



SOCIO ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE TRIBAL FARM FAMILIES

S. Lakra*, Neeta Khare and M. A. Khan

Department of Agricultural Extension, Indira Gandhi KrishiVishwavidhayalya, Krishak Nagar,
Jora, Raipur - 492 012 (Chhattisgarh), India.

Abstract

The study was on the socio-economic conditions of farmers in Jashpur district of Chhattisgarh, India. The data were collected by personal interview with the help of well prepared, structured and pretested interview schedule. The sample size is 120 tribal farm families. The study revealed about socio economic profile of the tribal farm families based on age, education level, family size, sub-caste, social participation, occupation, land holding, land ownership, irrigation availability, credit acquisition and annual income of the family. Majority of the respondents were illiterate and they belonged to Uraon sub-caste. Majority of the male respondents were member in Gram Panchayat. Both male and female respondents had farming experience more than 20 years and cent per cent of the respondents were practicing agriculture as their main occupation and having medium annual income (up to 1 lakh). Most of the land were owned by the male head of the family. The maximum number of respondents were having small size of land holding (1 to 2 ha) and their operational holdings were situated near (up to 2 km) to their home. Canal was found as the most popular irrigation source amongst the irrigated respondents. Most of the land was owned by the male head of the family.

Key words : Socio-economic, male and female respondents, tribal farm families, post-harvest management activities.

Introduction

Socio-economic condition means an economic and social combined total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others; based on income, education and occupation (Bhattacharya, 2014). The poor socio-economic condition of tribal farm families in Jashpur is caused by low education level and lack of knowledge regarding post-harvest management of rice. This paper attempts to know the reasons of poor socio-economic condition of tribal farm families. The specific objective is :

1. To study the socio-economic profile of the tribal farm families.

Methodology

The present study was undertaken in Jashpur district of Chhattisgarh. Out of 8 blocks, 4 blocks were selected purposively because of high tribal population and also having large area of rice crop. For this study 12 tribal villages were selected, 10 tribal farm families from each

selected village were selected randomly. Thus the total 120 farm families were selected for the study. In this way ($12 \times 10 = 120$) a total of 120 rice growing farm families were selected for present study. The data were collected by personal interview with the help of well prepared, structured and pretested interview schedule. Data were analyzed using frequency distribution, percentages and correlation coefficient.

Results and Discussion

The study provided the following information regarding the socioeconomic profiles of rural rice farmers of district Swat:

Age of the respondents

The table 1 shows that in the male category maximum percentage (51.67%) of the respondents belong to middle age group (36-55 years), followed by 42.5 per cent from old age group (above 55 years) and only 5.83 per cent belong to young age group (up to 35 years). On the other hand in female category maximum 47.5 per cent belong to middle age group, 35 per cent belong to old age group and 17.5 per cent from young age group.

*Author for correspondence : E-mail: kalashashi1994@gmail.com

The survey on farmer shows that middle age group and old age group are mostly involved in agriculture and young age group are not much involved as compared to middle and old age group.

Education

Education of farmers in study area is enlisted in the table 2. The table shows that in the male category highest number of respondents (27.50%) were illiterate, followed by 25.83 per cent were having higher secondary level of education, 14.17 per cent were having middle school and high school level of education, 11.67 per cent have primary level of education and only 06.66 per cent have graduate and above level of education.

If we talk about education level of female respondents, maximum were found illiterate similar to male respondents, primary education holders were 20.83 per cent, middle school education holders were 15.83 per cent, high school education holder were 09.17 per cent, higher secondary education holder were 15.83 per cent and graduation and above level of education holder were only 5 per cent middle age (35.00%) old age and (17.50%) young age.

Family size

The data regarding size of family is presented in table 3. It indicates that 44.17 per cent of the respondents were having medium size family (5 to 8 members), followed by 36.66 per cent of respondents have small size family (1 to 4 members) and only 19.17 per cent of the respondents belonged to large size family (Above 8 members).

Social participation

Social participation Social participation gives an idea about the respondents participation in social activities. As regard to social participation in the male category, majority of the respondents (84.17%) were only member of an organization, followed by 13.33 per cent were member cum office bearer and only 2.50 per cent have no participation. 48 On the other hand, most of the female respondents (67.50%) had no participation in any social activities. Less than one third (27.17%) of the females have member of an organisation and very few 3.33 per cent have office bearer. The extension workers should be motivated, encouraged the farmers to involve themselves actively in rural development activities.

Sub-caste

Sub-caste of the respondents The data presented on caste of the respondents in table 5 indicates that the majority of the respondents (97.50%) belonged to Uraon sub-caste, while only 02.50 per cent of the respondents belonged to Gond sub-caste in the study area.

Occupation

Occupation regarding the distribution of respondents according to their occupation, it was observed from the data compiled in table 6 that all the respondents were involved in agriculture. In the male category, 77.50 per cent of the respondents work in MGNREGA, 69.16 per cent responded as labour, 22.50 per cent were giving various services, 03.30 per cent were involved in livestock, 01.66 per cent respondents were doing business and 04.16 per cent were involved in some other

Table 1 : Distribution of respondents according to their age.

S.no.	Age group	Male		Female/spouse	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Young (Up to 35 years)	7	5.83	21	17.50
2.	Middle (36 -55 years)	62	51.67	57	47.50
3.	Old (Above 55 years)	51	42.50	42	35.00

Table 2 : Distribution of respondents according to their education.

S. no.	Education level	Male		Female/spouse	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1	Illiterate	33	27.50	44	36.67
2	Primary school	14	11.67	25	20.83
3	Middle school	17	14.17	15	12.50
4	High school	17	14.17	11	9.17
5	Higher Secondary School	31	25.83	19	15.83
6	Graduation and above	8	6.66	6	5.00

Table 3 : Distribution of respondents according to their size of family.

S.no.	Size of family	Frequency	Percentage
1	Small (1 – 4 members)	44	36.66
2	Medium (5 – 8 members)	53	44.17
3	Large (Above 8 members)	23	19.17

Table 4 : Distribution of respondents according to their social participation.

S. no.	Type of membership	M.F.	Percentage	FF	Percentage
1	No participation	3	2.50	81	67.50
2	Member of an organization	101	84.17	35	29.17
3	Office bearer	16	13.33	4	3.33

M.F. = Male Frequency, F.F. = Female Frequency.

Table 5 : Distribution of farm families according to their sub-caste.

S. no.	Sub-Caste	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Uraon	117	97.5
2.	Gond	3	2.5

Table 6 : Distribution of respondents according to their participation in different occupation.

S. no.	Activities	Occupation			
		Male		Female	
		F	%	F	%
1	Agriculture	120	100.00	120	100.00
2	MANREGA	93	77.50	54	45.00
3	Labour	83	69.16	35	29.16
4	Livestock	4	3.30	4	3.30
5	Business	2	1.66	2	1.66
6	Service	27	22.50	19	15.80
7	Other	5	4.16	3	2.50

F = Frequency, % = Percentage.

occupations. On the other hand, in female category, 45.00 per cent of the respondents work in MGNREGA, followed by 29.16 per cent were worked as labour, 15.80 per cent were giving services, 3.30 per cent were involved in livestock same as male respondent, 01.66 per cent were doing business and 2.50 per cent have other kind of occupation.

Land holding

The distribution of the respondents according to their size of land holdings are presented in the table 7. The data regarding land holdings indicates that 40 per cent of the selected tribal family had small (1 to 2 ha) land holdings, followed by 25.83 per cent of the respondents had

marginal (less than 1 ha) land holdings, 19.16 per cent had medium (2 to 4 ha) land holdings and 15.00 per cent of the respondents were having large (above 4 ha) size of land holdings.

Land ownership

Land ownership is mostly owned by male in the study area. Studied data shows that 81.67 per cent ownership in family by male, 9.17 per cent by jointly male and female, 05.83 per cent land owned by female and 3.33 per cent land ownership was found in the name of their children.

Irrigation facility

The data regarding the availability of irrigation facility has shown on the table 9. According to the data, 61.66 per cent of the respondents have available irrigation facility and 38.33 per cent have responded as they don't have irrigation facility. Among the respondents, who have irrigation facility, maximum 32.43 per cent of the respondents use canal as source of irrigation, followed by 18.92 per cent by pond, 16.22 per cent by tube well,

Table 7 : Distribution of respondents according to land holding in family

S. no.	Size of land holdings	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Marginal (Less than 1 ha)	31	25.83
2.	Small (1 to 2 ha)	48	40.00
3.	Medium (2.1 to 4 ha)	23	19.17
4.	Large (Above 4 ha)	18	15.00

Table 8 : Distribution of respondents according to land ownership in family.

S. no.	Land ownership	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male only	98	81.67
2	Female only	7	5.83
3	Both	11	9.17
4	Children	4	3.33

Table 9 : Distribution of the respondents according to availability of irrigation.

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
A. Irrigation availability		
• Available	74	61.66
• Not available	46	38.33
B. Sources of irrigation		
• Canal	24	32.43
• Well	8	10.81
• Pond	14	18.92
• River	10	13.52
• Tube-well	12	16.22
• other	6	8.10

13.52 per cent by river, 10.81 per cent by well and 08.10 per cent use other source of irrigation.

Distance of field from home

The table regarding the distance of field from home shows that most of the farmers were having their fields near to their home, 62.50 per cent of respondents reported that their farm located within the radius of 2 km and 30 per cent respondents had field distance in between 2.1 to 5 km, whereas, only 7.5 per cent have their farm far than 5 km.

Annual income of family

It was observed that majority of respondents, (58.34%) were having annual income in the range of Rs. 50,001-2,00,000, followed by 16.67 per cent of the respondents come under the income category of up to Rs.50,000 while, 15.83 per cent of the respondents reported that they were covered annual income above Rs. 3,00,000 and 9.16 per cent of the respondents were found under income range of Rs. 2,00,001 to 3,00,000 (table 10).

Credit acquisition

The findings regarding credit acquisition are compiled in the table 11. It is clear from this table that the majority of respondents (55.00%) were not acquired credit and 45.00 per cent of respondents were acquired credit. Out of total credit acquired respondents, the majority of the respondents (38.88%) were taken credit from cooperative society, followed by 29.63 per cent of respondents have taken credit from Friends/Neighbours/Relatives, 18.52 per cent have preferred shopkeeper/Money Lender and 12.97 per cent of the respondents were reported that were taken credit from nationalized bank.

As regards to duration of credit, the majority of the respondents (62.97%) were taken credit for up to 6 month, 27.78 per cent were taken credit between 6-12 months and 09.25 per cent of respondents have taken credit for more than 12 months. According to the purpose of obtaining credit, majority of the respondents (38.89%) have used their credit for seed purchasing, 35.19 per cent

Table 10 : Distribution of respondents according to their annual family income.

S. no.	Annual income	Frequen- cy	Percen- tage
1.	Low (Up to Rs. 50000)	20	16.67
2.	Medium (Rs. 50001-100000)	35	29.17
3.	Moderate (Rs. 100001-200000)	35	29.17
4.	High (Rs. 200001-300000)	11	9.16
5.	Very High (Above Rs. 300000)	19	15.83

Table 11 : Distribution of the respondents according to credit acquisition in family.

Particulars	Frequency	Per cent
Credit acquisition (n=120)		
• Not acquired	66	55.00
• Acquired	54	45.00
Source of Credit (n =54)		
• Nationalized bank	7	12.97
• Co-operative Society	21	38.88
• Friend/Neighbour/Relatives	16	29.63
• Shopkeeper/ Money Lender	10	18.52
Duration of Credit (n=54)		
• Short term(< 6 month)	34	62.97
• Medium term (6-12 month)	15	27.78
• Long term (> 12)	5	9.25
Amount of Credit (n=54)*		
Cash (n=43)		
• Up to Rs. 20000	16	37.21
• Rs. 20001-Rs. 30000	21	48.84
• Above Rs. 30001	6	13.95
Commodity (n=28)		
• Up to Rs.10000	14	50.00
• Rs 10001-Rs. 20000	8	28.57
• Above Rs. 20001	6	21.43
Purpose of Credit (n=54)		
• Fertilizer Purchasing	19	35.19
• Seed Purchasing	21	38.89
• Purchasing of Pesticide/ Herbicides	8	14.81
• Equipment	4	7.41
• For other purpose of purcha- sing and repayment	2	3.70
Mode of Repayment (n=54)		
• Cash	39	72.22
• Commodities	15	27.78

for purchasing of fertilizers, 14.81 per cent used for purchasing of pesticides and herbicides, 07.41 per cent were wring for purchasing of equipment and only 3.70 per cent of the respondents have used their credit for other kind of purchasing and repayment. Mode of repayment of credits of respondents is also mentioned in the table 4.12. Mostly repayment is preferred by cash

deposit (72.22%) and 27.78 per cent of the respondents repaid their credits by giving commodities.

Conclusion

The findings of the study shows that most of the male and female respondents belonged to middle age group. Majority of the respondents were illiterate and they belonged to Uraon sub-caste. Majority of the male respondents were member in Gram Panchayat. Both male and female the respondents were practicing agriculture as their main occupation and having medium annual income (up to 1 lakh). The findings clearly stated that all of the respondents depend for their livelihood on agriculture and labour in the study area. The data revealed that almost all the land owned by male as alone or jointly with spouse only, rarely the land registration is done on females name only. The study revealed that the maximum number of respondents were having small size of land holding (1 to 2 ha) and their operational holdings were situated near (up to 2 km) to their home. Canal was found as the most popular irrigation source amongst the irrigated respondents. Almost 45 per cent of the farm families were acquired credit.

References

- Achanta, L. D. (1982). *Role of Rural Women in Agricultural Development*, Kurukshetra, **31(2)**: 15-16.69.
- Desai, S. (1992). The influence of family structure on child welfare in Latin America and West Africa” in understanding how resources are allocated within households IFPRI policy briefs 8. Washington D.C.
- Govt. of Pakistan. Agric. Statistics of Pakistan (1999-00). Econ.Wing, Ministry of Food, Agric. and Livestock, Islamabad.
- Gray, I. (1994). The changing structure of rural communities. *Rural Soc.*, **4(3/4)**: 17-21.
- Hoddinott, J. (1992). “*Household Economics and Economics of Households*” in understanding how resources are allocated within households IFPRI policy briefs 8. Washington D.C.
- Irene, R. T. (2005). Women and pesticide management in the Philippines : An Assessment of roles and knowledge. *Ph.D. rural sociology thesis*, The Pennsylvania State University College of Agricultural Sciences. p 73,74
- Kim, M. H. (1993). Structure of the rice market and proposals for rice policy changes in Korea. *J. Rural Dev. Seoul.*, **16**, 1 : 101-131.
- Omotesho, K. F. (2015). Analysis of farmers perception of the accountability of agricultural extension services in Oyo State, Nigeria. Volume **3**, Issue **2**, p. 96-97
- Pandey, U. K. (1986). Existing Status of Rural Women in Changing Haryana Agriculture, Paper Presented in the Seminar on Role of Development Programme on Socio-Economic Status of Women held in the Department of Agricultural Economics, HAU Hisar on 21-22nd March.79
- Pandey, S. and M. Sanamongkhoun (1998). Rainfed lowland rice in Laos: A socio-economic benchmark study. *Int. Rice Res. Inst. (IRRI)*, Manila, 124 p.
- Saxena , B. (2003). Study on knowledge and adoption level of tomato production technology among the farmers of Jashpur district in Chhattisgarh. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*, IGKV, Raipur (C.G).
- Thomas, D. (1992). The distribution of income within the household and household expenditure patterns.” in understanding how resources are allocated within households IFPRI Policy Briefs 8. Washington D.C.
- Wilson, P. A. 1995. Embracing locality in local economic development’. *Urban Studies*, **32(4/5)**: 645-658.
- Zaffaroni, E., P. R. Taboadaand, J. G. Correa and da-Silva (1996). Analysis of small and large scale rice production systems in Arroio Grande, Rio Grande doSul: socioeconomic Aspects. *Lavoura-Arrozeira*. **49**, 428, 19-24.
- Zahoor, A. (2009). Twenty-Five Years of Research on Women Farmers in Africa: Lessons and Implications for Agricultural Research Institutions; with an Annotated Bibliography. CIMMYT Economics Program Paper No. 99- 02. Mexico D.F.: CIMMYT.