

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

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

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.

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