



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2017; SPI: 1117-1119

Masudkar DD
PG, Student of Department of
Extension Education, College of
Agriculture, Latur, Maharashtra,
India

Kamble VB
Professor, Department of
Extension Education, College of
Agriculture, Latur, Maharashtra,
India

Anarase MS
M.Sc. (Agri), Scholar of
Department of Extension
Education College of Agriculture,
Latur, Maharashtra, India

Socio-economic status of the farmers in adopted village

Masudkar DD, Kamble VB and Anarase MS

Abstract

The present study was undertaken in the Latur district of Marathwada region Maharashtra state. to know socio-economic status of the farmers in adopted and non-adopted village. The socio-economic characteristics pertaining to demography, means of production and investment income and expenditure pattern of people living in a particular location strongly influence their responses to technological changes and participation in development schemes. Thereby 75 respondents were selected from adopted village. From the study it is found that majority of the respondents belonging to adopted village were from middle age, educated up to middle school education level, belonging to open category with medium and lower equal size of family having marginal land holding category with medium annual income, scientific orientation, economic motivation, risk preference. Regarding non adopted village respondents they were found in middle age, open category, having large size of family, medium land holding category, with medium annual income, scientific orientation, risk preference, economic motivation having medium level category. In respect of socio-economic status it was found that majority of adopted and non adopted village respondents had medium level of socio-economic status.

Keywords: socio-economic status, farmers, adopted village

Introduction

Socio-economic status is the field of study that examines social and economic factors to better understand how the combination of both influences something. The socio-economic characteristics pertaining to demography, means of production and investment of income and expenditure pattern of people living in a particular location strongly influence their responses to technological changes and participation in development schemes. The goal of socio-economic study is to bring about socio-economic development in terms of understanding the present condition of a particular area. Socio-economic study of villages is mainly for understanding the present condition of villages regarding the lifestyle, education status, and health status, dependency on forest, water hazards, food scarcity and overall development of rural areas. Study focuses on socio-economic status and of respondents. It becomes necessary for extension workers to recognize the respondents with attitude and the respondents who are lagging behind the course of development. Socio-economic status gives a picture of an individual and his family in respect of social and economic position in a community. Chapin has described socio-economic status as "The position of an individual or a family". The study focuses on social class structure in selected villages.

Specific Objectives

1. To study the profile of the respondents.
2. To study Socio-economic status of the respondents.

Methodology

The present study was conducted in Latur district of the Marathwada region of Maharashtra State. Latur district was purposively selected as it was convenience to researcher. There are Ten Tahsils of Latur district of which one Tehsil namely Latur was selected purposively for study. For the purpose of study, from the selected Tehsil one village was selected i.e. Adopted village Khulgapur was selected purposively for the study. Selecting the respondents criteria was followed. Respondents selected from adopted village. From Adopted village 75 respondents was selected randomly. Thus, Ex-post facto design of social research was used in the present study. Specially developed interview schedule was developed for data collection from adopted villages. Collection of data regarding socio-economic status of the respondent's from selected Adopted villages was gathered by personally interviewing the respondents by focusing on socio-economic status of the respondents in adopted villages. The respondents were taken into confidence by establishing a rapport with them prior to interviewing them.

Correspondence
Kamble VB
Professor, Department of
Extension Education, College of
Agriculture, Latur, Maharashtra,
India

Thus, data were obtained that personal interview method and generally the respondents either were interviewed at farm or at their homes.

Results & Discussion

1. To study the profile of the respondents.

1. Age

It was noticed from Table 1. That majority of the respondents (65.34 per cent) were from middle age group followed by young age group (14.66 per cent) and old age group (20.00 per cent). This shows that majority of the respondents were from middle age group in adopted village. The reason might be that middle aged persons are more experienced. They are actually doing the agriculture.

2. Caste

It was noteworthy from Table 1. That majority of the respondents (73.33 per cent) were from open category followed by NT category (12.00 per cent) and OBC (8.00 per cent), ST (4.00 per cent), and only (2.67 per cent) from SC category in adopted village.

3. Family size

It was observed from Table 1. That 40.00 per cent of respondents had medium family size whereas, 20.00 per cent of respondents had low size of family and 40.00 per cent of respondents had high family size.

4. Education

It was observed from Table 1. there was slight difference in education among adopted and non- adopted village. It was clear from Table 6 that 48.00 per cent of the respondents were educated up to middle school, 17.33 per cent of respondents were educated up to primary school level, 14.67 per cent of respondents were higher secondary school education, 12.00 per cent of the respondents were illiterate, 8.00 per cent of respondents were can read and write from adopted village.

5. Land holding

It was observed from table 1. that 40.00 per cent of respondents were marginal farmers (up to 1 ha), 33.33 per cent of respondents were small farmers (1.1 to 2.0 ha), While 21.33 per cent of respondents were semi - medium farmers (2.1 to 4.0 ha), 5.34 per cent medium land holding category (4.1 to 10 ha) and 0.00 per cent from big land holding (Above 10 ha) category of adopted village respondents.

6. Annual income

It was observed from Table 1. that 81.37 per cent of the respondents had medium level of annual income i.e. Rs. 36273 to 306660, while 13.33 per cent of respondents had high level of annual income Rs306661 and 5.30 per cent of respondents had low annual income i.e.36272.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondent according to their profile

Sr. No.	Variables	Adopted Village (N=75)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	Age		
	Young	11	14.66
	Middle	49	65.34
	Old	15	20.00
2	Caste		
	SC	2	2.67
	ST	3	4.00
	NT.D/VJNT	9	12.00
	OBC	6	8.00
	OPEN	55	73.33
3	Size of Family		
	Small	15	20
	Medium	30	40
	Large	30	40
5	Education		
	Illiterate	9	12.00
	Can read and write	6	8.00
	Primary School	13	17.33
	Middle School	36	48.00
	Higher Secondary School	11	14.67
5	Size land holding		
	Marginal	30	40.00
	Small	25	33.33
	Semi-medium	16	21.33
	Medium	4	5.34
	Big	0	0
6	Annual income		
	Low	4	5.30
	Medium	61	81.37
	High	10	13.33
7	Scientific orientation		
	Low	7	9.33
	Medium	57	76.00
	High	11	14.67
8	Economic motivation		
	Low	9	12.00
	Medium	55	73.33

	High	11	14.67
9	Risk preference		
	Low	16	21.33
	Medium	45	60.00
	High	14	18.67

7. Land holding

It was observed from table 1. that 40.00 per cent of respondents were marginal farmers (up to 1 ha), 33.33 per cent of respondents were small farmers (1.1 to 2.0 ha), While 21.33 per cent of respondents were semi - medium farmers (2.1 to 4.0 ha), 5.34 per cent medium land holding category (4.1 to 10 ha) and 0.00 per cent from big land holding (Above 10 ha) category of adopted village respondents.

8. Annual income

It was observed from Table 1. that 81.37 per cent of the respondents had medium level of annual income i.e. Rs. 36273 to 306660, while 13.33 per cent of respondents had high level of annual income Rs306661 and 5.30 per cent of respondents had low annual income i.e.36272.

9. Scientific orientation

It was observed from Table 1. that the information of the respondents regarding their scientific orientation. It is clear from above data that 76.00 per cent of the respondents had medium scientific orientation, whereas, 14.67 per cent of the respondent had high followed by 9.33 per cent of the respondents had low scientific orientation.

10. Economic motivation

It was observed from Table 1. that the information of the respondents regarding their Economic motivation it is clear from data that 73.33 per cent of the respondents had medium economic motivation, whereas, 14.67 per cent of the respondent had high followed by 12.00 per cent of the respondents had low economic motivation.

11. Risk preference

It was observed from Table 1. That 60.00 per cent of respondents had medium risk preference whereas, 21.33 per cent of respondents had low risk preference followed by 18.67 per cent of the respondents having high risk preference.

2. To study Socio-economic status of the respondents.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic status

Sr. No.	Category	Adopted village (N=75)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low	7	9.33
2.	Medium	53	70.67
3.	High	15	20.00

It was observed from Table 2. That 70.67 per cent of respondents had middle socio-economic status, followed by 20.00 per cent of respondents in high socio-economic status, 9.33 per cent of respondents from low category of socio-economic status of the respondents in adopted village.

Conclusions

Village is the prime institute striving for integrated rural development. Study focuses on socio-economic status of respondents. The study indicated that, It was observed that majority of the respondents were from middle age 65.34 per

cent in adopted village, the 73.33 per cent of the respondents from open caste category, 40.00 per cent of the respondents having large size of family (above 7 members) in adopted village. Considering education of respondents in adopted village having up to middle school education 48.00 per cent belonging to adopted village, Nearly half of the respondents from adopted village having marginal land holding 40.00 per cent, Nearly half and above respondents of the adopted village 81.37 per cent had medium level of annual income. The 76.00 per cent of the respondents from adopted village had medium scientific orientation, 73.33 per cent of the respondents of adopted village had medium level of economic motivation. The 60.00 per cent of the respondents of adopted village had medium level of risk preference. Regarding the socio-economic status 70.67 per cent of respondents had middle socio-economic status, followed by 20.00 per cent of respondents in high socio-economic status, 9.33 per cent of respondents from low category of socio-economic status of the respondents in adopted village.

References

1. Atanu Nanda. The socio-economic status of pineapple growers under contract farming condition. Department of Agril. Extension Education, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Mohanpur-741252, India, Indian Journal of Agricultural Research. 2012; 46(3):256-261.
2. Chapin PS. A quantity scale for for rating of home and social environment. Measurement Of socio-economic status journal education Psychology. Vol. 19, p-19
3. Hadole SM. Socio-economic status of farmers adopting different farming systems in Ratnagiri district. M. Sc. (Agri.) B. B. K. K. V., Dapoli. 2005.
4. Manay S, Farzana C. Socio-economic characteristics of rural family. Maharashtra J. Extn. Edun. 2000; 19:325-328.
5. Patel AR. Socio-economic status of tribal farm women's as influence by milk Co-operative Krishi Vigyan Kendra Ambheli, Valsad, Gujrat, India Agri update. 2012; 7(3/4):316-318.
6. Shisode MG. Socio-economic status characteristics of rural dairy farmers in Maharashtra II Family size, heard size and Annual Income, Krantisingha Nana Patil college of veterinary science (MAPS) University Shirval-412801, MH, India. 2009.