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

Abstract

The research examined the economic and social consequences of grape growers on one block in the Dindigul district of Tamil Nadu, involving three villages that were purposefully chosen and 120 respondents who were chosen at random. It was discovered that the participant primary source of income for subsistence was grape cultivation. A planned schedule was used to gather data in order to quantify the socioeconomic status of grape growers. According to the data, the majority(53.33%) of respondents belonged to the middle age category followed by 34.16 per cent of the respondents had the education was up to higher secondary and 30.83 per cent had middle school level.Majority (52.50 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of annual income, followed by majority of the respondents had agriculture as their main occupation for their livelihood.Majority of the farmers, or 90.83 percent, had nuclear families with fewer than five members and only 09.16 percent of those surveyed had a large family. Maximum number of respondents (82.50 per cent) had pointed out the independent decision followed by remaining 17.50 per cent of the respondents had pointed the joint decision. Majority (55.83 per cent) of the respondents belonged to small farmer category Majority of the respondents had medium level of mass media exposure and extension agency contact. Here it concluded that the overall socioeconomic condition was found be to medium range among the grape growers. The Government of Tamil Nadu's Department of Horticulture must work hard to inform grape growers about better grape varieties and cultivation practices to improve the socio-economic status.

Keywords: Grape growers, socio economic impact.

1. Introduction

The grape (Vitis sp.), an annual crop of commercial importance in India, is a member of the Vitaceae family. This crop is temperate and has acclimated to the humid climate of the Indian region. Maharashtra accounts for about 80% of production, with Karnataka and Tamil Nadu following closely behind [1]. Around everywhere, its primary uses are in the manufacture of beverages (82%), raisins (10%), and table grapes (8%).

However, it is primarily eaten as fresh fruit in India, where a small amount is also used to make beverages and to preserve fruits like raisins. Evaluating the farmer features is

crucial to any field of study because it provides a clear and fundamental grasp of the farmers' backgrounds [2].

2. Materials and Methods

Since the Dindigul district of Tamil Nadu had the greatest efficiency and manufacturing, the study was carried out there. The study was therefore carried out in the Dindigul district. A snowball sampling technique was used to choose the study participants. The investigation was a post-facto survey. To gather information from farmers and key informants, standardized data collection instruments were employed (interview schedule). Following coding and tabulation, the responses were examined using evocative statistical analysis, which included percentage calculations.

3. Results and discussion

The socioeconomic position of those who grow grapes is summarized in the following table. All in all, this indicates that they anticipate their lives getting better.

Table1: OverallpercentageofSocio-economicstatusof farmers (n=120)

Sl. No	Category	Number	Percentage
1	Low level	32	26.67
2	Medium level	51	42.50
3	High level	37	30.83
4	Total	120	100.00

Around forty percent of the farmers (42.50 %) had a medium socioeconomic position, then followed by those with a wealthy background (30.83 %), and the remainder of the participants (26.67%) had a low socioeconomic level, according to Table 1.

Characteristics wise socio-economic status of grape growers.

Table2: Socioeconomiccharacteristicsoffarmers(n-120)

Sl. No	Dimensions	Category	Number	Percent
1	**Age**	Old age	22	18.33
		Middle age	64	53.33
		Young age	34	28.33
		PrimarySchool	20	16.67
		MiddleSchool	37	30.83

2	**Education**	HigherSecondary	41	34.16
		Degree	22	18.33
3	**Annual Income**	Less income	22	18.33
		Medium income	63	52.50
		High income	35	29.16
4	**Occupation**	Agriculture	120	100.00
		Non-Agriculture	--	--
5	**Farm size**	Marginal farmer	14	11.67
		Small farmer	67	55.83
		Big farmer	39	32.50
6	**Farming Experience**	Less experience	20	16.67
		Medium experience	65	54.16
		High Experience	35	29.17
7	**Decision making pattern**	Independent decision	99	82.50
		Joint decision	21	17.50
8	**FamilySize**	Nuclear Family	112	90.83
		Joint Family	11	09.16
9	**Extension agency contact**	Low level	30	25.00
		Medium level	70	58.33
		High level	20	16.66
10	**Mass Media Exposure**	Low level	25	20.83
		Medium level	64	53.33
		High level	31	25.83

(a) Age

Table 2 revealed that more than half of the respondents (53.33percent)werebelonged to middle age category of about thirty to forty five,followed28.33 per cent belonged to young age category of about less than thirty years and remaining 18.33 per cent of the respondents had belonged to old age category of about more than forty five years.

(b) Education

It was observed from the table more than thirty (34.16 per cent) of the respondents had the education was up to higher secondary, followed by 30.83 per centhad middle school level, 18.33 per cent had degree and remaining 16.67 per cent had primary level of education. This demonstrated that farmers with higher levels of education saw themselves as having a significant socioeconomic influence on the advised cultivation methods [3].

(c) Annual Income

The data from the table indicated that majority (52.50 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of annual income about Rs 60,000 to 1,50,000 followed by29.16 per cent of the respondents had high level of annual income of about more thanRs 1,50,000 and remaining 18.33 per cent of respondents had less level of annual income of about Less than Rs.60,000 respectively.

(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) Farm size

The data regarding farm size represent that majority (55.83 per cent) of the respondents belonged to small farmer (0.5 to 1.5 acre) category followed by32.50 per cent were belonged to big farmer (more than 1.5 acre)category and remaining 11.67 per cent belonged to marginal farmer (below 0.5 acre) category. This shows that the maximum per cent of grape growers were had the small and big land holding.

(f) Farming experience

Regarding farm experience majority of the respondents (54.16 per cent) had medium level of farming experience i.e. twenty to twenty five years, followed by 29.17per cent of the respondents had high level of experience of about more than twenty five years and remaining 16.67per cent of the respondents had low level of experience of about less than twenty years of farming experience [5].This shows that the respondents had the adequate experience in cultivation of grapes.

(g) Decision making pattern

The results revealed that the maximum number of respondents (82.50 per cent) had pointed out the independent decision followed by remaining 17.50 per cent of the respondents had pointed the joint decision. This results shows that the respondents had able to take the decisions independently regarding their farm activities.

(h) Familysize

The overwhelming majority of the farmers, or 90.83 percent, had nuclear families with fewer than five members, according to the results. And only 09.16 percent of those surveyed had a joint family consisting of more than five people. The majority of farmers

had nuclear families, according to data on family sizes. Few of them had sizable families. This indicates that the idea of the joint family approach is gradually disappearing from the villages, as a result of fragmentation, and people are starting to become independent. The development of agriculture is not supported by this trend. This could also be a result of their heightened social awareness of government-sponsored family planning initiatives aimed at slowing population growth [6].

(i) Extension agency contact

It is evident from the Table 2 that more than half of the respondents (58.33per cent) hadmedium extension agency contact, followed by only 25.00per 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 (53.33per cent) hadmedium mass media exposure, followed by only 25.00per cent had high mass media exposure and remaining were 20.83per cent had low mass media exposure.

4. Conclusion

Thedatarevealedthat , the majority (53.33%) of respondents belonged to the middle age category followed by 34.16 per cent of the respondents had the education was up to higher secondary and 30.83 per cent had middle school level. Majority (52.50 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of annual income, followed by majority of the respondents had agriculture as their main occupation for their livelihood. Majority of the farmers, or 90.83 percent, had nuclear families with fewer than five members and only 09.16 percent of those surveyed had a large family. Maximum number of respondents (82.50 per cent) had pointed out the independent decision followed by remaining 17.50 per cent of the respondents had pointed the joint decision. Majority (55.83 per cent) of the respondents belonged to small farmer category Majority of the respondents had medium level of mass media exposure and extension agency contact. This shows that the majority of the farmers had medium to high socio economic status towards the cultivation practices of grapegrowers.

5. References

1. Avinash Sureshrao Pradhan, Dr. Nitin Barker and Akash Rai.Socio-economic status of grape growers in Nashik district, Maharashtra: A comprehensive study.International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

.Volume 7; Issue 2; Jan 2024; Page No. 101-105.

2. Chavan PM, Shirke VS, Ahire MC, Kharde PB. Constraints faced by grape growers in the Nashik District of Maharashtra; c2021.
3. 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; p. 259.
4. Manuel Taifouris, Mahmoud El-Halwagi, and Mariano Martin. Evaluation of the Economic, Environmental, and Social Impact of the Valorization of Grape Pomace from the Wine Industry. ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering 2023 11 (37), 13718-13728
5. 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.
6. Rachana P. Economic analysis of marketing channel of grapes in Maharashtra. Int Res J Agric Econ Stat. 2017;8(1):21-25.
7. Shende AH, Tupe SD. Problems and prospects of grape exports: A case study of Maharashtra; c2024.
8. 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.
9. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337230841_Grapes_in_the_World_Economy
10. https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/12/12/2063