

# **A STUDY ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF CABBAGE GROWERS IN KRISHNAGIRI DISTRICT OF TAMIL NADU**

## **ABSTRACT**

Rural development is crucial for development of the nation. Socio economic status is dynamic in nature. Socio economic status provides information on the association between certain factors and the livelihood of vegetables growers. In this study, an attempt had been made to understand the reality of cabbage grower. Krishnagiri was purposefully selected. Kelamangalam block was chosen for the study. Total sample size for this study was 120. Data was collected by personal interview method. The personal variables, social variables, economic variables, farming related variables are taken into account. Agriculture was the main occupation in the study area. Majority of sample farmers had moderate experience in farming. Most of sample farmers had smaller land holding. Most of the farmers were found to be in low income group.

**KEYWORDS: Rural development, livelihood.**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Rural development is crucial for development of the nation. The farmers who mostly rely only on agriculture usually find it difficult in satisfying their basic needs whereas; farmers engaged in other allied activities have better opportunities to fulfill their basic requirements which in turn results in improving their socio economic status. An individual's socioeconomic status includes basic information about his or her age, family composition, occupation, and other factors such as income, farm size and other essential amenities. Socio economic status is dynamic in nature

since it is, subjected to change over a period of time. Socio economic status provides information on the association between certain factors and the livelihood of vegetables growers. The socio economic status provides an insight into how families live their lives in society. Farming communities' perceptions are better understood through socio economic status.

In this study, an attempt had been made to understand the ground reality of cabbage grower's social and economic status which will help the policymakers to formulate suitable policies and strategies, for the well-being of the cabbage growers. The finding of the study will help to design appropriate extension programs to boost cabbage growers in the study area and other areas. With this as a background, the present study was conducted to understand the various effects of social and economic factors on cabbage production in the Krishnagiri district of Tamil Nadu.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Study area selection**

Multistage sampling technique was used for selection of districts, blocks and villages. Krishnagiri was purposefully selected. The Krishnagiri district was first in terms of area and production of cabbage in Tamil Nadu. Cabbage is grown during winter season in Krishnagiri district. Kelamangalam was chosen because this block was one of the leading producers of cabbage and also had high area under cabbage cultivation.

### **Tools and techniques of data collection**

A pre-tested structured interview schedule was prepared. Data was collected by personal interview method. Simple statistical analysis like the average, frequency and percentage were used to examine the characteristics of sample farm households such as age, educational status,

size of operational holdings, etc. For this study a total sample of 120 cabbage cultivators were interviewed.

## **Results and Discussion**

The data collected in selected block are presented in accordance to relevant domains to gain better perspectives of socio- economic characteristics of farmers.

### **1. Personal variables**

The personal variables of the respondents include their age, marital status, occupation, and level of education. According to the age-wise analysis, 64.17 per cent of cabbage growers were middle aged between 35 and 55 years, followed by old age farmers above 55 years. Young cabbage growers below 35 years represent 7.5 per cent of the total cabbage growers. According to the results, middle age group had the highest share among the respondents. Majority of the sample respondents are married (91. per cent) and married are only 5.83 per cent. and few of the respondents were widowed(1.67 per cent) and divorced(0.83 per cent).As far as occupational aspect goes 74.17 per cent of the sample households are farmers which means agriculture is the main occupation and business constitutes 19.17 per cent of the total occupational status. Service and office workers make up 6.66 per cent of the occupational distribution. The level of literacy influences the level of adoption of new technologies on the farm. It is evident that a high proportion of farmers with primary education at 35.83 per cent followed by farmers with collegiate education at 15 per cent, and secondary education farmers at 30 per cent. The Percentage of illiterate farmers was 19.17 per cent and secondary education was predominant among cabbage farmers.

**Table 1- Distribution of the respondents by their Personal variables**

Sl.No.	Personal variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	<b>Age</b>		
	Below 35 years	9	7.50
	Between 35-50 years	40	64.17
	Above 50 years	71	28.33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
2	<b>Marital status</b>		
	Unmarried	7	5.83
	Married	110	91.67
	Widowed	2	1.67
	Divorced	1	0.83
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
3	<b>Occupation</b>		
	Farmers	89	74.17
	Business	23	19.17
	Service Sector	8	6.66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
4	<b>Educational Status</b>		
	Illiterates	23	19.17
	Primary education (between 1-5th std)	43	35.83
	Secondary education (between 6-12th std)	36	30.00
	Diploma/degree holders	18	15.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>

**SOURCE:** Computed from primary data collected by author during survey

## 2. Social variables

The social variables of the respondents include their castes; family structure and their organizational membership are presented in Table 2. The table shows the average proportion of adult males among the respondents was 2.76 and 2.47 for female and 1.07 for children. The average family size among respondent was found to be 6.24 members.

**Table 2- Distribution of the respondents based on Social variables**

Sl.No.	Social variables	Frequency	Percentage
1	<b>Family Composition of Sample Households</b>		
	Average Male	2.76	44.23
	Average Female	2.41	38.62
	Average Children	1.07	17.50
	Average Family size	<b>6.24</b>	<b>100</b>
2	<b>Family structure</b>		
	<b>A) Type of family</b>		
	Nuclear	81	67.50
	Joint	39	32.50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>B) Family size</b>		
	Small (up to 4 members)	42	35.00
	Medium (5-8 members)	71	59.17
	Large (More than 8 members)	7	5.83
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
3	<b>Caste</b>		
	SC/ST	23	19.17
	BC	46	38.33
	MBC	49	40.83
	OC	2	1.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
4	<b>Organization membership</b>		
	Non Members	94	78.33
	Member of a formal organization	12	10.00
	Office bearer of formal organization	3	2.50
	Member of non-formal organization	11	9.17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>

**SOURCE:** Computed from primary data collected by author during survey

The majority of the respondents (70.31 per cent) had small size family up to four members, followed by 27.19 per cent and 2.5 per cent respondents having medium-sized families (5-8 members) and large size family (more than 8 members), respectively. The majority of the respondents (40.83 per cent) were from a most backward caste (MBC). Only 1.67 per cent of respondents belonged to the upper caste, followed by backward caste (38.33 per cent) and SC/ST (19.17 per cent). Nearly 67.50 per cent the respondents were residing in nuclear families while

the remaining 32.50 per cent of the respondents were from joint families. As for membership and participation in organization only 10 per cent were part of formal organization and 9.17 per cent in part of non formal organization. Most of the respondents (78.33 per cent) were never part any form of organization. Only 2.50 per cent of respondents were office bearer of formal organization.

### 3. Economic Variables

The economic variables of the sample farmers can be measured as their size of landholding, type of housing, land ownership, annual income of farmers. From the table 3 it could be inferred that 56.67 per cent of the sample farmers had lands less than 2.5 acres, while 40 per cent of the farmers had a lands between 2.5 acre and 5 acres. The farmers with a land more than 5 acre were less and were only 3.33 per cent compared to others. It could be concluded that the majority of sample farmers had smaller size of land and the farmers with more land share were found less in the study area. Majority of the cabbage growers had own land (70.83 per cent) and leashed land were also used for cultivation purpose (29.17 per cent). Out of 85 owned farm land 61.18 per cent was owned individually and 38.82 per cent of the land were joint ownership.

**Table 3- Distribution of the respondents based on Economic variables**

Sl.No.	Economic variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b>1</b>	<b>Land holding</b>		
	<b>A) Size of land</b>		
	Marginal farmers (Less than 2.5 acres)	68	56.67
	Small farmers (between 2.5 and 5 acres)	48	40.00
	Large farmers (More than 5 acre)	4	3.33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>B) Type of Holding</b>		
	Owned	85	70.83

	Leashed	35	29.17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>C) Type of ownership</b>		
	Individual ownership	52	61.18
	Joint ownership	33	38.82
	<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Annual Income</b>		
	Below Rs.2 lakhs	73	60.83
	Rs.2 lakhs to Rs.5 lakhs	33	27.50
	Exceeding Rs.5 lakhs	14	11.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Housing</b>		
	Owned	<b>105</b>	87.50
	Rented	<b>15</b>	12.50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Other household facilities</b>		
	<b>A) Electronic Appliances</b>		
	Television	<b>120/120</b>	<b>100</b>
	Refrigerator	<b>110/120</b>	<b>91.67</b>
	Washing Machine	<b>13/120</b>	<b>10.83</b>
	Air Conditioner	<b>4/120</b>	<b>3.33</b>
	<b>B)Transportation owned</b>		
	Bicycle	<b>62/120</b>	<b>51.67</b>
	Scooter/Moppet	<b>40/120</b>	<b>33.33</b>
	Bike	<b>98/120</b>	<b>81.67</b>
	Car	<b>7/120</b>	<b>5.83</b>

**SOURCE:** Computed from primary data collected by author during survey

The sample households were post-stratified into three different groups based on the annual income. Households with an annual income of below Rs.2 lakhs were categorized as low income group, households with annual income of Rs.2 lakhs to Rs.5 lakhs were classified as middle income group and those with annual income exceeding Rs.5 lakhs were classified as high income group. Households with an annual income of below Rs.2 lakhs were 60.83 per cent, households with an annual income between Rs.2 lakhs and Rs.5 lakhs were 27.50 per cent and an annual income exceeding Rs.5 lakhs were 11.67 per cent. As far as the housing is concerned more than three fourth had their own houses (87.50 per cent) and only 12.50 per cent did have own houses and were staying in rented houses. Each and every household had television and 91.67

per cent had refrigerator in their houses, washing machine was owned only by 13 respondents (10.83 per cent) and only 4 respondents had Air conditioner installed in their houses. In transportation aspect 51.67 per cent had a bicycle, 33.33 owned a scooter and the most common mode of transport was bike owned by 81.67 of the respondents and car owner meager 5.83 per cent.

#### **4. Farming related Variables**

From the table 4 it could be inferred that 65.83 per cent of the sample farmers had an experience of 10 to 20 years in cabbage cultivation, while 11.67 per cent of the farmers had an experience of less than 10 years. The farmers with rich experience of more than 20 years were less and constituting only 22.5 per cent of the total cabbage growers. Most cultivated land was irrigated land (71.67 per cent) and wet land (28.33 per cent). The most common source of irrigation was canal irrigation (93.33 per cent). 18.33 per cent have bore well and 8.33 per cent have well for irrigation.

Based on details regarding the area under cabbage cultivation in the sample farms are it could be inferred that 43.33 per cent of the sample farmers had less than one acre of land under cabbage cultivation, while 41.67 per cent of the farmers had a land holding of one acre for cabbage cultivation purpose. The farmers with a landholding more than one acre were very few 15 per cent compared to other landholdings. From the above results, it could be concluded that majority of sample farmers had less than one acre of land under cabbage cultivation and the farmers with more than 1 acre of land under cabbage were found less in the study area. The total population of livestock was 621 in total. In the sample household poultry occupies 79.40 per cent, cattle were 12.32 per cent, sheep and goats were 8.53 per cent.

**Table 4- Distribution of the respondents by Farming related variables**

Sl.No.	Farming variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b>1</b>	<b>Farming Experience of the Sample Farmers</b>		
	Below 10 years	14	11.67
	Between 10 to 20 years	79	65.83
	More than 20 years	27	22.50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Type of Land</b>		
	Wet land	34	28.33
	Irrigated land	86	71.67
	Dry land	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Irrigation</b>		
	Well	10/120	8.33
	Canal	112/120	93.33
	Bore well	22/120	18.33
<b>4</b>	<b>Area under Cabbage in the Sample Farms</b>		
	Less than one acre under cabbage cultivation	52	43.33
	One acre under cabbage cultivation	50	41.67
	More than one acre under cabbage cultivation	18	15
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Livestock Particulars of sample respondents</b>		
	Poultry	509	79.40
	Cattles ( Cows and Buffaloes)	79	12.32
	Sheep and goats	53	8.53
	<b>Total</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>100</b>

**SOURCE:** Computed from primary data collected by author during survey

### 5. Service variables

Farmers require timely financial services and means of their financial sources to ensure proper cultivation. Beneficiaries of insurance and government schemes etc are accounted and furnished in the table 5.

**Table 5- Distribution of the respondents by Service variables**

Sl.No.	Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	Extension activities (Demonstration, Workshops, etc)	12/120	10.00
2	Kisan Credit card	57/120	47.50
3	Crop insurance	62/120	51.67
4	Credit facilities		
	Borrowing from Money lenders	78/120	65.00
	Bank loan	89/120	74.17
	Borrowing from friends and relatives	17/120	14.17

**SOURCE: Computed from primary data collected by author during survey**

From the table it can be seen that only 12 (10 per cent) among 120 respondent are accessing the extension services offered by government to the farmers. 47.50 of the respondent hold a kisan credit card and 51.67 of the farmers have insured the crops under crop insurance schemes provided by government. In financial aspect bank serves as the major credit source (74.17 per cent) but still 65 per cent of the farmers turn to moneylender for financial needs and 14.17 per cent have borrowed from the friend and relatives.

### **Conclusion**

In depth observation of socio economic status gives us the overall picture of the farming community and the sustainability in the society. Understanding of the socio-economic status of the farmers and its determinants will help in accelerating the process of effective transfer of technology as because it largely affects the adoption process.

Agriculture is the main occupation in the study area as majority of the people were engaged in agriculture followed by own business. From the above results, it could be concluded that the

majority of sample farmers had moderate experience in farming in. Most of sample farmers had smaller land holding and the farmers with more land share was found less in the study area. Almost three fourth of the farmers were found to be in low income group (less than 2 lakh per annum) in the study area. Livestock serves an important source of income for farm families. Adding livestock to cropping system significantly reduces the risks associated with farm income.

#### **DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLEGINCE)**

Author(s) hereby declare NO generative AI technologies (Chat GPT, COPILOT, etc) and text to image generators have been used during the writing and editing of manuscripts.

#### **REFERENCE**

Akinniran, T. N, Taiwo, K. B. Economic Analysis of Cocoa Production in Ilesha Metropolis of OSUN State, IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS), e-ISSN: 2319-2380, p-ISSN: 2319-2372. Volume 9, Issue 10 Ver. I (October. 2016), PP 82-88

Almaszabeen Badekhan and K. Uma Devi. The Socio-economic Status of Cotton Farmers and their Attitude Towards Pesticide Use. Economic Affairs, Vol. 63, No. 4, pp. 883-889, December 2018. DOI: 10.30954/0424-2513.4.2018.11

Gurshaminder Singh, Shweta Choudhary, Subhashree Nayak and Gautam Malik, Study on socio profile of farmers in SAS Nagar district of North-Eastern Punjab, India. The Pharma Innovation Journal 2023; 12(2): 441-449

Mandla I, Vaidya M K, Sharma N. Evaluation of socio-economic status and cost-return structure of major vegetable crops in Kullu Valley of Himachal Pradesh (India). Plant Science Today . 2023; 10(2): 144–151. <https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.2038>

Rahman MS, Manjira S, Majumder MK, Rahman S. Socio-economic determinants of off-season summer cabbage cultivation. *International Journal of Vegetable Science*. 2021; 27(3): 252-259.

Roy, M.L., Chandra, N., Kharbikar, H. L., Joshi, P. and Jethi, R. Socio-economic Status of Hill Farmers: An Exploration from Almora District in Uttarakhand. *International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science Technology*. 2013; 4:4(353-358).

Tenzing Palmu Sherpa , Pratima Rana , Parvani Sharma and Samriti. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, Volume 41, Issue 3, Page 35-41, 2023; Article no.AJAEES.96530. ISSN: 2320-7027

UNDER PEER REVIEW