

Socio-economic Profile of Rice Growers in Jammu District of J&K State

Iqbal Singh¹, Sunil Kumar Singh¹ and Amardev Singh²

¹Department of Agricultural Extension, R.B.S. College, Bichpuri, Agra, (U.P.)

²Sericulture Development Department, Poonch (J&K)

Correspondence author: iqbalsingh1976@gmail.com

Abstract

The socio-economic profile of rice farmers in two randomly selected blocks namely R.S. Pura and Marh of Jammu district was studied. A total number of 240 farmers were selected randomly and were surveyed through structured schedule by personal interview method. The data indicated that majority of the respondents belongs to 45 years of age, had poor social participation and had education up to middle standard. Further, the majority of famers belong to marginal category having land holding below one hectare.

Keywords: Farmers, paddy, participation, land holding.

Paddy (*Oryza sativa*) is grown all over the world and is staple food for more than half of the world population. India is the second leading producer of rice in the world. In India, rice is grown on an area of 44 million hectares with a production of about 132 million tons (Sharma *et al.* 2015). Indian agriculture is the home of small and marginal farmers. Majority of the holdings are small and number of such holdings are increasing with fragmentation of land. Rice is a popular crop of selected blocks. It occupied a pivotal place in selected blocks domestic food and livelihood security system. Most of the farmers were either directly or indirectly related with it (Naeem-ur-Rehman Khattak and Anwar Hussain, 2008). Kim, 1993, studied that the proportion of farm income earned from rice in total farm income had decreased due to the rapid growth of farmers' non-agricultural income; almost 50% of agricultural income was earned from rice. Therefore, the present study has been designed to investigate the socio-economic

profiles of rural rice farmers in two blocks of district Jammu namely, R.S. Pura and Marh.

Methodology

Jammu district geographically and administratively consists of eight blocks namely Dansal, Bhalwal, Satwari, Khour, Akhnoor, Bishnah, R.S. Pura and Marh. Considering the vast geographical situation of the district, it was not practically possible to study the entire district. Therefore, the study was concentrated on two randomly selected blocks namely R.S. Pura and Marh. A sample of 240 paddy farmers was drawn at random following multistage random sampling method for the study. To collect the primary data from the farmers, a structured schedule was prepared well in advance and information collected by visiting each and every farmer individually. The data collected from the farmers was tabulated in the form of number, frequency and percentages for drawing meaningful conclusions.

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic features of the respondents:

The socio-economic background of the respondents was studied in terms of characteristics of individual farmers, their families and the farms namely size of holdings, type and size of family, caste background, social participation, urban contact, educational background, change agent linkage, number and type of building possessed and occupation background. The findings of these aspects are presented below under relevant sub-heads.

Age of the respondents

The respondents were categorized into three age groups, namely up to 30 yrs; 31-45 yrs and above 45 yrs. The age-group wise distribution of the respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Age Background of the Respondent

S. No.	Age group	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Up to 30 years	18	7.50
2.	31-45 years	42	17.50
3.	Above 45 years	180	75.00
Total		240	100.00

75 per cent of the respondents were found in the age group of above 45 years while 17.50 per cent belong to the age groups of 31 to 45 years and 7.50 per cent farmers belong to the age group of up to 30 years. Thus, from the above discussion, it may concluded that majority of the respondents are found in the age group of above 45 years.

Social background

The social background of the respondents was studied in terms of three major categories namely general caste, backward caste and scheduled caste. The data related to this aspect are presented in the Table 2. 55 per cent of the respondents belong to scheduled caste, while backward and general caste farmers were comparatively having low percentage of 17.5 per cent and 27.5 per cent respectively.

Table 2: Caste Background of the Respondents

S. No.	Caste	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	General caste	66	27.50
2.	Backward caste	42	17.50
3.	Scheduled caste	132	55.00
	Total	240	100.00

Educational background

Literacy is a very significant and common attribute of adoption of modern and improved technology of farming. Its connection with awareness of the farmer to know new innovations is not difficult to understand. Hence, education was considered an influential determinant of the progressive nature of the farmers, as it is supposed to affect his level of adoption of the modern technology and use of new agro input. The family leader decides about farm plans and arranges inputs for the production, which is largely based on farmer's experience and awareness which to an extent associated with his level of education. The education level of the farm family members in different farm size groups is given in Table 3. The educational status was divided into different categories namely illiterate, can read only, can read and write, primary, middle, high-school/intermediate, and graduate & above.

Table 3: Educational Background of the Respondents

S. No.	Level of education	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Illiterate	-	-
2.	Can read only	15	6.25
3.	Can read and write	24	10.00
4.	Primary	40	16.67
5.	Middle	89	37.08
6.	High school/intermediate	40	16.67
7.	Graduate and above	32	13.33
	Total	240	100.00

The overall literacy percentage of the farmers in the study area was absolutely 100 per cent, no one was found illiterate. The majority of the farmers (37.08%)

had education up to the middle level. 17 per cent of the respondents attained education up to primary level and those who can read and write were 10.00 per cent. Only 13 per cent farmers had education up to graduation level or above.

Family size and type of family

In agriculture, the family workers play an important role in enhancing farm income with its proper utilization. The family composition and family size have an important role in the utilization of farm labour, because in modern agriculture, proper use of available farm resources at proper time is essential in enhancing farm efficiency and ultimately the income. The availability of family farm labour for the farm use depends upon the size and composition of family. The size of the family being broadly grouped into two categories namely up to 5 members and above 5 members as indicated in Table 4. The majority of the respondents (62.5%) had family size up to 5 members per household while rest 37.5 per cent respondents belong to the families having more than 5 members.

Table 4: Distribution of the farmers according to size of family and type of family

S. No.	Size of family	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Up to 5 members	150	62.5
2.	Above 5 members	90	37.5
	Total	240	100.00
Family Type			
1.	Single	205	85.42
2.	Joint	35	14.58
	Total	240	100.00

The family composition background of the respondents was also studied in terms of the types of the families being categorized as single and joint families. 85 per cent of respondents were found living in a single family system and remaining 35 per cent were living in joint family (Table 4).

Participation of respondents in social activities

Social participation plays an important role in enhancing the knowledge and attitude level of

the farmers, which ultimately affect the economic condition. The participation of the respondents in the society has been assessed under the sub head, member of one or two organization, office bearer and public leader. Table 5 depicts the data regarding social participation of the respondents.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents on the basis of social participation

S. No.	Social participation	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	No participation	166	69.17
2.	Member of one organization	48	20.00
3.	Member of more than one organization	15	6.25
4.	Office holder	10	4.17
5.	Public leader	1	0.42
	Total	240	100.00

The social participation of the farmers was found to be very low. 69.17 per cent farmers had no participation in any of the social or political activity. 20 per cent farmers were member of only one organization. The percentage of those who are member in more than one organization, including office holder and public leader was 6.25, 4.17 and 0.41 per cent, respectively.

Change Agent Linkage

The monthly contact of the farmers with the extension agencies has been worked out and presented in Table 6. 27 per cent of the respondents had no contact with V.D.O.'s or Agricultural supervisor not even once a month while about 30 per cent farmers had contact with V.D.O.'s once a month and about 19 per cent contact twice a month. Only 12 per cent of the respondents had contact with V.D.O.'s, Agricultural supervisor four to six times in a month.

Annual income and size of land holding

Annual income of the household of selected farmers from all the sources have been calculated and presented in Table 7. The annual income of the farmers was categorized in different slabs starting from below ₹ 50,000 to above ₹ 3,00,000. The annual family income of majority of the sample farmers

(46.67%) was in the range of ₹ 50000 to ₹ 100000. whereas 41 per cent farmers earned the annual income in the range of ₹ 1, 00,000 to ₹1, 50, 0000. Out of total farmers under study 24, 16 and 24 per cent of the farmers earned ₹ 1,50,000 to 2,00,000, ₹ 2,00,000 to 2,50,000 and ₹ 2,50,000 to 3,00,000, respectively. As the small farmers were more in the sample and thus majority of the farmers was having annual income below ₹ 100000.

Table 6: Change Agent Linkage of the respondents

S. No.	Urban contact	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Not even once	65	27.08
2.	Once a month	73	30.42
3.	Twice a month	45	18.75
4.	Thrice a month	28	11.67
5.	Four times	23	9.58
6.	Five times	4	1.67
7.	Six times	2	0.83
	Total	240	100.00

Table 7: Distribution of the sample farmers according to annual income and size of land holding

S. No.	Income group	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Up to ₹ 50,000	8	3.33
2.	₹ 50,000 to 1,00,000	112	46.67
3.	₹ 1,00,000 to 1,50,000	41	17.08
4.	₹ 1,50,000 to 2,00,000	24	10.00
5.	₹ 2,00,000 to 2,50,000	16	6.67
6.	₹ 2,50,000 to 3,00,000	24	10.00
7.	Above ₹ 3,00,000	15	6.25
	Total	240	100.00
Size of land holding			
	Size of holding	No. of respondents	Percentage
1.	Below 1 ha.	177	73.75
2.	1 to 2 ha.	44	18.33
3.	Above 2 ha.	19	7.92
	Total	240	100.00

Table 8: Frequency of Farmers' contact with the extension agencies

Extension Agencies	weekly	Fort-nightly	Monthly	Once in 2 month	Once in 4 month	Once in 6 month	Total
Ag. Supervisor	3 (5.36)	7 (12.50)	25 (44.64)	10 (17.86)	6 (10.71)	5 (8.93)	56 (23.33)
Adult educator	5 (41.67)	2 (16.67)	2 (16.67)	1 (8.33)	1 (8.33)	1 (8.33)	12 (5.00)
A.E.O.	1 (3.70)	4 (14.81)	3 (11.11)	14 (51.85)	4 (14.81)	1 (3.70)	27 (11.25)
B.D.O.	2 (5.41)	9 (24.32)	13 (35.14)	8 (21.62)	4 (10.81)	1 (2.70)	37 (15.42)
S.M.S.	-	-	2 (20.00)	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)	1 (10.00)	10 (4.17)
DAO	2 (9.09)	6 (27.27)	4 (18.18)	4 (18.18)	2 (9.09)	4 (18.18)	22 (9.17)
FTV/KVK	14 (13.59)	17 (16.50)	20 (19.42)	22 (21.36)	16 (15.53)	14 (13.59)	103 (42.92)
Commercial agent	9 (7.76)	18 (15.52)	22 (18.97)	18 (15.52)	23 (19.83)	26 (22.41)	116 (48.33)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage

The size of farm is an important factor of production, which affects the mechanization and use of inputs on the farm. 74 per cent of the farmers owned land holding below 1 hectare while the percentage of the farmers having land holding 1 to 2 hectare and above 2 hectare was about 18 and 8 per cent respectively. It clearly shows the dominance of marginal and small farmers in the study area.

Contact with extension agencies

116 numbers of respondents had shown their contact with extension agencies while rest 124 respondents did not contact with any of the extension agency at all. Out of 240 respondents, only 116 respondents made contact with commercial agents, about 22 per cent respondents made contact once in 6 months and 20 per cent respondents made contact once in 4 months, 19 per cent respondents made contact monthly and 16 per cent respondents contacted fortnightly and rest 8 per cent respondent contacted weekly (Table 8). Out of 240 respondents, only 103 respondents made contact with FTC/KVK and among them about 16, 19, 21 and 16 per cent

respondents made contact fortnightly, monthly once in 2 and 4 months, respectively. 14 per cent of the respondents made contact weekly and once in 6 months. Out of 240 respondents, only 56 respondents made contact with Agriculture supervisor, among them percentage of respondents who made contact with Agriculture supervisor weekly, fortnightly and monthly was 5, 11 and 45 per cent respectively while approximately 18, 11 and 9 per cent of respondents respectively contacted once in two, four and six months.

References

- Sharma, K., Dhaliwal, N.S. and Kumar, A. 2015. Analysis of adoption and constraints perceived by small paddy growers in rice production technologies in Muktsar district of Punjab state, India. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu* **15**(2): 20-23.
- Kim, M.H. 1993. Structure of the rice market and proposals for rice policy changes in Korea. *J. Rural Dev. Seoul* **16**(1): 101-131.
- Rehman, Khattak and Hussain, A. 2008. An analysis of socioeconomic profile of rural rice farmers in district Swat. *Sarhad J. Agric* **24**(2): 377-382.

