

Original Research Article
SOCIOLOGICAL AND ECONOMICAL IMPACT OF GRAPES
GROWERS IN DINDIGUL DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU

Abstract

The study was carried out in Dindigul district of Tamil Nadu covering one block with eight purposively selected villages and 120 randomly selected respondents to analyze the socio economic impact of grapes growers. It was found that grapes cultivation was the main source of income for livelihood of the respondents. Data was collected using structured schedule for quantifying socioeconomic status of grapes growers. The data revealed that more than half of the respondents (53.33 per cent) were medium landholders, more than one-third of respondents had high school (37.5 per cent) education, nearly two third (66.67 per cent) of the respondents were having pakka house, majority (70.83 per cent) of the respondents were belonged to OBC category, majority (93.33 per cent) of the farmers had small family, majority (58.33 per cent) of the farmers had medium level of extension contact, majority (53.33 per cent) of the farmers had medium level of mass media exposure and Cent percent of the respondents were following agriculture as their main occupation. The Department of Horticulture, Government of Tamil Nadu needs to take up intensive efforts to educate the grapes growers on improved grapes cultivation practices.

Keywords: Grape growers, socio economic impact.

1. Introduction

Grape (*Vitis* sp.) belonging to Family Vitaceae is a commercially important fruit crop of India. It is a temperate crop which has got adapted to sub-tropical climate of peninsular India. About 80% of the production comes from Maharashtra followed by Karnataka and Tamil Nadu [1]. World over it is grown mainly for wine making (82% production), raisin making (10% production) and rest for table purpose (8%).

In India, however it is mostly consumed as fresh fruit and only a limited quantity is utilized for the production of liquor, dry fruits like raisins etc. In any social science, it is essential to analyze the characteristics of farmers, which would give a basic and clear understanding about the background of the farmers. At the end of this research we look at the

socio economic impact of the amla growers. This will enable experts to formulate plans in this area [2].

2. Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Dindigul district of Tamil Nadu, since the district had highest, production and productivity. Hence, the study was conducted in Dindigul district. Snowball sampling procedure was followed to select the respondents of the study. The study was an ex-post-facto survey research. Standardized data collection tools were utilized to collect the data from farmers (interview schedule), key informants (interview schedule). The responses were coded, tabulated and subjected to descriptive statistical analysis comprising percentage analysis.

3. Results and discussion

The following table describes the overall socioeconomic situation of Grape growers. Overall, this suggests that they are looking forward to improvement in their lives.

Table1: OverallpercentageofSocio-economicstatusof farmers (n=120)

Sl. No	Category	Number	Percentage
1	Low	32	26.67
2	Medium	50	41.67
3	High	38	31.67
4	Total	120	100.00

Table 1 shows that more than two-fifth of the farmers (41.67 per cent) had medium level of socio-economic status followed by high level of socio economic status (31.67 per cent) and remaining respondents (26.67 per cent) had low level of socio economic status.

Table 2 next shows the characteristics wise socio-economic status of grape growers.

Table2:Socioeconomiccharacteristicsoffarmers(n-120)

Sl. No	Dimensions	Category	Number	Percent
1	Land Holding	<5 acres	51	42.50
		5–10 acres	63	52.50
		>10acres	6	5.00
2	Education	Illiterate	2	1.67
		PrimarySchool	6	5.00
		MiddleSchool	25	20.83
		HighSchool	45	37.50

		HigherSecondary	29	24.17
		Degree	13	10.83
3	Housing Pattern	Hut	--	--
		Kachhahouse	40	33.33
		PakkaHouse	80	66.67
4	Occupation	Agriculture	120	100.00
		Non-Agriculture	--	--
5	Caste	SC/ST	35	29.17
		OBC	85	70.83
		Others	--	--
6	FarmPower	Draughtanimals	18	15.00
		Powertiller	2	1.67
		Tractor	--	--
7	Agricultural Implements	WoodenPlough	46	38.33
		M.B.Plough	71	59.16
		SeedCum FertilizerDrill	20	16.67
		Sprayer	27	22.50
		Bullockcart	2	1.67
8	FamilySize	Tractor	--	--
		Sizeupto5	112	93.33
		Morethan5	8	6.66
9	Extension agency contact	Low	30	25.00
		Medium	70	58.33
		High	20	16.66
10	Mass Media Exposure	Low	25	20.83
		Medium	64	53.33
		High	31	25.83

(a) Landholding

Table 2 revealed that more than half of the respondents (52.50percent)weremediumlandholders, followedbyonly 42.50 per cent in small land holders category whereas big land holdings was observed to the least extent of only 5.00 per cent. The possible reasons that could be attributed to this resultwerethosewhohadagricultureasthemainoccupation almost depend on their land for their lively hood. So they always try to possess more acres of land. It could also be their ancestor's property.

(b) Education

It was observed that more than one-third (37.50 per cent) of the respondents had high school education followed by higher secondary (24.17 per cent) and middle school (20.83 per cent). 10.83 per cent of the respondents had college level education and 5.00 per cent of the respondents had primary school of education. Illiterates were noticed to the extent of 1.67 per cent but there were no post Graduate respondents were noticed. This indicated that more educated farmers visualize the farmers had high level of socio economic impact towards the recommended cultivation practices [3].

(c) Home

The perusal of data indicated that majority (66.67 per cent) of the respondents were having pakka house followed by kachha house (33.33 per cent). However, none of the respondents were living in the huts. The reasons behind these results may be majority of the respondents were having sufficient income which help them to construct a pakka house.

(d) Occupation

It is evident from the Table 2 that all the 120 respondents were following agriculture as their main occupation for their livelihood. It is needless to say that farmers had Agriculture as the major occupation since ages [4].

(e) Caste

Majority (70.83 per cent) of the respondents belonged to OBC category and rest (29.17 per cent) were belonged to SC/ST category. This might help in narrowing down the gap that may create among the different sections of the society.

(f) Farm power

Fifteen percent of the respondents were having draught animals as farm power followed by 1.67 percent) of farmers were having power tiller. And none of the respondents were noticed having tractor as their source of farm power. The observations in the earlier tables revealed that majority of the respondents were small farmers who cannot afford tractor with high investment. Under such circumstances, the only alternative for them is to have draft animals for farm operations [5].

(g) Agricultural implements

Table 2 reveals the farm implements possessed by the farmers. Pooled data depicts that majority of the farmers (59.16 per cent) owned the M.B. plough, 38.33 per cent of the farmers possessed wooden plough, sprayer was owned by the 22.50 per cent of the farmers

and 16.67 per cent of the farmers had seed cum fertilizer drill. Least percentage of farmers (1.67 per cent) possessed Bullock cart and none of the farmers possessed Tractor. It is not surprising to note that majority of the farmers possess all the materials required for farming. Hence, it is quite essential to own and use the farm implements for quality production.

(h) Family size

The results indicated that majority (93.33 per cent) of the farmers had nuclear family of less than five members. And only 6.66 percent of the respondents had big family of more than five members. The information on size of the family showed that majority of the farmers had nuclear family. Only few of them had large family size. This shows that the concept of joint family approach is slowly eroding in the villages; instead people started become independent due to fragmentation. This trend is not supportive to agriculture development. This might also be due to their increased social awareness on family planning efforts made by the Governments to check the population growth. Further, the education levels of the respondents might have also made them to incline towards the small family. It is also true that the families in the villages are in the verge of disintegration because of urban influence and fragmentation. Further, the families with very few earning members may not be able to get the required facilities [6].

(i) Extension agency contact

It is evident from the Table 2 that more than half of the respondents (58.33 per cent) had medium extension agency contact, followed by only 25.00 per cent were low extension agency contact and remaining were 16.66 per cent had high extension agency contact [7].

(j) Mass Media Exposure

It is evident from the Table 2 that more than half of the respondents (53.33 per cent) had medium mass media exposure, followed by only 25.00 per cent had high mass media exposure and remaining were 20.83 per cent had low mass media exposure.

4. Conclusion

The data revealed that more than half of the respondents (53.33 per cent) were medium landholders, more than one-third of respondents had high school (37.5 per cent) education, nearly two third (66.67 per cent) of the respondents were having pakka house, majority (70.83 per cent) of the respondents were belonged to OBC category, majority (93.33 per

cent) of the farmers had small family, majority (58.33 per cent) of the farmers had medium level of extension contact, majority (53.33 per cent) of the farmers had medium level of mass media exposure and Cent percent of the respondents were following agriculture as their main occupation. This shows that the majority of the farmers had high socio economic status towards the cultivation practices of grapegrowers.

5. References

1. Chavan PM, Shirke VS, Ahire MC, Kharde PB. Constraints faced by grape growers in the Nashik District of Maharashtra; c2021.
2. Karangami R, Bhange S, Ahire ACM, Kabre G, Wani V. Marketing behaviour of grape growers in Maharashtra state. In: National conference on Transformation of Agricultural Extension-Strategies for Effective Reformation (TAESERE 2021) 22nd and 23rd www.extensionjournal.com December 2021; c2021. p. 259.
3. Preethi B, Sasane GK, Gadmale SY. A study on profile characteristics of grape insured farmers in Nashik district of Maharashtra. Young (Up to 35 years). 2022;22(29.33):25.
4. Rachana P. Economic analysis of marketing channel of grapes in Maharashtra. Int Res J Agric Econ Stat. 2017;8(1):21-25.
5. Shende AH, Tupe SD. Problems and prospects of grape exports: A case study of Maharashtra; c2024.
6. Karangami RS, Bhange SB, Ahire MC, Chavai AM, Kabre GB, Wani VS, et al. Sources of agricultural information in utilization pattern of pesticides by grape growers; c2021.