

Socio- Economic Traits of Mango Growers.

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Lucknow District of Uttar Pradesh. Malihabad and Bakshi Ka Talab were selected proportionally for the study. 120 farmers were included in the sample for the present investigation. Results reveals that majority of respondents were found in majority of the respondents (46.66 per cent) were observed in the middle age category of up to 40-60 years. So, the majority of the respondents (Farmers) fall in the category of age group up to 40 -60 years. That is majority of respondents found under the married Category (80.33 per cent) followed by unmarried category (13.33 per cent) and other specific (5.83 per cent). It revealed that the fact is majority of respondents (95.83 per cent) belongs Joint family system. Thus, it is concluded that the majority of the respondents was found in category of small family size. The average income was observed to Rs. 138,000 with a range of minimum Rs. 38000 and maximum Rs. 750,000. It is evident that majority of the respondents (36.66 per cent) were having participation in more than two organization. That most of the respondents were found with medium (60 per cent) degree of scientific orientation followed by High (28.33 per cent) degree and then lastly Low (11.66 per cent) degree of scientific orientation. That is out of 16 variables studied. The Six variables are Attitude, Adoption, Social participation, Caste, Education; Extension contact has highly significant and positive correlation. Size of family and Age are two variables which is Highly Significant and negative correlation with knowledge. Type of Family, Risk orientation, Economic Motivation, Scientific orientation are non significant and the correlation is negative with Knowledge. Annual Income is single variable which correlated with Knowledge which is non significant and positive correlation with knowledge.

Introduction: Agriculture is the premise of throughout improvement paintings. If we fail in agriculture, it does now no longer remember what else we acquire what number of plant life we placed up our monetary improvement will now no longer be complete.

Mango (*Mangifera indica*) is likewise called king of fruit. Is a fruit plant mango is used as a meals, juices, mango pulp, pickles, chutneys, jams, slice in brine. For human intake and additionally correct for fuel, farm animals feed. The tree is mango performs big position in agriculture because of its nature of fruit and play critical position Agri. meals industries. (Ganeshamurthy et. al. 2018)

India is the biggest manufacturer of mango with inside the international, contributing to almost 46% of the whole international mango manufacturing. India has an facet over

different nations with regards to mango manufacturing in phrases of herbal sources required and climatic conditions. (Yadav et. al.2016)

Mango includes 70 species, mainly limited in tropical Asia. Generally, mango is a deep rooted; evergreen plant bears severa branches and develops into big timber. It loves deep soils and grows luxuriously in correct and beneficial agro-climatic conditions. (yadav et al. 2016)

That need to visible as a top-notch possibility to be exploited through Indian mango cultivators. The studies famous that China and Philippines have skilled maximum boom fee (11.30per centage) and (9.08 per centage) CGR respectively, even with inside the mango manufacturing additionally. This virtually shows the reality that China has found out the awesome capability this is being hidden on this specialised quarter, i.e. mango cultivation industry, and is attempting to take advantage of the equal earlier than every other united states does. Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan and Nigeria are the nations which are experiencing big boom among four and six per centage. India, unfortunately, is the most effective united-states that has skilled a poor boom of -0.86 per centage CGR, no matter her being the pinnacle maximum manufacturer of mango. (Purushottam Bung 2018)

Methodology:

The present study was conducted in Lucknow district of Uttar Pradesh considering the convenience of elevation of Lucknow 125 meter (410 feet), latitude 26.8465 degree and longitude 80.9466 degree. Total area of Lucknow 631 km² & population of Lucknow is 35 lakhs. Density of Lucknow 5500/km². The district is bounded on the east by Barabanki, on west by Unnao, on the south Raebareli and in north by Sitapur & Hardoi. The soil and climatic condition of this district is most suitable for cultivation of mango. Lucknow district has 8 blocks, namely Bakshi Ka Talab, Chinhath, Gosainganj, Kakori, Mal, Malihabad, Mohanlalganj, Sarojini Nagar, out of those the Malihabad and Bakshi Ka Talab could be decided on proportionally for the study Because of the best wide variety of farmers included below Mango cultivation. A whole listing of all The fundamental mango cultivated village become organized in session with the non-public of sales and agriculture branch from the diagnosed block have been decided on from the listing so organized on the premise of most region mango cultivation. Thus general villages have been decided on for the prevailing investigation. Selection of respondents- for choice of respondents, a complete listing of mango cultivators become put together from every diagnosed village from each the block with the assist of villages patwari and agriculture officials of respective village, mango cultivators have been decided on proportionally from every village diagnosed block etc. one hundred twenty farmers have been blanketed with inside the pattern for the prevailing investigation.

Result and Discussion: In this section, data regarding socio-economic profile are- Age, Education, Marital status, Religion, Caste status, Family type & Family size etc are included which is given as follows-

Age: On basis of age, the respondents were classified into three categories.

Table-1: Distribution of the respondents according to age: n=120

S.N.	Categories	f	%
1	Below 40 years	28	23.33
2	40 - 60 years	56	46.66
3	Above 90 years	36	30
	Total	120	100

f=frequency, S.D. = 16.89, Mean =52.09, max =86, min. =23.

It is evident from the Table 1 that majority of the respondents (46.66 per cent) were observed in the middle age category of up to 40-60 years of age followed by old age above 60 years (30 per cent) and young age 0-40 years (23.33 per cent) respectively. So, the majority of the respondents (Farmers) fall in the category of age group up to 40 -60 years.

Table-2: Distribution of the respondents according to their education: n=120

S. No.	Education Level	f	%
1	Illiterate	8	06.66
2	Literate	112	93.34
1	Primary education	4	04.28
2	Middle	22	18.33
3	High school	26	21.66
4	Intermediate	26	21.66
5	Graduate	17	14.16
6	Post Graduate	17	14.16
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, Mean = 3.47, S. D. = 1.66, max. = 6, min = 0.

It is evident from the Table 2 that majority of both respondent were educated up to High school and Intermediate (21.66 per cent) followed by Middle (18.33 per cent), graduate (14.16 per cent), post graduate (14.16 per cent), Illiterate (06.66 per cent) and primary education (4.28 per cent).

Table-3: Distribution of the respondents according to their marital status: n=120

S.N.	Categories	f	%
1	Married	97	80.33
2	Unmarried	16	13.33
3.	Other specific	07	05.83
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, S.D. = 0.55, Mean = 1.25, Max. = 3, Min. =1.

It is evident from the Table 3 that majority of respondents found under the married Category (80.33 per cent) followed by unmarried category (13.33 per cent) and other specific (5.83 per cent).

Table-4: Distribution of the respondents according to their Caste status: n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1	Scheduled Caste	60	50.00
2	ST	8	06.66
3	Other Backward Caste	28	23.33
4	General Caste	24	20.00
	Total	120	100

f=frequency, Mean = 2.56, S.D. = 0.88, Max. = 4, Min. = 1.

It is evident from the Table 4 that maximum number of the respondents was found in scheduled caste (50 per cent) followed by other backward caste (23.33 per cent), general category (20 per cent) and scheduled Tribes (6.66 per cent). Thus, it may be said that the Scheduled caste was dominant in the study area.

Table-5: Distribution of the respondents according to their family type: n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
------	----------	---	---

1	Nuclear Family	5	04.16
2	Joint Family	115	95.83
	Total	120	100

f=frequency, S.D. = 0.20, Mean = 1.04, Max = 2, Min. = 1.

It is evident from the Table 5 that the 95.83 per cent respondent's belonged to joint family system followed by 4.16 per cent of the respondents who belong to Nuclear family system. It revealed that the fact is majority of respondents (95.83 per cent) belongs Joint family system.

Table-6: Distribution of the respondents according to size of family: n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1	Small (0-4 member)	56	46.66
2	Medium (5-9 member)	44	36.66
3	Large (more than 10 member)	20	16.66
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, Mean= 1.7, S.D. = 0.74, Range-Min. =1, Max. = 3.

It is evident from Table 6 that 46.66 per cent respondent's families were observed such who had Up to 0-4 members followed by 36.66 per cent families having 5-9 members and the large size of family was observed to be (more than 10) members. The range between minimum and maximum number of family members was recorded from 1 to 18. Thus, it is concluded that the majority of the respondents was found in category of small family size.

Table-7: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their land holding: n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1	Marginal (0-1 ha.)	40	33.33
2	Small (1 – 2ha.)	48	40.00
3	Medium (2-4 ha.)	28	23.33
4	Large (above 4 ha.)	4	03.33
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, Mean = 1.96, S.D. = 0.83, Range - Min. = 1, Max. = 4.

It is evident from the Table 7 that majority of respondents were exist in small size farmers category (40 per cent) followed by Marginal scale farmers (33.33 per cent), medium scale farmers (23.33 per cent) and lastly Large scale farmers (03.33 per cent).

Table-8: Distribution of the respondents according to annual income (Rs.) n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1	Up to 1,00,000 Rs.	40	03.33
2	1,00000 Rs -400000 Rs	72	60.00
3	Above 500000 Rs	08	06.66
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, Mean = 1.71, S.D. = 1.31, Min. = 0.35, Max. = 6.

It is evident from Table 8 that maximum (60 per cent) of the respondents were found in the income categories of Rs. 1,00,000- 4,00,000 followed by other categories viz., 6.66per cent (above Rs. 5,00,000), 3.33per cent (up to 1,00,000).The average income was observed to Rs. 1,38,000 with a range of minimum Rs. 38000 and maximum Rs. 750000.

Table-9: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of social participation: n=120

S. N.	Category	f	%
1	No Participation	12	10.00
2	Participation in one organization	32	26.66
3	Participation in two organization	32	26.66
4	Participation in more than two organization	44	36.66
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, S.D. = 1.01, Mean = 1.9, Max. = 3, Min. = 0.

It is evident from the Table 9 that majority of the respondents (36.66per cent) were having participation in more than two organization followed by participation in one organization (26.66per cent), and participation in two organizations (26.66per cent) and very least number of respondents (10per cent) have no participation in any organization.

Table-10: Distribution of the respondent on the basis of farm power: n=120

S. No.	Category	f	%
1	Bullock	10	08.33
2	Electric motor	30	25.00
3	Pumping set/ Diesel engine	80	66.66
4	Power tiller	18	15.00
5	Tractor	60	50.00
	Total	120	100

It is evident from the Table-10 that 66.66per cent respondents were having Pumping set/ Diesel engine, 50per cent respondents were having Tractor, 25per cent respondents have electric motor, 15per cent of the respondents were having power tiller, and 8.33 per cent respondents were have Bullocks.

Table-11: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of household materials: n=120

S. No	Particulars	f	%
1.	Double bed	54	45.00
2.	Sofa set	28	23.33
3.	Dressing Table	40	33.33
4.	Gas cylinder	98	81.66
5.	Electric press	70	58.33
6.	Pressure cooker	120	01.00
7.	Crockery	60	50.00

8.	Fan	140	116.66
9.	Cooler	60	50.00
10.	Solar light	40	33.33
11.	Heater	80	66.66
12.	Cots	100	83.33
13.	Sewing machine	90	75.00
14.	Chair	160	133.33
15.	Wall watch	140	116.66
16.	Induction cooker	56	46.66
17.	Washing machine	40	33.33
18.	Dining Table	45	37.50

Table-11 denotes the different household material posses by the respondents.

Table-12: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of communication media possession: n=120

S.N.	Particulars	f	%
1.	Radio	88	73.33
2.	T.V.	95	79.16
3.	D.T.H.	58	48.33
4.	Mobile phone	120	100
5.	Computer	80	66.66
6.	Laptop	60	50.00
7.	News Paper	42	35.00

It is evident from the table 12 that cent- per cent of the respondents have mobile phone. Computer is possessed by 66.66 per cent of the respondents, 50 per cent respondents have

laptop, 35 per cent respondents have subscribed to the newspaper, Radio is possessed by 73.33 per cent, TV is possessed by 79.16 per cent and DTH is possessed by 48.33 per cent.

Table-13: Distribution of respondents according to their economic motivation level:

n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1.	Low (up to 25)	52	43.33
2.	Medium (25-30)	34	28.33
3.	High (30-40)	34	28.33
	Total	120	100

f=frequency, Mean=26.60, S.D. = 5.61, Range- Min. =15, Max. =39.2.

It is evident from the table 13 that majority of the respondents (43.33 per cent) was possessing Low level of economic motivation followed by medium (28.33 per cent) and high level (28.33 per cent) of economic motivation.

Table-14: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their scientific orientation:

n=120

S.N.	Category	f	%
1.	Low (29-40)	14	11.66
2.	Medium (41-60)	72	60.00
3.	High (78)	34	28.33
	Total	120	100

f= frequency, Mean=52.16, S.D. =11.20, Range- Min. =29, Max. = 77.4.

It is evident from the table 14 that most of the respondents were found with medium (60 per cent) degree of scientific orientation followed by High (28.33 per cent) degree and then lastly Low (11.66 per cent) degree of scientific orientation.

Table No15: Distribution of respondents on the basis of extension contact:

S. No.	Source of information	Respondents	
		Mean per score	Rank
A.	Formal Sources		
1.	B.D.O.	3.13	VIII
2.	A.D.O.	2.26	X
3.	V.D.O.	2.70	IX
4.	Kisan Sahayak	5.70	I
5.	Gram Pradhan	3.33	VII
6.	Co-operatives	3.53	VI
7.	Agril. College/University	3.70	IV
8.	Mandi Samiti	3.83	III
9.	Fertilizer/Seed Stores	3.63	V
10.	Agril. Scientists	3.90	II
	Mean	3.57	
B.	Informal Sources		
1.	Family Members	4.23	VI
2.	Neighbour	4.50	V
3.	Friends	4.60	IV
4.	Relatives	4.70	II
5.	Local Leaders	4.90	I
6.	Progressive farmer	4.63	III
	Mean	4.59	
C.	Mass Media Exposure		
1.	Radio	5.16	III
2.	T.V.	6.79	I
3.	News paper	6.14	II
4.	News bulletins	3.76	VII
5.	Farm magazines	3.54	X
6.	Circular letters	3.55	IX
7.	Agri. Books	3.72	VIII
8.	Posters	4.92	IV
9.	Farmers fair	1.66	XI
10.	Demonstration	1.50	XIII
11.	Folders	1.57	XII
12.	Social Media	4.03	V
13.	Others	3.94	VI
	Mean	3.86	

Table 15 denotes the extension contacts by the respondents.

It is evident from the Table-15 that is out of 3 variables studied. The variable of formal source is average mean of 3.86. Found the Ranks of Formal Sources is Kisan sahayak (I),

Followed by Agril. Scientist is (II), Mandy Samiti (III), and Agril. College/University (IV), Fertilizers/Seed Stores (v), Co-operatives (VI), Gram- Pradhan (VII), B.D.O.(VIII), V.D.O.(IX), and A.D.O.(X).

Variable of Informal Sources Average Mean is 4.59. In this table result is available in Ranks Local Leaders (I), Followed by Relatives (II), Progressive Farmers (III), Friends (IV), Neighbour's (V), and Family Members (VI).

In third variable Mass Media Exposure result found in Ranks. In this table ranks followed one by one. Average Mean of Mass Media Exposures is 3.86. T.V (I), Relatives (II), Radio (III),Posters (IV), Social Media (V), Others (VI), Folders (VII), Agri. Books (VIII), Circular Letters (IX), Farm Magazines (X), Farmers Fair (XI), Folders (XII), and Demonstration (XIII).

Conclusion: The greater part of respondents (46.66 per cent) was observed in the middle age category of up to 40-60 years. The greater part of the both respondents was educated up to High school and Intermediate (21.66 per cent).The greater part of respondents found under the married Category (80.33 per cent).The maximum number of the respondents was found in scheduled caste (50 per cent).The majority of 95.83 per cent respondent's belonged to joint family system. The 46.66 per cent respondent's families were observed such as who had Up to 0-4 members. The best part of the respondents was existed in small size farmer category (40 per cent).The maximum (60 per cent) of the respondents were found in the income categories of Rs. 100,000- 400,000.The greater part of the respondents (36.66 per cent) was having participation in more than two organizations. The 66.66per cent respondents were having Pumping set/Diesel engine, 50 per cent respondents were having Tractor, 25 per cent respondents have electric motor, 15 per cent of the respondents were having power tiller, and 8.33 per cent respondents were have Bullocks. The cent- per cent of the respondents have mobile phone. Computer is possessed by 66.66 per cent of the respondents, 50 per cent respondents have laptop, 35 per cent respondents have subscribed to the newspaper, Radio is possessed by 73.33 per cent, TV is possessed by 79.16 per cent and DTH is possessed by 48.33 per cent. The mass of the respondents (43.33 per cent) were possessing Low level of economic motivation. The most of the respondents were found with medium (60 per cent) degree of scientific orientation.

References:

- Aski, S.G. and Hirevenkanagoudar, L.V. (2010). Extent of adoption of improved mango cultivation practices by the KVK trained farmers. Published in *Asian Sciences*. **5**(2): 98-101.
- Balaji, J. and Manjunath, L. (2011). Knowledge level of farmers regarding recommended cultivation practices of mango. *Journal artical Agriculture Update*; **6** (2): 73-76.
- Bhople, R.S. Thakur, K.K., and Atrey, A.H. (1990). Sources of information, knowledge and adoption of dry land horticulture technology by fanners, Published in *national level seminar on changing scenario of rainfed horticulture in rural areas, MAU, Parbhani (M.S.)*.14-200.
- Chatterjee, D. Jha, S.K. and Maiti, S. (2019). Effect of Multimedia on Preparation of Traditional Dairy Products at the Household Level, Published in *Journal Pertanian*. **4** (2): 212-235.
- Chaudhari, S.K. and Singh, A. (2019). NRM Interventions for Enhanced Mango Productivity and Quality, Published in *Advanced Agricultural Research & Technology Journal*. **3** (1): 9-29.
- Chauhan, N.B. Siddhartha, D.S.D. and Patel, J.G. (2003). Entrepreneurial distinctive features of poultry entrepreneur. Published in *Guj. J.Ext.Edu*;14: 42-45.
- Chinchmalatpure, U. R. (2001). Sardar Sarovar Project affected farmers' attitude towards rehabilitated place and their adoption of agricultural technology. Published in *Ph.D Thesis, G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar*.
- Dana, S. S. and Kanbid, B. R. (1998). Impact of knowledge on attitude of livestock owners towards artificial insemination in cattle. Published in *Indian Vet. J.* **75** (6): 572- 573.
- Dibaba, R. Hagos, A. Bekele, A. and Alemu. D. (2019) Challenges and Opportunities of Mango Production and Marketing in Assosa Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Region: Evidence from Ethiopia. Published in *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, **53** (1): 2422-8451.

Diwan, Y.B. (2000). Study on role performance of Tribal farm women in Adoption of maize production technology in Dahod dist. of Guj. State. Published in *M.Sc. thesis, GAU, S. K. Nagar.*

Dodia, L. B. (1997). Assessment of Training Needs of Tobacco Growers with Regard to Tobacco Nursery Management in Kheda District of Gujarat State. Published in *M.Sc. (Agri). Thesis, G.A.U., Anand Campus, Anand.*

Dongardive, V.T. (2002). A study on adoption of recommended technology of chilly crop by chilly Growers of Anand district of Gujarat state. Published in *M.Sc (Agri.) thesis G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar.*

Ganeshamurthy, A.N. Rupa, T.R. and Shivananda, T.N. (2018). Enhancing Mango Productivity through Sustainable Resource Management, Published in *Journal of Hortl. Sci.* **13** (1): 1-31.

Gouda, K.C. (1995). Extent of adoption of banana cultivation technology by the farmers of Anand Taluka of Gujarat State. Published in *M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis, GAU, S.K. Nagar.*

Jawale, P.S. and Nachane, M.N. (1994). Socio-personal characteristics and adoption of recommended practices of mango and citrus crops. Published in *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edn.* 13 :139.

Joshi, P.I. (2004). Extent of knowledge and adoption of farmers about modern practices of cotton in Bhal area of Gujarat state. Published in *M.Sc (Agri.) thesis, G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar.*