Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences
Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci., Vol 10 [8] July 2021 : 222-226

Online ISSN 2277-1808
Journal's URL:http://www.bepls.com
CODEN: BEPLAD

SHORT COMMUNICATION **OPEN ACCESS**

Socio-economic profile of vegetables growers at different size group of farms in District Meerut western U.P.

Ashwani Kumar[1] and O.K.Tiwari[2]
Department of Agricultural Extension,
[1]CSSS (PG) College, Machhara, Meerut
[2] A.S.College,Lakhaoti , Bulandshar
*Corresponding Author E-mail: ak5206428@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The present investigation attempts to scrutinize the socio-economic profile of vegetable farmers of District-Meerut Uttar Pradesh. The study was conducted in four villages located at Meerut district comprise of 4 blocks in which one blocks namely i.e. Mawana, Parichitgarh, Macchara and Khakhonda were purposively selected. Four villages from four blocks were purposively selected vegetables growers. Thus the total sample size was of 125 farmer respondents. The data were collected through personal interview. The data were analysed and find out the tabulation, percentage and rank order. The findings of the study reveal that, the 52.0 per cent of the vegetable farmers had high school education. Among the sample about 46.4 per cent of farmers were small. The study revealed that the farmer can get an additional income of about Rs. 910 per day.in addition to their routine work from their production of different vegetables.
Key words: *Socio-economic profile, sugarcane grower farmers, different Size groups of farms*

Received 21.05.2021 Revised 22.06.2021 Accepted 15.07.2021

INTRODUCTION

Among the low income households vegetable cultivation has an increasingly important commercial role to play. It has great potentiality and scope for improving socio-economic condition of small and marginal farmers as vegetable growing in comparison to food grains cultivation provides higher yield and high economic return in short time. Vegetable growing being an intensive programme, it has more income per unit area and employment generation in short span of time [1]. In India where per capita availability of land has been gradually decreasing and as such the small holdings are becoming smaller day by day and the deprived farmers are in a fix to adopt modern agricultural practices [2]. The exorbitant increase in the price of agricultural inputs is making traditional agriculture less remunerative. Whatever they are India has been bestowed with wide range of climate and physic-geographical conditions and as such is most suitable for growing various kinds' of vegetables. Vegetables are important constituents of Indian agriculture and nutritional security due to their short duration, higher production, nutritional richness, economic viability and ability to generate on-farm and off-farm employment[4,5]. India has witnessed voluminous increase in horticulture production over the last few years. Significant progress has been made in area expansion resulting in higher production. During 2017-18, the total area under horticulture crops was also up by 3.26 per cent at 25.66 million hectares (mha) from 24.85 million hectares (mha) in 2016-17. Horticulture production of the country is estimated to be 306.82 million tonnes during 2017-18, which is 2.05 per cent higher than the previous year's 300.64 million tonnes, and 8.5% higher than the past five years average production according to the third advance estimates of horticultural production released by the Agriculture Ministry. To address the problem of small, marginal or landless farmers, GOI started the Farmer The programme aims at enhancing farmer's scientist interface for technology development and application [6]. It was, therefore, required to study the profile of vegetable growers to get some knowledge about socio economic profile of vegetable growers.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Present study was conducted in the adopted villages of Farmer Meerut district comprise of 4 blocks in which one blocks namely i.e. Mawana, Parichitgarh, Mawana and Khakhonda were purposively selected. Four villages from four blocks were purposively selected and sugarcane growers were selected from all

villages. Thus the total sample size was of 125 farmer respondents. The data were collected through personal interview with the help of pre structured schedule. The data were analysed and find out the tabulation, percentage and rank order. A total of 125 farmers were under study during the two consecutive years 2018-2019. Precise sampling and study twenty (125) farmers from each village and a total of sixty (125) farmers were selected under production of vegetables in surrounding area in house during the study. They were provided with plug trays, farm yard manure (FYM), improved seeds of vegetables, for an area of about 4000 m2 (1acre) under Farmer Pre testing interview schedule was prepared for primary data collection, whereas the secondary data were collected from base line survey of the project, Gram Panchayat, Sarpanch, Sachive and progressive farmers through direct face to face interviews. Frequency, percentage distribution and mean yield and income were used as statistical tools for the study for vegetable growers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The socio-economic approach is mainly concerned with the social, economic, and political aspects of individuals or social groups in society. Generally the socioeconomic approach focuses on identifying the adaptive capacity of individuals or communities based on their internal characteristics such as age, education, size of land holding, social participation, and farm power and so on [1-3]. Variations of these factors are responsible for the variations in socioeconomic characteristics of farmers. The findings about the socioeconomic status of the study area are given in the Table 1.

On the basis of age

Investigation indicates that majority of the vegetable farmers (44.0%) were in middle age group, 22.4 per cent of vegetable farmers belonged to old age group and 31.67 per cent vegetable farmers were in young age group.

On the basis of education

Response with regards to education a higher percentage of (52.0 %) of respondents possessed high school and above level of formal education followed by middle school level (29.6 %), illiterate (0.04%) and primary level (17.06%) of education.

On the basis of Land Holding

Investigated depicts that 32.80 per cent of vegetable farmers were having less than 1 ha of land, thus belonged to marginal farmers category. The farmers who belonged to small and medium categories were 46.40 per cent and 0.08 per cent, respectively. Data also shows that none of vegetable farmers were having large land holding. Thus, it may be concluded that majority of the vegetable farmers were small farmers having 1.01 to 1 hectare of agricultural land. This is due to the fact that in Madhya Pradesh, per capita agricultural land is comparatively less. The other reason may be the fragmentation of the holdings due to nuclear family system [4].

On the basis of Social Participation

The table 1 shows that the high school participation 52.0 per cent of the vegetable farmers were the member of one organization, while medium 38.4 % were the member of 11-15 organizations. In this way, 80% of vegetable farmers were associated with the organizations like panchayats, cooperatives,youth-club, religious and political organization [5]. It can also be concluded that only 4.39% of vegetable farmers were holding office in one or more organization.

On the basis of Farm Power

Vegetables production from the farm power shows the number of instruments the farmer has to deploy for its agricultural needs and allied farming. For measuring the variable, open response from farmers was recorded. Table 1 depicts that majority of vegetable farmers (5.12%) had have low level of farm power followed by medium level (2.48%).With regards to Psychological attributes of the respondent's i.e. economic motivation**,** scientific orientation and innovation proneness among the respondents were studied. With regards to economic motivation a higher percentage of (4.00 %) economic motivation was carried out by medium group of respondents followed by high group (3.28%) and low (2.56%). Scientific orientation was high among medium group of respondents i.e. 4.48% followed by high group of respondents (3..36 %) whereas lowvegetable growers (2.48%) had high level of innovation proneness**.** (Table–1) In the study of communicational attributers of the respondent's due to time to time contact and providing need based trainings to the farmers by the farmer [7].They had high mass media exposure 4.05% and followed by medium 3.36%. Contact with the development agencies high 4.0% followed by medium 3.36% in the Table-1.

The findings, income generation of the farmers through vegetable production of the investigation area are given in Table 2, reveals that the distribution of production potential of vegetables at farmer's field i.e. brinjal, tomato, okra, chilli and cabbage all were cultivated in 365, 365,348,300 and 285 m2 followed by cauliflower, bitter guard and bottle guard in 125, 112, and 100 m2 all vegetables were grown in total

2000 m2 area. The production potential of vegetable in terms of average production showed that brinjal, followed by tomato was more remunerative in terms of production. The economic analysis of the inputs and out puts of the vegetables growers showed that on the basis of average production and cost involved in the production for the eight different vegetables (Table-3) shows that a family having an area of (½ acre) 2000 m2 can earn net return of Rs. 12138 from brinjal followed by Rs. 11507 from tomato, Rs. 6469 from itter guard, Rs. 5541 from cauliflower, Rs. 5038 from okra, Rs 3997, Rs 1375 from chilli and Rs. 1134 from bottle guard. Further it shows that the farmer can get an additional income of about Rs. 910 per day in addition to their routine work with the production of different vegetables [2]. The socioeconomic characteristics of farmers are important for better policy options. On the basis of the findings it is suggested that socio-economic status of the farmers can be improved by imparting technical knowledge/ training to vegetable farmers, increasing their education level and increasing their social participation are very needful.

Table.1 The socioeconomic profile of vegetable growers (Mean two consecutive years 2018-19 and 2019-20)

S.No.	Categories of attributes	Categories of respondents			
		N-125			Percent
A	**Socio personal attributes of the respondents**				
1.	**Age**	**2018-19**	**2019-20**	**Mean**	**%**
	Young (18 – 35 years)	36	32	34	27.2
	Middle (36 – 55 years)	56	54	55	44.0
	Old (above 55 years)	27	29	28	22.4
2.	Education				
	Illiterate	06	04	05	0.04
	Primary passed	23	21	22	17.6
	Middle passed	36	38	37	29.6
	High school passed and above	67	63	65	52.0
3.	Size of land holdings				
	Marginal (0.5 to 1.0 ha)	43	39	41	32.8
	Small (1.1 to 1.5 ha)	59	57	58	46.4
	Medium (1.6 to 2.0 ha)	12	10	11	0.08
	Large (2.1 to 2.5 ha)	03	05	04	0.03
4.	Social participation				
	Low (5 – 10)	27	31	29	23.2
	Medium (11 – 15)	24	24	48	38.4
	High (16 – 20)	38	24	65	52.2
5.	Farm power				
	Low (Up to 5)	62	66	64	5.12
	Medium (13 – 16)	29	33	31	2.48
	High (above 16)	22	25	24	1.92
6.	Material process				
	Low (Up to 12)	49	53	51	4.08
	Medium (13 – 16)	38	42	40	3.20
	High (above 16)	29	33	31	2.48
B	**Psychological attributes of the respondents**				
1	Economic Motivation				
	Low (24 – 30)	30	34	32	2.56
	Medium (31 – 36)	51	49	50	4.00
	High (37 – 42)	39	43	41	3.28
2.	Scientific orientation				
	Low (24 – 30)	34	28	31	2.48
	Medium (31 – 36)	59	53	56	4.48
	High (37 – 42)	45	39	42	3.36
3	Innovation proneness				
	Low (Up to 5)	19	23	21	1.68
	Medium (6 – 9)	39	43	41	3.28
	High (above 9)	51	53	52	4.16
C	**Communicational attributes of the respondents**				
1.	Mass media exposure				
	Low (up to 7)	27	29	28	2.24
	Medium (8 – 11)	41	43	42	3.36
	High (above 11)	53	49	51	4.08
2.	Contact with development agencies				
	Low (Up to 6)	23	25	24	1.68
	Medium (7 – 10)	41	43	42	3.36
	High (above 10)	52	48	50	4.00

Table.2: Vegetables production potential at farmer's field (Mean two consecutive years 2018-19 and 2019-20))

S. No.	Name of crop	Area (m^2)			Average production (Kg)			Duration (Days)		
		2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean
1	Okara	348	344	346	369	373	371	86	88	87
2	Bottle Guard	100	114	107	162	166	164	88	92	90
3	Chilli	300	350	325	152	164	158	140	142	141
4	Brinjal	365	365	365	1675	1547	1611	124	126	125
5	Tomato	365	331	348	1370	1236	1303	125	129	127
6	Cabbage	285	265	275	1317	1325	1321	114	116	115
7	Cauliflower	125	117	121	1065	1197	1131	109	115	112
8	Bitter guard	112	114	113	956	116	536	182	186	184
	Total	**2000**	**2000**	**2000**	**7066**	**6124**	**6595**	**968**	**994**	**981**

Table.3: Income generation of the production of vegetables from half acre area (Mean two consecutive years 2018-19 and 2019-20)

S. No.	Name of crop	Area m2			Cost of cultivation (Rs.)			Gross return (Rs.)			Net return (Rs.)			Net Income / Day		
		2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean	2018-19	2019-20	Mean
1	Okara	348	344	346	2823	2873	2848	8153	7619	7886	7886	2848	5038	98	94	96
2	Bottle Guard	100	114	107	765	629	697	1866	1796	1831	1831	697	1134	105	111	108
3	Chilli	300	350	325	1166	1130	1148	2532	2514	2523	2523	1148	1375	145	135	140
4	Brinjal	365	365	365	2176	2210	2193	14525	14137	14331	14331	2193	12138	135	133	134
5	Tomato	365	331	348	2676	2596	2636	14327	13959	14143	14143	2636	11507	138	136	137
6	Cabbage	285	265	275	2395	2415	2405	5945	6859	6402	6402	2405	3997	96	94	95
7	Cauliflower	125	117	121	1267	1213	1240	6780	6782	6781	6781	1240	5541	84	88	86
8	Bitter guard	112	114	113	1126	1152	1139	7321	7895	7608	7608	1139	6469	112	116	114
	Total	2000	2000	2000	14394	14218	14306	61449	61561	61505	61505	14306	47199	913	907	910

REFERENCES

1. Amlendra Kumar Verma et all, Dan Singh, DK Singh, Manoj Kumar Singh and Gaje Singh (2019). Socio-Economic profile of vegetable growers in Western Uttar Pradesh, India, Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry; 8(1): 1508-1511.
2. Mohammad Imran Khan1, Sharad Bisen and Gaurav Mahajan (2020), Socio-Economic Profile of Vegetable Growers under Horticulture based Module of Farmer FIRST Project in Balaghat (M.P.), India, *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci, 9*(3): 3252-3257.

3. Pradeep Kumar and OP Mishra (2018). Communication behaviour of tribal vegetable growers in Ranchi district of Jharkhand state, Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry ; 7(5): 196-201.
4. PrajaktaTelange, DM Mankar and TruptiRathod (2019). Personal, socio-economic profile of theshadenet owners in Vidarbha region; ournal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry ; 8(5): 164-168
5. RenuJethi, ManikLal Roy, AnirbanMukherjee, Nirmal Chandra and Pratibha Joshi (2015). Knowledge Level of Vegetable Growing Farmers in Hills of Uttarakhand: A Comparative Study; *TECHNOFAME- A Journal of Multidisciplinary Advance Research* Vol.8 No. 2, 01-08.
6. Dan Singh, R.N. Yadav, D.K. Singh, Gopal Singh, Rajendra Singh and Balvir Singh (2018). Effectiveness of Extension Methods for Knowledge and Skill Development; *Indian Journal of Extension Education Vol. 54, No. 4, 2018 (147-152)*
7. M.J. Azad, M.S. Ali, M.R. Islam, M. Yeasminand K.H. pk (2014). Problem perceived by the farmers in vegetable cultivation *J. Expt. Biosci. 5(2): 63-68,*

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

Ashwani Kumar and O.K.Tiwari. Socio-economic profile of vegetables growers at different size group of farms in District Meerut western U.P. Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci., Vol10[8] July 2021 : 222-226