

PERSONAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FARMERS OF BANASKANTHA DISTRICT

R.R.Patel¹, P.K.Patel² and R.M.Patel³

1 Assistant Research Scientist (Agril. Econ), AICRP-Integrated Farming Systems (OFR), SDAU.,
Adiya District: Patan -384255

2 Assistant Research Scientist (Agril. Chem), AICRP-IFS, SDAU., S.K.Nagar,-385 506

3 Assistant Professor (Agril. Econ), College of ABM, SDAU., S.K.Nagar,-385 506

4 Assistant Research Scientist, SDAU., Radhanpur

E mail: rrpatelecon@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

An attempt was made to study the socio-economic characteristics of farmers of Banaskantha district. Out of 12 block one high productive and one low productive block were selected purposively. Three villages from each block were selected randomly being the sample size of 360. Nearly half of the respondents were middle aged, had education up to secondary and higher secondary level from other backward class, had medium size family, agriculture and husbandry as a main occupation, marginal farmers possessed 3 to 4 milch animals and had annual income ranging from ₹ 2,00,000.00 to ₹ 3,00,000.00.

Keywords : farmers, personal socio-economic characteristics

INTRODUCTION

Gujarat has shown good progress in agriculture. The economy of state largely depends on agriculture. The banaskantha district is a one of the important district of the state. The district had 2 tribal and 10 non tribal taluka. The social-economic status of the farmers of district largely depends on agriculture and allied fields. Many government schemes had been functioning in the district to uplift socio-economic condition of farmers including tribal sub plan. Moreover, agriculture and animal husbandry is the main source of livelihood for the rural people of district. Therefore, the present study which entitled “Personal and Socio-Economic Characteristics of farmers of Banaskantha district” was planned.

OBJECTIVE

To study the socio-economic characteristics of farmers of Banaskantha district

METHODOLOGY

Banskantha district was selected purposively. Out of 12 blocks one high productive (Deesa) and low productive (Danta) blocks were selected randomly. Three villages from each blocks were randomly selected. Proportionally one-third farmers from each category were selected randomly for the study. Total 360 farmers from randomly selected villages were selected for the study keeping view; the objective of the study, the interview schedule was developed. The data were transferred into master table and analysed in forms of frequency and percentage in order to make findings

meaningful.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that near to half (45.00 per cent) of the farmers belonged to middle age group, followed by 37.22 per cent with old age and 17.78 per cent in young age group. The 44.44 per cent of the farmers had education up to primary level and followed by secondary/higher secondary level, (23.89 per cent), illiterate (26.39 per cent) and only 5.00 per cent had education up to graduation level. The possible reason for this might be that the older age farmers may have lower or no education because of low education facilities in those periods.

Table 1 : Personal and Socio-economical characteristics of respondents n=360

| Sr. No. | Personal Characteristics | Frequencies | Per cent |
|----------|---|-------------|----------|
| 1 | Age | | |
| | Young (below 35 years) | 64 | 17.78 |
| | Middle (36 to 50 years) | 162 | 45.00 |
| | Old (Above 50 years) | 134 | 37.22 |
| 2 | Education level | | |
| | Illiterate | 95 | 26.39 |
| | Primary (1 st to 8 th standard) | 160 | 44.44 |
| | Secondary / Higher secondary (9 th to 12 th standard) | 86 | 23.89 |
| | Graduation and above | 18 | 05.00 |

Extension Strategies for Doubling the Farmers' Income for Livelihood Security

| 3 | Caste | | |
|---|--|-----|-------|
| | Schedule Caste | 6 | 01.67 |
| | Schedule Tribe | 14 | 03.89 |
| | Other backward caste | 340 | 94.44 |
| | General | 0 | 00.00 |
| 4 | Family size | | |
| | Small family (up to 4 members) | 131 | 36.38 |
| | Medium family (5 to 8 members) | 188 | 52.24 |
| | Large family (more than 9 members) | 41 | 11.38 |
| 5 | Occupation | | |
| | Only Agriculture | 09 | 2.50 |
| | Agriculture + Horticulture | 02 | 0.56 |
| | Agriculture + Livestock | 231 | 64.17 |
| | Agriculture + Horticulture + Livestock | 118 | 32.77 |
| 6 | Average annual income | | |
| | Up to ₹ 1,00,000/- | 08 | 02.22 |
| | ₹ 1,00,001/- to ₹ 2,00,000/- | 41 | 11.40 |
| | ₹ 2,00,001/- to ₹ 3,00,000/- | 49 | 13.61 |
| | ₹ 3,00,001/- to ₹ 4,00,000/- | 65 | 18.05 |
| | Above ₹ 4,00,000/- | 197 | 54.72 |
| 7 | Land holding | | |
| | Marginal (Upto 0.99 ha.) | 91 | 07.51 |
| | Small (1.0 to 1.99 ha.) | 119 | 22.48 |
| | Medium (2.0 to 3.99 ha.) | 112 | 40.36 |
| | Large (above 4.0 ha.) | 38 | 29.65 |
| 8 | Animal possession (milch) | | |
| | Up to 2 animals | 55 | 15.27 |
| | 3 to 4 animals | 231 | 64.17 |
| | More than 4 animals | 74 | 20.56 |
| 9 | Agricultural implements | | |
| | Indigenous/ Improved plough | 225 | 62.50 |
| | Bullock cart | 56 | 15.56 |
| | Tractor | 37 | 10.28 |
| | Chaff cutter | 189 | 52.50 |
| | Thresher | 39 | 10.83 |
| | Sprayer pump | 141 | 39.17 |
| | Diesel pump/ Electric motor | 186 | 51.67 |

| 10 | House hold items | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-----|-------|
| | T.V. colour / Black & White | 269 | 74.72 |
| | LPG Connection | 85 | 23.61 |
| | Cycle | 245 | 68.06 |
| | Motor cycle/ Scooter | 105 | 29.17 |
| | Mobile Phone | 294 | 81.67 |

The data indicate that 94.44 per cent of the farmers belonged to other backward class category followed by Schedule tribe (3.89 per cent) and Schedule caste (1.67 per cent). None of the respondents were from General category.

More than half (52.24 per cent) of the farmers belonged to medium sized families i.e. 5 to 8 members, while 36.38 per cent of them belonged to small size families having up to 4 members and 11.38 per cent belonged to large families having above 9 members. It can be observed from the data that near to two-third (64.17 per cent) of the farmers had occupation of agriculture with animal husbandry. Only 2.50 per cent farmers had agriculture as an occupation. It shows that most of the farmers were engaged in agriculture along with animal husbandry occupation for their livelihood security.

The data show that about 54.72 per cent of farmers earned annual total income ranging above ₹ 4,00,000/- followed by 18.05 per cent of them had annual income in ranging from ₹ 3,00,001/- to ₹ 4,00,000/-. Whereas, 13.61 per cent of them income in range ₹ 2,00,001/- to ₹ 3,00,000/- and 11.40 per cent had annual income ranging ₹ 1,00,001/- to ₹ 2,00,000/-. Only 2.22 per cent earned annual income below ₹ 1,00,000/-. It can be observed from the table that only (7.51 per cent) are marginal farmers. While, 40.36 per cent of them were medium farmers followed by large farmers (29.65 per cent) and small farmers (22.48 per cent). It indicates that more than two-third farmers had land holding above 2.0 hectare and only one-third of the farmers have less than 2.0 hectares land holding.

Looking to the possession of animals, it is clear that near to two-third (64.17 per cent) possessed milch animal 3 to 4 followed by 20.56 per cent with more than 4 animals and 15.27 per cent possess less than 2 animals. It shows that farmers kept milch animals for their regular income.

The data in table regarding agricultural implements indicate that more than one half (62.50 per cent) farmers possessed indigenous / improved plough followed by chaff cutter (52.50 per cent), diesel / electrical motor (51.67 per cent), sprayer pump (39.17 per cent), bullock cart (15.56 per cent), thresher (10.83 per cent) and tractor (10.28 per cent). Moreover, the data reveal that more than fourth-fifth (81.67 per cent) of farmers possessed mobile phone followed by

television (74.72 per cent), cycle (68.06 per cent), motor cycle/ scooter (29.17 per cent) and LPG connection (23.61 per cent).

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that more than four-fifth of farmers were found in the middle and near to four-fifth of old aged group and most of them were educated up to secondary level, belonged to other backward class with medium family size and had agriculture with animal husbandry as a major occupation. Most of farmers were in small and marginal group, possess up to 3 to 4 animals having TV/Mobile/ Cycle/Motorcycle facilities.

REFERENCES

- Girawale, V.B., Naik, R.M. and Patil, R.M., Personal, Socio-Economic and Communicational Characteristics of Root & Tuber crop growers (2016). *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, Vol:27 (2): 169-171
- Pandya, C.D., Bhatt, S.T. and Chauhan, N.M. (2013). Knowledge and Adoption Level of Farmers about Scientific Cultivation of Okra in Tapi district. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, Vol:24 : 102-104
- Pandya, C.D. and Pandya, R.D. (2010) A critical analysis of Socio-Economic Status of organic farming followers of South Gujarat. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis (Un published), Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari.
- Patel, R.R., Patel, P.K. and Patel, R.M. Personal and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Farmers of Sabarkantha district (2016). *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, Vol:27 (2): 151-153
- 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.
- Vohra, S.G., Thorat, G.N and Dweep Ramjiyani, Personal and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Livestock Keepers in Dahod district (2015). *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, Vol:26 (2): 195-198