

PERSONAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FARMERS OF SABARKANTHA DISTRICT

R.R. Patel¹, P.K. Patel² and R.M. Patel³

1 Assistant Research Scientist, OFR Project, SDAU, Jagudan - 382710

2 Associate Research Scientist, AICRP-IFS, SDAU, SKNagar-385506

3 Assistant Professor, College of Agri-Business Management, SDAU, SKNagar-385506

Email : rrpatelecon@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

An attempt was made to study the socio-economic characteristics of farmers of sabarkantha district. Out of 13 block one high productive and one low productive block were selected purposively. Three villages from each block were selected randomly making the sample size of 321. The majority of the respondents were old 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 three to four 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 sabarkantha district is a one of the lodging district of the state. The study was conducted before bifurcation of the district. The district had 5 tribal and 8 non tribal talukas. 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 Sabarkantha district" was planned with the following specific objective:

OBJECTIVE

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

METHODOLOGY

Sabarkantha district was selected purposively. Out of 13 blocks one high productive (Idar) and low productive (Megharaj) 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 321 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 master table and analysed in terms of frequency and percentage in order to make findings meaningful.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that majority (54.83 per cent) of the farmers belonged to old age group, followed by 33.96 per cent with middle age and 11.21 per cent in young age group. The 37.38 per cent of the farmers had education up to secondary/ higher secondary and followed by primary level, (30.53 per cent), illiterate (24.92 per cent) and only 7.17 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.

The data indicate that 38.32 per cent of the farmers belonged to General category followed by other backward class (31.46 per cent) and Schedule caste (15.89 per cent). Only 14.33 per cent respondents were from schedule tribe category.

Table 1 : Personal and Socio-economical characteristics of respondents

n=321

Sr. No.	Personal Characteristics	No.	Percent
1	Age		
	Young (below 35 years)	36	11.21
	Middle (36 to 50 years)	109	33.96
	Old (Above 50 years)	176	54.83
2	Education level		
	Illiterate	80	24.92
	Primary (1 st to 7 th standard)	98	30.53
	Secondary / Higher secondary (8 th to 12 th standard)	120	37.38
	Graduation and above	23	07.17
3	Caste		
	Schedule Caste	51	15.89
	Schedule Tribe	46	14.33
	Other backward caste	101	31.46
4	General	123	38.32
	Family size		
	Small family (up to 4 members)	111	34.58
	Medium family (5 to 8 members)	174	54.21
5	Large family (more than 9 members)	36	11.22
	Occupation		
	Only Agriculture	35	10.90
6	Agriculture + Animal husbandry	286	89.10
	Average annual income		
	Up to ₹ 1,00,000/-	36	11.21
	₹ 1,00,001/- to ₹ 2,00,000/-	74	23.05
	₹ 2,00,001/- to ₹ 3,00,000/-	92	28.66
	₹ 3,00,001/- to ₹ 4,00,000/-	45	14.02
7	Above ₹ 4,00,000/-	74	23.05
	Land holding		
	Marginal (Upto 0.99 ha.)	111	34.58
	Small (1.0 to 1.99 ha.)	106	33.02
	Medium (2.0 to 3.99 ha.)	67	20.87
8	Large (above 4.0 ha.)	37	11.53
	Animal possession (milch)		
	Up to 2 animals	124	43.36
	3 to 4 animals	102	35.66
9	More than 4 animals	60	20.98
	Agricultural implements		
	Indigenous/ Improved plough	134	41.74
	Bullock cart	94	29.28
	Tractor	47	14.64
	Chaff cutter	80	24.92
	Thresher	47	14.64
	Sprayer pump	153	47.66
Diesel pump/ Electric motor	190	59.19	
10	House hold items		
	T.V. colour / Black & White	246	76.64
	LPG Connection	053	16.51
	Cycle	170	52.96
	Motor cycle/ Scooter	166	51.71
	Mobile Phone	168	52.34

More than half (54.21 per cent) of the farmers belonged to medium sized families i.e. five to eight members, while 34.58 per cent of them belonged to small size families having up to four members and 11.22 per cent belonged to large families having above nine members. It can be observed from the data that more than four-fifth (89.10 per cent) of the farmers had occupation of agriculture with animal husbandry. Only 10.90 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 28.66 per cent of farmers earned annual total income ranging from ₹ 2,00,001/- to ₹ 3,00,000/- followed by 23.05 per cent of them had annual income in both category ranging from ₹ 1,00,001/- to ₹ 2,00,000/- and ₹ 4,00,000/-, 14.02 per cent had annual income ranging ₹ 3,00,001/- to ₹ 4,00,000/- . Only 11.21 per cent earned annual income below ₹ 1,00,000/- . Observed from the table that more than one-third (34.58 per cent) marginal farmers. While, 33.02 per cent of them were small farmers followed by medium farmers (20.87 per cent) and large farmers (11.53 per cent). It indicates that more than two-third farmers had land holding below 2.0 hectare and only one-third of the farmers have more than 2.0 hectares land holding.

Looking to the possession of animals, it is clear that more than two-fifth (43.36 per cent) possessed milch animal up to two followed by 35.66 per cent with three to four animals and 20.98 per cent possess more than four 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 (59.19 per cent) farmers

possessed diesel pump/ electric motor, followed by sprayer pump (47.66 per cent), indigenous improved plough (41.74 per cent), bullock cart (29.28 per cent), chaff cutter (24.92 per cent) and tractor & thresher (14.64 per cent). Moreover, the data reveal that majority of farmers possessed television (76.64 per cent) followed by cycle (52.96 per cent), mobile phone (52.34 per cent), motor cycle/ scooter (51.71 per cent) and LPG connection (16.51 per cent).

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that majority of farmers were found in the old and middle aged group and most of them were educated up to secondary level, belonged to general and 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 four animals and three to four animals having TV/Mobile/Cycle/Motorcycle facilities.

REFERENCES

- 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 (Unpub.), Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari
- 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

Received : July 2016 : Accepted : October 2016