

Socio-Economical Profile and its Correlation with Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Vegetable Growers in Varanasi District of Uttar Pradesh

ABSTRACT

The present study was carried out during the year 2021-2022 in four blocks of Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. The present study was conducted on 160 respondents and data were collected through personal interview method with the help of interview schedule. The study revealed that the majority of vegetable growers (60.62 per cent) belonged to middle age group, (77.50 per cent) belong to Other Backward Caste, (36.25%) were having education up to intermediate level, (86.25 per cent) were married, (66.87 per cent) belonging to joint family system, (61.25 per cent) were having 5 to 8 members in a family, (92.50 per cent) were having Pucca house, (79.38 per cent) respondents were engaged in agriculture as main occupation, (53.75 per cent) respondents were having membership of only one social organizations, (38.75 per cent) were having 2 to 4 ha of land, (51.25 per cent) were having medium material possession, (30.00 per cent) were having Rs. 2 lakh to 3 lakh. The result from the study reveals that majority of the respondents belonged to medium socio-economic status (42.50 per cent) followed by high socio-economic status (31.87 percent) and remaining belonged to low socio-economic status (25.63 per cent). Most of the socio-economic variable were having positively and significantly correlation with entrepreneurial behaviour. The variable age was found to have negative correlation with entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers.

Key words- Socio-Economic variables, Agriculture, Vegetable growers, Entrepreneurial behaviour, Correlation.

INTRODUCTION

Vegetables are widely grown crops throughout the country as a commercial crop. Vegetables constitute an important item of human diet. Vegetables provides all the nutrient component like carbohydrates, proteins, fat, vitamins, minerals and water along with roughages, which are essential constituents of a balanced diet. Vegetables are important constituents of Indian agriculture and nutritional security due to their short duration, high yield, nutritional richness, economic viability and ability to generate on-farm and off-farm employment. Our country is blessed with diverse agro-climates with distinct seasons, making it possible to grow wide array of vegetables. Most of the vegetables, being short duration crops, fit very well in the intensive cropping system and are capable of giving very high yields and very high economic returns to the growers. Vegetable based farming is emerging as powerful engine for economic growth in rural India. India is the 2nd largest producer of vegetables in the world after China. According to ICAR- IIVR Report (2019) the fruits and vegetables together share about 92% of total horticultural production in our country and Vegetables covers 7.14 percent of the world's total agricultural area. Major vegetables grown in India are Potato (26.75%), Onion (13.94%), and Tomato (10.12%). Cauliflower, Cabbage, Bean, Egg Plants, Cucumber, Garkin, Frozen Peas, Garlic and okra are other major

vegetables grown in India. According to report of Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer's Welfare (2020) the total production of vegetables in India is 191.76 Million Tonnes from area of 10.35 Million Hectare. West Bengal is major vegetable producing state of India with total production of 29.29 Million tonnes from 1.49 Million Hectare area followed by Uttar Pradesh which has total production of 27.19 Million Tonnes from area of 1.27 Million Hectare (Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmer's Welfare, 2020). The contribution of vegetables remains highest (59-61%) in horticulture crop productions over the last five years. Globally India ranks second in vegetable production, however, the country is largest producer of okra and ranks second in production of green peas, tomato, potato, onion, cabbage, cauliflower and brinjal. The vast production base of vegetables offers India tremendous opportunities for export. According to report of The Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEDA) during 2019-20, India exported vegetables worth Rs. 4,350.13 crores. Out of this the country has exported 7,50,111.99 MT of Fresh Vegetables other than Onion to the world for the worth of Rs. 2,029.43 crores and 2,53,276.92 MT of Processed Vegetables to the world for the worth of Rs. 2,760.57 crore in 2019-20. So apart from nutritional benefits, the production of vegetables improves the economy of a country as these are very good source of income and employment generation for rural people.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. Varanasi district comprises of eight blocks, out of which four blocks namely Arajiline, Kashividyapith, Chiraigaon and Harahua were selected on the basis of maximum vegetable growers availability and highest area under vegetable production. From each selected blocks 4 villages were selected purposively where vegetables are grown and from each selected village 10 vegetable growers were selected on basis of systematic random sampling method. Thus the total sample size was of 160 respondents for the investigation. The data was collected through personal interview and collected data was coded, then analyzed using relevant statistical tools & techniques and find out frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation and coefficient of correlation and the results were then interpreted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1 Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economical profile
N= 160**

Variables	S.No.	Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
Age	1	Young(Upto 25 years)	25	15.63
	2	Middle (26-50 years)	97	60.62
	3	Old (Above 50 years)	38	23.75

Education	1	Primary	14	8.75
	2	Middle school	29	18.12
	3	High school	43	26.88
	4	Intermediate	58	36.25
	5	Graduation	13	8.13
	6	Post Graduate and above	3	1.87
Caste	1	SC/ST	15	9.38
	2	OBC	124	77.50
	3	General	21	13.22
Marital Status	1	Unmarried	22	13.75
	2	Married	138	86.25
Family Type	1	Nuclear Family	53	33.13
	2	Joint Family	107	66.87
Family Size	1	Small (up to 4 member)	9	5.63
	2	Medium (5-8 member)	98	61.25
	3	Large (above 8 members)	53	33.12
Housing Pattern	1	Kachcha house	0	0.00
	2	Mixed	11	6.87
	3	house(Kachcha+Pucca) Pucca	149	93.13
Land Holding	1	Marginal (Below 1 Ha)	23	14.38
	2	Small (1-2 Ha)	57	35.62
	3	Medium (2-4 Ha)	62	38.75
	4	Large (Above 4 Ha)	18	11.35
Occupation	1	Agriculture	127	79.38
	2	Agriculture with Business	26	16.25
	3	Agriculture with Service	7	4.37
Social Participation	1	No member of any organization	55	34.38
	2		86	53.75
	3	Member of one organization Member of more than one organization	19	11.87
Material Possession	1	Low (13-31)	37	23.13
	2	Medium (32-49 score)	82	51.25
	3	High (50-67)	41	25.62
Annual Income	1	Below Rs. 1,00,000	29	18.12
	2	Rs. 1,00,001-2,00,000	44	27.50
	3	Rs. 2,00,001-3,00,000	48	30.00
	4	Above Rs. 3,00,001	39	24.38

Table 1 indicated that maximum numbers of respondents (60.62%) belong to middle age group followed by old age group (23.75 %) and the remaining belongs to young age (15.63%). It could be stated from the above findings that majority (60.62%) of the respondents were found in middle age group. The probable reason might be that the middle age farmers comparatively have free hand in financial affairs and they can take up an

independent decision to implement their ideas. The above findings are in consonant with the findings of Ram *et al.* (2010).

It also reveals that maximum numbers of respondents (36.25%) were having Intermediate educational status followed by (26.88 %) High school, Middle school (18.12 %), Primary level (8.75 %), Graduation (8.13 %), post-graduation and above (1.87%). It can be concluded that majority of respondents (36.25 %) had Intermediate level of education. The probable reason for literacy among the respondents may be due to more primary and secondary level education facilities available in rural area and realization about the significance of education for the overall development of the life. The above findings are in agreement with that of Karat and Baby (2020).

Also maximum numbers of respondents (77.50%) belonged to other backward caste followed by (13.22%) general category and the remaining were (9.38 %) schedule caste/schedule tribe. The above findings are in agreement with that of Singh *et al.* (2017).

The study reveals that maximum numbers of respondents (86.25 %) were married and the remaining (13.75 %) respondents were found unmarried. So it may be concluded that, the majority of respondents who were growing vegetables were found married., majority of (66.87 %) of respondents were living in joint family system and the remaining (33.13 %) respondents were living in the nuclear family system, majority of (61.25 %) of respondents were having 5-8 members in their family followed by (33.12 %) more than eight members and the remaining (5.63 %) up-to four members in family. maximum respondents (93.13 %) were having pucca house followed by (6.87%) mixed type of house there were nobody having kuccha house in the study area. This may be concluded that maximum respondents were living in pucca house and hence they possessed basic needs i.e. food, clothes and shelter. Majority of the farmers (38.75 %) belong to Medium farmers category with land holding of 2-4 ha followed by small farmer (35.62 %), Marginal farmers (14.38 %) and Large farmers (11.35 %). It may be concluded that, the maximum respondents (38.75 %) were having 2 to 4 ha of land which comes under medium farmers category. The possible reason could be that the main occupation of the respondents is agriculture and they must have inherited this land holding from their ancestors. Moreover, it might be easier to employ latest technology in medium farms as compared to marginal or small farms. The above finding gives conformity with study of Kumar and Aski (2016), Somvanshi *et al.* (2016) and Yewatkar *et al.* (2019).

Majority of the respondents (79.38 %) were engaged in agriculture followed by (16.25%) respondents were engaged in agriculture with business activities and the remaining (4.37 %) were engaged in agriculture along with service. majority of respondents were having membership of one social organization (53.75 %) followed by having no any membership for social organization (34.38 %) and the remaining (11.87 %) had membership of more than one social organization. It may be concluded that, most of the respondents were having membership of one social organization. This might be due to the fact that most of the respondents were member of farmer producer organization (FPOs), few respondents were members of Gram Panchayat, co-operative societies and Self Help Groups etc. So they have medium to high level of social participation. In terms of material possession majority of the respondents belongs to medium category (51.25 %), followed by high category (25.62 %) and low category (23.10 %). The above findings are in agreement with that of Tengli and Sharma (2017)

In terms of annual income majority of respondents were having Rs. 2 lakh to 3 lakh (30.00 %) followed by Rs. 1 lakhs to 2 lakhs (27.50%), More than Rs. 3 lakhs (24.38 %)and

Less than Rs.1 lakh (18.12%). The probable reason, which could be attributed for varied income categories of respondents, is the different size of the land holdings for each respondent, growing of various other crops and practicing of subsidiary occupations like business and service along with agriculture by the respondents.

Table 2 Distribution of respondents according to their Overall Socio-Economic Status
N=160

S.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (31-54)	41	25.63
2	Medium (55-77 score)	68	42.50
3	High (78-100)	51	31.87
	Total	160	100.00

Mean = 66.65

S.D. = 18.20

The distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic status is shown in table 2 which indicates that majority of the respondents belonged to medium socio-economic status (42.50 %) followed by high socio-economic status (31.87 %) and remaining belonged to low socio-economic status (25.63 %). It may be concluded that, majority of the respondents belonged to medium-high socio-economic status. The probable reason for this could be that most of the respondents possess medium land holding, are indulged in agriculture as an occupation, have annual income in range of 2-3 lakhs, are members of 1-2 organization, have necessary material possession, live in pucca house and are having basic education. It is in conformity with the findings of Mishra and Ghadei (2015).

Table 3 Correlation Between Socio Economical Profile With Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Vegetable Growers

N=160

S. No.	Particulars	Coefficient of correlation (r) with Entrepreneurial Behaviour
1	Age	-.348**
2	Education	.793**
3	Cast	.123
4	Marital status	.016
5	Family type	.066
6	Family size	.054
7	Housing pattern	.299
8	Land holding	.858**
9	Occupation	.468*
10	Social participation	.844**
11	Material possession	.806**
12	Annual income	.824**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N.S - Non significant

The result of the correlation analysis revealed that the entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers were found to be positively and significantly correlated with their education, land holding, social participation, material possession and annual income at one

per cent level of significance while occupation was found to have positive and significant correlation at five percent level of significance. The variable age was found to have negative correlation with entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers. However, the rest of the variables, namely, caste, marital status, types of family, size of family and housing pattern were found to be positive but non-significantly correlated with the entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers.

CONCLUSION

It may be concluded that majority of the vegetable growers were having medium socio-economic status with middle age, having intermediate level of education, belongs to Other Backward Caste, lives in Joint family system having 5-8 members in family, having 2-4 ha of land, pucca house with medium material possession and low social participation and most of the vegetable growers have annual income of Rs. 2-3 lakhs. Also the correlation analysis reveals that people with better education, more land holding, higher social participation, more material possession and higher annual income have higher entrepreneurial behavior in growing vegetables. While those farmers who were young are growing vegetable more successfully as an entrepreneur.

REFERENCES

- Karat, Shilpa., and Baby, Smitha. (2020).** Entrepreneurial behaviour of polyhouse farmers in Kerala. *International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research (IJASR)*;10(2):29-40.
- Kumar, A. S. and Aski, S. G. (2016).** Profile characteristics of cabbage growers in north Karnataka. *Indian Research Journal*; 11(3):293-297.
- Mishra, D. and Ghadei, K. (2015).** Socio-Economic Profile of Vegetable Farmers in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences*; 1(2):25-28.
- Ram, D., Singh, M.K., Gopimohan, N. and Ghadel, K. (2010).** Entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers. *Journal of communication studies* 28 :51-58.
- Singh, D., Yadav, R. N., Singh, D. K., Prakash S. and Kumari, S. (2017).** Study on Personal Socio-Agro-Economic, Psychological and Communicational Characteristics of the Vegetable Growers in Western Uttar Pradesh, India *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*; 6(7): 2255-2262.
- Somvanshi, R.M., Deshmukh, A.N., Mokhale, S.U. and Godase, S.K. (2016).** Entrepreneurial behaviour of vegetable growers. *Agric. Update*, 11(3): 239-241.
- Tengli, M.B and Sharma, O.P.(2017).** Profile Study under Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Young Farmers of Navsari District. *IJSS*. 6(4) :223-226.
- Yewatkar,H., Lahariya,K.T., Raut,A., Sanjeevkumar, Salame .(2019).** Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Garlic Growers. *International Journal Of Chemical Studies*. 7(3): 2644-2647

UNDER PEER REVIEW