Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

Bhanu Pratap Singh
Research Scholar, Department of Extension Education, NDUA& T Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

RK Doharey
Professor, Department of Extension Education, NDUA& T Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

SN Singh
Subject Matter Specialist Agril. Extension, KVK, Siddharthnagar, Uttar Pradesh, India

Sunil Kumar
Department of Agriculture, IIAST, Integral University, Kursi road Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Anjali Verma
Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Department of agricultural Extension Bundelkhand University, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh, India

Socio economic status of vegetable growers in Bareilly district

Bhanu Pratap Singh, RK Doharey, SN Singh, Sunil Kumar and Anjali Verma

Abstract
This study conducted Bareilly district is selected purposively as it is highly vegetable production area for the study undertaken. Another reason for its selection is the close familiarity of investigator with respect to locality, culture, people, officials, etc. Find that the middle aged categories of the people are more engaged in farming in the study area. Thus it is concludes that the general caste were dominant in the study area. It can be concluded that the maximum numbers of respondents was found literate. Hence, it may be concluded that almost every farmers who attain the age of 30 years was married. The range between minimum and maximum number of family members recorded from 4 to 22. On the basis of data, it can be said that agriculture is the main occupation of rural people. Other than caste based occupation of the respondents was having subsidiary occupation that majority of the respondents did have more interest in one participating in the social organization. It means that this area was having pucca type of housing pattern.

Keywords: Vegetable farmers, scientist, socio economic

Introduction

India is one of the largest producer of raw materials for the food processing industries in the world, the industry itself, is under developed in India. Less than 2 per cent of fruit and vegetable production is processed, compared with 30 per cent in Thailand, 70 per cent in Brazil, 78 per cent in Philippines and 80 per cent in Malaysia. The value addition in food sector is as low as 7 per cent. There is need for increasing food processing from 2 per cent to 10 per cent by 2010.This will require an investment of Rs. 1,40,000 crore in food processing sector.

The nearly 300g of vegetable daily recommended from the food habits. Growing of vegetables is 4 to 8 times more remunerative than cereals and it also generate employment in the rural areas. Commercial vegetable cultivation is not getting as popular as it should be among growers because of high input costs, lack of irrigation facilities and difficulties in their marketing and storage. India is the second largest producer of vegetable in world next only to China. Currently per capita consumption of vegetable is 175g per capita per day, which is far below recommended dose of 300g (ICMR). Country's vegetable demand would be around 135 million tones. There is an urgent need to increase the productivity of vegetable in order to provide nutritional security to increasing population of India. Uttar Pradesh is second largest producer of vegetable after West Bengal. It has an area of 0.84 million ha under vegetable which account for 15.8 million tones production, a study was conducted to find out the adoption of production and marketing management behaviour of vegetable growers in Bareilly district for commercial cultivation of vegetable.

In everyday usage, a vegetable is any part of a plant that is consumed by humans as food as part of a meal. The term *vegetable* is somewhat arbitrary, and largely defined through culinary and cultural tradition. It normally excludes other food derived from plants such as fruits, nuts, and cereal grains, but includes seeds such as pulses. The original meaning of the word *vegetable*, still used in biology, was to describe all types of plant, as in the terms "vegetable kingdom" and "vegetable matter".

Research Methodology

Bareilly district is selected purposively as it is highly vegetable production area for the study undertaken. Another reason for its selection is the close familiarity of investigator with respect to locality, culture, people, officials, etc.

Out of fifteen communities development blocks in Bareilly district. The highest vegetable cultivation under block was obtained from the district Horticulture Officer and four respective

Correspondence
Bhanu Pratap Singh
Research Scholar, Department of Extension Education, NDUA& T Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

blocks namely: Faridpur, Bhunta, Bitharichainpur and Shergarh. Selected from highest number of vegetable growers in the blocks. Faridpur block has been selected purposively for study of the research problem because of this block has largest area of vegetable production and also nearer to home and its easy accessibility.

Result Discussion
Socio-economic profile of the vegetable growers

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents according to age:
N=240

S No.	Age group (years)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Young age (Up to 34 years)	40	16.66
2.	Middle age (35 – 57 years)	153	63.75
3.	Old age (58 and above years)	47	19.58
	Total	240	100.00

Mean=45.47, S.D= 11.73, Range-Min=24, Max=65

It reveals from the Table.1 that the maximum number of respondents (63.75%) was observed in middle age category followed by old (19.58%) and young (16.66%) respondents. The age range of the selected respondents from 24 to 65 years. The mean age of the respondents were observed to be 45.47 years.

It can be said that the middle aged categories of the people are more engaged in farming in the study area.

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents according to caste: N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	General caste	102	42.50
2.	Other Back ward caste	80	33.33
3.	Scheduled caste	58	24.16
	Total	240	100.00

The Table 2 indicates that the maximum numbers of respondents (42.50%) were observed general caste followed by other backward caste (33.33%) and scheduled caste (24.16%), respectively. Thus it is concludes that the general caste were dominant in the study area.

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents according to education:
N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Illiterate	14	05.84
2.	Literate	226	94.16
	Total	240	100.00
2.a.	Can signature only	15	06.25
b.	Can read and write	28	11.66
c.	Primary	24	10.00
d.	Middle	51	21.25
e.	High school	44	18.33
f.	Intermediate	36	15.00
g.	Graduate	28	11.66
	Total	240	100.00

The Table-3 focuses that literacy percentage of the respondents was observed to be 94.16% literate and 5.84% illiterate. Further, the distribution of literate respondents descending order as order as 21.25%, 18.33%, 15.00%, 11.66%, 11.66%, 10.00% and 06.25%, for middle, high school, intermediate, can read and write, graduate, primary

and can signature only, respectively. It can be concluded that the maximum numbers of respondents was found literate.

Table 4: Distribution of the respondents according to marital status: N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Married	232	96.67
2.	Unmarried	8	3.33
	Total	240	100.00

It is obvious from the Table 4 that maximum number of the respondents were married (96.67%) against it (3.33%) respondents were unmarried. The ratio between unmarried and married was 1:29.03.

Hence, it may be concluded that almost every farmers who attain the age of 30 years was married

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents according to land holding
N=240

S. No.	Categories (ha)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Marginal (below 1 ha)	65	27.08
2.	Small (1-2 ha)	78	32.50
3.	Medium (2-4 ha)	52	21.66
4.	Large (4 ha and above)	45	18.75
	Total	240	100.00

Mean-3.30, Min-0.5, Max-10

The Table-5 indicates that most of the respondents 32.5% was found in the land holding category as small farmers (1-2 ha), followed by 27.08% categories of marginal farmers (less than 1 ha), 21.66% in the categories of medium farmers (2-4 ha) and 18.75% in the categories farmers of large (4 ha and above), respectively.

The average land holding of the respondents was found to be 3.30 hectare. Thus, it may be said that small and marginal farmers are more than others in the study area.

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents according to family type: N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Nuclear/ single family	92	38.33
2.	Joint family	148	61.66
	Total	240	100.00

The Table-6 shows that joint families are more than in nuclear/single families. In terms of percentage 61.66% respondents belong to joint type families and 38.33% belong to nuclear/ single type of families system.

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents according to size of family: N=240

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Small (up to 5 members)	65	27.08
2.	Medium (6-13)	148	61.66
3.	Large (14 and above)	27	11.25
	Total	240	100.00

Mean=8.9, S.D=4.09, Range-Min=4, Max=22

It is evident from Table-7 that 61.66% of the respondents families were observed such who had 6-13 members in their family followed by 27.08% family having up to 5 members

and only 11.25 % respondent's family having 14 and above and above members in their family. The average size of the family was observed in 8.9 members per family. The range between minimum and maximum number of family members recorded from 4 to 22.

Table 8: Distribution of the respondents according to annual income N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 60,000)	79	32.91
2.	Medium (60,001-2,70,000)	122	50.83
3.	High (2,70,001 and above)	39	16.25
	Total	240	100.00

It is obvious from Table-8 that maximum (50.83%) of the respondents were observed that those families whose annual income were found in the categories of Rs. 60,001 to 2,70,000 and belonged from the medium categories followed by low categories *viz.*, 32.91 per cent (Rs. up to 60,000) and only 16.25per cent respondent were who belonged from high categories of income Rs. 2,70,001 and above, respectively.

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents according to occupation N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents			
		Main occupation		Subsidiary occupation	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	Agriculture labour	30	12.50	30	1.25
2.	Caste based occupation	16	6.66	51	21.25
3.	Service	38	15.83	22	9.16
4.	Agriculture	116	48.33	80	33.33
5.	Agro-based enterprise	22	9.16	25	10.41
6.	Business	18	7.50	7	2.91
	Total	240	100.00	215	78.31

It is evident from the Table-9 that the maximum 48.33% respondent was observed such who had their main occupation as agriculture followed by service 15.83%, agriculture labour 12.50%, Agro based enterprise 9.16%, business 7.50% and caste based occupation 6.66%, as main occupation, respectively. The maximum 33.33% respondent was observed such who had their subsidiary occupation as agriculture followed by 21.25% respondent caste based occupation, 10.41% agro-based enterprise, 9.16% service, 2.91% business and 1.25 agriculture labour as subsidiary occupation, respectively. On the basis of data, it can be said that agriculture is the main occupation of rural people. Other than caste based occupation of the respondents was having subsidiary occupation

Table 10: Distribution of the respondents according to farming experience N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 8year)	50	20.83
2.	Medium (9to22year)	141	58.75
3.	High (23and above)	49	20.41
	Total	240	100.00

Mean=15.33, S D-6.93, Min. -3, Max. -29

It is evident from Table-10 that 58.75% of the respondents were observed such who had Medium (9 to 22 year) farming experience followed by 20.83% low (up to 8 year) and

20.41%, high (23 and above) years of farming experience, respectively.

Table 11: Distribution of the respondents according to vegetable farming experience N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 3years)	29	12.08
2.	Medium (4 to 15years)	179	74.58
3.	High (16 and above years)	32	13.33
	Total	240	100.00

Mean-8.97, S D-6.38, Min-1, Max-28

It is evident from Table-11 that 74.58% of the respondents were observed such who had Medium (4 to 15 years) vegetable farming experience followed by 13.33% respondents high (16 and above years) and only 12.08% respondents low (up to 3 years) vegetable farming experience, respectively.

Table 12: Distribution of the respondents according to social participation: N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	No participation	22	09.16
2.	Participation in one organization	84	35.00
3.	Participation in two organizations	58	24.16
4.	Participation in more than two organizations	16	06.66
5.	Office bearer	60	25.00
	Total	240	100.00

The Table-12 indicates that the 35% of the respondents participates in one organization followed by 25.00% respondents office bearer, 24.16% respondents participation in two organizations, 9.16 did not take any participation and 6.66% respondents participation in more than two organizations, respectively. It means that majority of the respondents did have more interest in one participating in the social organization.

Table 13: Distribution of the respondents according to housing pattern: N=240

S No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Kuccha	7	2.91
2.	Mixed	66	27.50
3.	Pucca	167	69.58
	Total	240	100.00

The Table-13 indicates that 69.58% majority of the respondents reported having pucca type house followed by 27.50% mixed and 2.91% kuchha, housing pattern respectively. It means that this area was having pucca type of housing pattern.

Conclusion
A maximum number of the respondents were finding in the age group *i.e.* middle. The maximum numbers of the respondents were belonging to general caste followed by Other Back ward caste. The maximum respondents were found to be literate. The majority of the respondents were married against it, respondents were unmarried. The maximum number of respondents were belonging from the land holding category *i.e.* small farmers in this study,

respectively. Joint families were more in number than single families. The majority of the respondents were from those families whose annual family income were between Rs. 60001 to 270000. An over whelming majority respondents families was reported Agriculture as their main occupation. The maximum respondents were observe having 4-15 members in their faming experience. The maximum number respondents reported for their pacca type houses.

Reference

1. Barrera VH, Alwang J, Cruz Collaguazo E, del P. Analysis of the socio-economic and environmental feasibility of the potato-milk production system in the sub-watershed of the Illangama-River Ecuador. Archivos Latino Americanos de Production Animal. 2010; 18(1-2):57-67.
2. Ekwe KC, Tokula MH, Onwuka S, Asumugha GN, Nawakor FN. Socio-economic determinants of sweet potato production in Kogi State, Nigeria. Nigerian Agricultural Journal. 2010; 41(1):192-199.
3. Ghimire B, Dhakal SC. Production economics of sustainable soil management based cauliflower (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. *botrytis*) in Dhading district of Nepal. American Journal of Agriculture and Forestry. 2014; 2(4):199-205.
4. Pandit Arun, Rana K, Anil Pandey RKKN, Kumar NR. A study on socio-economic profile of potato farmers: comparison of irrigated and rainfed conditions in Himachal Pradesh. Tropical Agricultural Research and Extension. 2010; 41(8):69-74.
5. Reichert LJ, Cuellar Padilla M, Gomes MC, Sanchez Caceres R. A socio-economic analysis of potato production in the municipalities of Sanlucar de Barrameda/Spain and Sao Lourenco do Sul/Brazil. Revista de Ciencias Agrarias (Portugal). 2012; 35(1):143-156.
6. Saini AK, Saini KS. Socio-economic Profile of Farmers Supplying Horticultural Produce to a Vegetable Market in Punjab, Inter. Jour. of Mang. and Soci. Sci. Res. 2015; 5(4):110-114.
7. Shakuntala M, Chaman F. Socio-economic characteristics of rural families. Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education. 2000; 19:325-328.