



Studies on Profile of Rice Growers in Dumka District Of Jharkhand

Rajiv Kumar

Scientist (Plant Protection)

Krishi Vigyan Kendra* under Birsa Agricultural University, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

E-mail: rjv123kmr@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Dumka district of Jharkhand to know the socio-economic status of farmers. They were categorized in two groups i.e. small and medium farmers which were differ from each other with regard to socio personal attributes. Majority of the respondents in small category were from middle age group as well as in medium category were from middle age. Medium land holding famers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers, both small and medium belonged to backward caste, medium land holding respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer who possessed small size of land, the maximum number of respondents in small categories had kaccha type and in medium category had mixed type of houses, the majority of the medium farmers were engaged in agriculture alone. While majority of small farmers were dependent on agriculture along with labour. The majority of the families have 6-10 members. Medium holding rice growers had high material possession than small farmers and majority of small farmers were not associated with any of the organization. Whereas, majority of the respondents in medium category were members of more than one organization and medium farmers have better socio-economic status than the small farmers. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in respect of psychological attributes. The medium rice growers depict a higher level of economic motivation, risk orientation, scientific orientation and aspiration for adoption of technologies as compared to the small rice growers. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in the ability to receive message related to agriculture through mass media. The farmers also mentions contact with the development agencies; hence, participate in the extension development programmes. While the small farmers have less exposure to mass media, low or no contact with development agencies and have low or no participation in rice training programme.

Key Words: Rice, socio-economic status, small farmers, medium farmers

Received 11.05.2017

Revised 29.06.2017

Accepted 09.07.2017

INTRODUCTION

Rice is staple food of humid areas of Assam, Manipur, West Bengal, Orissa, Jharkhand, Bihar, Eastern U.P. and South India. It prefers low lying and water logged areas where none of the other cereals could be grown. However, evolution of new plant type has made it possible to grow rice even in areas having relatively low rainfall and lighter soil types like Punjab, Haryana, and Western U.P. etc. It has also observed that the yield is much higher in newly acquired areas than the traditional rice growing areas which could be accounted for evolution of high yielding dwarf plant types, better soil and water management practices and efficient nutrient management schedule etc. Rice is one of the major crops of Jharkhand and occupies 7.17 lakh hectares contributing 10.40 lakh tones grain to the state and has direct effect on the economy of the farmers of the state. The average yield of the Jharkhand (1.45 tonns/ha) is below the national demonstration yield (1.9 t/ha). The present study was made to know the socio-economic condition of rice grower in Dumka district.

METHODOLOGY

The Dumka district of Jharkhand was selected purposively for the study. The district comprises of ten blocks, out of which Saraiyhat block was selected because it is the only block where rice is extensively cultivated. Ten villages were randomly selected for the study of the Saraiyhat block. Lists of sampling

farmers were made from each village and then the respondents were categorized on the basis of size of land holding.

Proportionate random samples of 30 per cent from each category i.e. small and medium farmers were selected from each village. Thus, the samples of 150 farmers were constituted for the purpose. The socio-personal variables were studied (1), Psychological variable viz. Economic motivation and risk on emotional scientific orientation (2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is obvious from Table 1 that 52 per cent of the small land holding respondents were of middle age group (36-55 years) followed by 30 per cent of young age group (up to 35 years). While, 18 per cent of small land holding respondents was of young age group (56 and above years). Similarly, 60 per cent of medium holding respondents were in the middle age group (35-55 years) followed by 24 per cent in the young age group (up to 35 years) and 16 per cent of old age group (56 and above years). Thus, majority of the respondents in small and medium category were from middle age.

Table 1: Profile of respondents in respect to socio personal attributes.

Sl. No.	Socio- personal variables	Category of attributes	Categories of respondents (N – 150)				Total farmers (N-150)	
			Small (100)		Medium (50)			
			f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Age	Young (Up to 35 yrs)	27	27	10	20	37	24.67
		Middle (35-55 yrs)	56	56	33	66	89	59.34
		Old (56 and above)	17	17	07	14	24	16.00
2.	Caste	General	08	08	07	14	15	10.00
		Backward (BCI, BCII)	65	65	25	50	90	60.00
		Schedule tribe	21	21	12	24	33	22.00
		Schedule caste	06	06	06	12	12	8.00
3.	Education	Illiterate	38	38	09	18	47	31.34
		Can read and write	21	21	18	36	39	26.00
		Primary education	15	15	10	20	25	16.67
		Middle School	11	11	07	14	18	12.00
		High School	13	13	03	06	16	10.67
		Graduate & above	02	02	03	06	5	3.34
4.	Size of land holdings	Up to one acres	29	29	12	24	41	27.34
		Up to 5 acres	53	53	14	28	67	44.67
		Above 5 acres	18	18	24	48	42	28.00
5.	Type of house	Kanccha	55	55	10	20	65	43.34
		Mixed	37	37	35	70	72	48.00
		Pucca	08	08	05	10	13	8.67
6.	Occupation	Agriculture	12	12	21	42	33	22.00
		Agriculture + Labour	48	48	09	18	57	38.00
		Agriculture + Caste occupation	31	31	15	30	46	30.67
		Agriculture + Service + Business	09	09	05	10	14	9.34
7.	Annual Income	Low income (Up to Rs. 70,000.00)	41	41	09	18	50	33.34
		Medium income (Rs. 70,000-1,40,000.00)	48	48	13	26	61	40.67
		High income (above Rs.140000)	11	11	28	56	39	26.00
8.	Size of family	Small (up to 5 members)	20	20	06	12	26	17.34
		Medium (6-10 members)	57	57	36	72	93	62.00
		Large (above 10 members)	23	23	08	16	31	20.67
9.	Material Possession	Low (up to 8)	58	58	12	24	70	46.67
		Medium (9-13)	32	32	28	56	60	40.00
		High (above 13)	10	10	10	20	20	13.34
10.	Social participations	Members none organization	59	59	05	10	64	42.67
		Members of one organization	33	33	10	20	43	28.67
		Members of more than one organization	08	08	35	70	43	28.67

f= Frequency % = Per cent

Table 2: Profile of respondents in respect to psychological attributes.

Sl. No.	Psychological attributes	Category of attributes	Categories of respondents (N – 150)				Total farmers (N-150)	
			Small(100)		Medium(50)			
			f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Economic motivation	Low (up to 27)	74	74	07	14	81	54.00
		Medium (28-31)	26	26	31	62	57	38.00
		High (above 31)	00	00	12	24	12	8.00
2.	Risk orientation	Low (up to 24)	81	81	00	00	81	54.00
		Medium (25-30)	19	19	40	80	59	39.34
		High (above 30)	00	00	10	20	10	6.67
3.	Scientific orientation	Low (up to 20)	89	89	00	00	89	59.34
		Medium (21-26)	11	11	31	62	42	28.00
		High (above 26)	00	00	19	38	19	12.67
4.	Aspiration	Low (up to 12)	22	22	00	00	22	14.67
		Medium (13-18)	78	78	17	34	95	63.34
		High (above 18)	00	00	33	66	33	22.00
5.	Management orientation	Low (up to 51)	67	67	00	00	67	44.67
		Medium (52-60)	33	33	13	26	46	30.67
		High (above 60)	00	00	37	74	37	24.67

f= Frequency % = Per cent

Table 3: Profile of respondents in respect to communicational attributes.

Sl. No.	Particular	Category of attributes	Categories of respondents (N – 150)				Total farmers (N-150)	
			Small (100)		Medium(50)			
			f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Mass media exposure	Low (up to 5)	71	71	11	22	82	54.67
		Medium (6-10)	23	23	35	70	58	38.67
		High (above 10)	06	06	04	08	10	6.67
		Low (up to 3)	84	84	04	08	88	58.67
2.	Contact with development agencies	Medium (4-6)	14	14	32	64	46	30.67
		High (above 6)	02	02	13	26	15	10.00
		Low (up to 4)	78	78	05	10	83	55.34
3.	Extension participation	Medium (5-8)	22	22	37	74	59	39.34
		High (above 8)	00	00	08	16	8	5.34

f= Frequency % = Per cent

The data resending the caste highest 54 per cent of the small land holding respondents were of backward caste followed by schedule tribe (25 per cent), general caste (11 per cent) and schedule caste (10 per cent) respectively. Similarly, 44 per cent of medium holding respondents were of backward caste followed by schedule tribe (20 per cent), schedule caste (20 per cent) and general caste (16 per cent) respectively.

Table 1 also depicts that the 20 per cent had no formal schooling but could only read and write. While the remaining 40 per cent small respondents had oral schooling out of which 40 per cent were illiterate followed by primary education (15 per cent), High school (13 per cent), middle school (10 per cent) and graduate and above (02 per cent). In case of medium farmer respondents, 20 percent were illiterate followed by respondents who can read and write (40 per cent), primary education (20 per cent), middle school (10 per cent), High school (06 per cent) and 04 per cent were graduate and above. From data it can be inferred that medium land holding farmers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers. Majority of the small respondents had land holding up to 5 acres while in case of medium respondents it is above 5 acres. Medium land holding respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer who possessed small size of land. Table also reveals that 52 per cent of the small land holding respondents were living in kaccha house, 40 per cent were in mixed and 08 per cent in pucca type of houses, whereas, 20 per cent of the medium land holding respondents were living in kaccha house followed by mixed house (72 per cent) and 08 per cent in pucca house. Half of the respondent in small land holding category had kaccha type of houses but in case of middle land holding category half of respondents had mixed type of houses.

The data regarding the occupation reveals that majority of the small farmers (48 per cent) were engaged in agriculture + labour followed by agriculture + caste occupation (33 per cent), agriculture (12 per cent) and in agriculture + service + business (7 per cent) respectively. Whereas, in case of medium farmers

majority of the respondents (44 per cent) were engaged in agriculture followed by agriculture + caste occupation, agriculture + labour (16 per cent) and agriculture + service + business (12 per cent) respectively. It reflects that the majorities of medium farmers were engaged in agriculture activities while majority of the small farmers were dependent on agriculture alone.

It is noticed that majority (60 per cent) of medium farmers were belonged to high income category (above Rs. 1, 40,000.00) and low income (up to Rs. 70,000.00) categories (18 per cent) respectively. Nearly half (45 per cent) of the small farmers were belonged to medium income category followed by low income (44 per cent) and high income (11 per cent) group. Majority of the respondents (small 53 and medium 72 per cent) had medium family size (6-10 members). About one fourth of the respondents (both categories) have small family size (25 members). Data indicated that there was no significant difference in both the categories regarding family size.

The inventory of material possession showed that 58 per cent were of small farmers and possessed low level of material possession while, 32 per cent had medium level of material possession. The data also indicated that 10 per cent respondent had high material possession. Whereas, 56 per cent respondents, in the medium category, had belonged to medium level of material possession followed by 24 per cent and 20 per cent belonging to medium and high level of material possession respectively. Overall medium holding rice growers have higher material possession than small holding farmers. The information regarding social participation indicated that 31 per cent of small farmers were members of one organization while 10 per cent small farmers were members of more than one organization. It is interesting to note that majority (59 per cent) of small farmers were not associated with any of the organization whereas, more than 70 per cent of the respondents in medium category were members of more than one organization and 20 per cent were members of one organization.

Majority (75 per cent) of small farmers showed a low level of economic motivation followed by medium (25 per cent) economic motivation. None of the respondents were found in the category of high level of economic motivation. With respect to medium respondents, majority (70 per cent) showed a medium level of economic motivation followed by high (20 per cent) and low (10 per cent). Here, medium farmers indicated medium level of economic motivation while small farmers showed low category of economic motivation (Table 2).

The data depicted in Table 2 revealed that majority (83 per cent) of the small respondents were in low level of risk orientation and 12 per cent had moderate level of risk orientation. None of the small respondents was found under the category of high level of risk level of risk orientations, whereas, in medium respondents majority (80 per cent) were indicating the moderate level of risk orientation and 20 per cent had high level of risk orientation. None of the medium respondents were found under the low level of risk orientation. Thus, it could be inferred on account of obtained result that majority of medium respondents had moderate level of risk orientation and small respondents had low level of risk orientation. Majority (92 per cent) of small farmers had low level of scientific orientation and 08 per cent had medium level of scientific orientation. None of the respondent was found in the categories of high level of scientific orientation. While in the medium farmers' category, majority (60 per cent) had medium level of scientific orientation followed by high (40 per cent). None of the respondent was found under the category of low scientific orientation. It means medium size of land holding had medium level of scientific orientation whereas small farmers had low level of scientific orientation. Majority of small land holdings farmers (79 per cent) had medium level of aspiration and 21 per cent had low level of aspiration. None of the respondent as found in the category of high level of aspiration. While, majorities of the medium category farmers (70 per cent) had high level of aspiration followed by medium categories (30 per cent). None of the respondent was observed under the category of low aspiration. This shows that, the medium farmers had good level of aspiration. Whereas, small farmers had low level of aspiration. 68 per cent of the small farmers have low level of management orientation exposure followed by medium (32 per cent) and none of the respondents had high level of management orientation. Whereas, in case of medium farmers majority (76 per cent) has high level of management orientation followed by medium level (24 per cent).

Higher percentage of small farmers (75 per cent) had low level of mass media exposure followed by medium (20 per cent) and high level (5 per cent) of mass media exposure, respectively. Whereas, in case of medium farmers majority (72 per cent) has medium level of mass media exposure followed by low category (20 per cent) and high category (8 per cent) (Table -3). It could be inferred that majority of medium respondents had medium level of mass media exposure, whereas, small respondents had low level o mass media exposure. Majority (86 per cent) of small farmers had low level of contact with development agencies followed by medium (12 per cent) and high (2 per cent) respectively. In case of medium farmers, majority (64 per cent) had medium level of contact with the development agencies and 28 per cent respondents belonged to medium level of contact with development agencies. While, 8 per

cent of the small respondents were fell into the category of low level of contact with development agencies. Therefore, it could be inferred on the basis of the data that medium respondents had high level of contact with development agencies than the small respondents.

The data regarding expansion participation revealed that the majority (81 per cent) of the small respondents were under the category of the low level of extension participation followed by medium level (19 per cent) and no extension participation of the small farmers were found under the category high level of extension participation. While in medium category, majority (76 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of extension participation followed by high (16 per cent) and low (8 per cent) level of extension participation. Thus, medium respondents had medium level of extension participation, whereas, the small respondents had low level of extension participation.

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that majority of the respondents in small and medium category were from middle age, medium land holding farmers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers. Both small and medium categories, majority of them belonged to backward caste. Medium land holding respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer. The data also revealed that maximum number of respondents in small categories had kaccha type and medium category had mixed types of house, the majority of medium farmers were engaged in agriculture alone while majority of small farmers were dependent on agriculture along with labour work. The majority of family size ranges between 6-10 members. Medium holding rice growers had high material possession than small farmers and majority of small farmers were not associated with any of the organization, whereas, majority of respondents in medium category were member of more than one organization. Further, it could be concluded that the medium farmers have better socio-economic status then the small farmers.

The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in respect of psychological attributes. The medium rice growers depict a higher level of economic motivation, risk orientation, scientific orientation and aspiration for adoption of technologies as compared to small rice growers. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in the ability to receive message related to agriculture through mass media. The farmers also mention contact with the development agencies had participated in the extension development programmes. While, the small farmers have less exposure to mass media, low or no contact with development agencies and have low or no participation in rice training programme.

REFERENCES

1. Trivedi, G. (1963). Measurement and analysis of socio-economic status of rural families. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Agril. Extn., IARI, New Delhi.
2. Supe, S.V. (1969). Factors related to different degree of rationality on decision making among farmers. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis is Agril. Extn. Ed., IARI, New Delhi.

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

Rajiv Kumar. Studies on Profile of Rice Growers in Dumka District Of Jharkhand . Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci., Vol 6[10] September 2017: 88-92