that most of the respondents were in middle age group and had middle school education. Majority of the respondents belonged to Schedule tribal caste and medium size of land holding. Majority of respondents had animal husbandry along with agriculture as their main occupation. Majority of respondents belonged to low annual income and had low material possession. Majority of respondents belonged to

nuclear family and had medium size of family. Majority of the respondents had no socio-political participation and had brick wall type house. Medium level of economic motivation and scientific orientation were observed among majority of the respondents. Most of the contract farmers had medium level of socio-economic status.

REFERENCES

- Keshavamurthy N. N. (2005). A study on contractfarming in gherkin production. Unpublished M.sc (agri). Thesis, Dharwad
- Kumbhani,S.R., Thakrar, D.M. and Gondaliya, R.H.(2011). Knowledge and their correlation with personnel and socio-economic characteristics of corriender growers. *Guj. J.Extn. Edn.*, 22:26-28
- Pandya, C. D. (2010). A critical analysis of soico-economic status of organic farming followers of South Gujarat. Unpublished Ph.D. (Agri). Thesis, N.A.U., Navsari.
- Robinson, F. R. (1976). Housing crisis or opportunity? extension services review. 41-46.
- Vinaya Kumar, H.M., Yashodhara, B. Preethi and Govinda Gowda, V. (2015). Impact of Community Based Tank Management Project on Socio-Economic Status and Crop Productivity of Beneficiary Farmers in Tumkur District of Karnataka State. *Trends in Biosciences*. 8 (9): 2289-2295.