

PROFILE OF SAFFRON GROWERS

S.S. Kubrevi¹ and N.K. Khare²

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Pulwama district of Kashmir to know the socio-economic status of farmers. The farmers of two categories i.e., small and medium farmers differ from each other with regard to socio-personal attributes. Majority of the respondents in small category were from old age while in medium category were from middle age. Medium land holding farmers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers. Regarding size of land holding, medium respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer respondents who possessed small size of land. Regarding type of house, most of the respondents in both the categories live in pucca house. Majority of small farmers were depending on agriculture, labour and caste occupation, whereas 81.25 per cent medium farmers were engaged in agriculture, service and business for earning the wages. Annual income of small and medium respondents indicate that 53.33 per cent of small respondents had annual income of Rs. 70, 000-1,40,000, whereas, a majority of medium respondents had annual income above Rs 1,40,00, regarding size of family, majority of respondents in both categories had medium sized family. Medium holding saffron growers had higher material possession than small farmers. The study revealed that the respondents of both the categories differed significantly with respect to the social participation. The medium farmers had better socio-economic status than the small farmers. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in respect of psychological attributes. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in the ability to receive messages related to agriculture through mass media. While the small farmers have less exposure to mass media, low or no contact with development agencies and have low or no participation in saffron training programme.

Key words: Saffron; Socio -economic status; Small farmers; Medium farmers

INTRODUCTION

In India Saffron is mostly grown in Jammu and Kashmir and that too in the table lands of Pampore block contributing nearly 3830 ha and 50.32 q to the total area and production of saffron in the country, consequently Jammu and Kashmir earns about Rs. 43 crore from saffron every year.

With out the support of an organized research and extension effort led to the failure of saffron cultivation in the Kashmir valley and caused dismay among growers. The farmers are not uniformly adopt the recommended practices of Saffron cultivation, due to varied socio-economic, psychological and communicational strata. So it is indispensable to assess the profile of the Saffron growers.

METHODOLOGY

The Pulwama district of Kashmir was selected purposively for the study. The district comprises of four tehsils, out of which Pampore was selected, because it is the only tehsil and block where Saffron cultivation is practiced. The Pampore block consists of 60 villages, out of which 29 were inhabited and 31 uninhabited villages. Out of the 29 inhabited villages, 10 villages were randomly selected for the study. A list of sampling farmers from each village was made, and then the respondents were categorized on the basis of size of land holding.

A proportionate random sample of 10 per cent from each category i.e. small and medium farmers was randomly selected

from each village. Thus, a total number of 200 farmers constituted the sample for the purpose of this study. The socio-personal variable were studied (scale developed by G. Trivedi and pareek, 1963), psychological variable viz. economic motivation, risk orientation, scientific orientation (scale developed by Supe, 1969), aspiration (scale by Sagar, 1983), management orientation (Samant, 1977). For communicational variables viz. Mass media exposure, contact with development agencies were measured by structured schedule and extension participation scale developed by Siddarmaiah and Jalihal (1983).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is obvious from Table 1 that, highest 46.66 per cent of the small land holding respondents was of old age group (>55 years) followed by 38.33 percent of middle age group (36-55 years). While, only 15 per cent of small land holding respondents was of young age group (up to 35 years). Similarly, 70 per cent of medium holding respondents were in the middle age group (36-55 years) followed by 16.25 per cent in the old age group (above 55 years) and 13.75 per cent of young age group (up to 35 years). Thus, majority of the respondents in small category were from old age while in medium category were from middle age.

The data regarding the education depicts that 5.83 per cent had no formal schooling but could only read and write. While the remaining 59.15 per cent small respondents had

1. Ph. D. Scholar 2. Professor, Department of Ext. Edu., COA, JNKVV, Jabalpur

formal schooling; out of which 35 per cent were illiterate followed by middle school 25 per cent, high school 18.33 per cent, primary education 9.16 per cent and 6.66 per cent were graduates and above. In case of medium farmer respondents 26.25 per cent were illiterate, followed by high school 23.25 per cent, graduate and above 21.25 per cent, middle 12.5 per cent; primary 10.0 per cent and 6.25 per cent can read and write. From data, it can be inferred that, medium land holding farmers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers.

Majority of small respondents had land holding up to 5 acres while in case of medium respondent possessed land holding above 5 acres. Medium land holding respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer respondents who possessed small size of land.

Table 1 reveals that 19.16 per cent of the small land holding respondents were living in kaccha house, 34.17 per cent were in mixed and 46.67 per cent in pucca type of house whereas 5.0

per cent of the medium holding respondents were living in kaccha house, followed by 30.00 per cent in mixed and 65.00 per cent in pucca house. Half of the respondents in both the categories had pucca type of house. Majority of respondents (small: 62.5 and medium: 65%) had medium family size (6-10 members). About one-fourth of the respondents (both categories) had small family size (<5 members). Data indicated that there was no significant difference in both the categories regarding family size (Table 1).

It is noticed from Table-1 that, majority (73.75 per cent) of medium farmers were belonged to high income category (above Rs.1,40,000). Whereas, 23.75 per cent and 2.50 per cent medium land holding respondents were belonged to medium income (Rs. 70,000 to Rs. 1,40,000) and low income (up to Rs. 70,000) categories respectively. Nearly half (53.33%) of the small farmers were belonged to medium income category followed by low income (42.50 %) and high income (4.17%).

Table 1. Profile of respondents in respect to socio-personal attributes

Socio-personal variables	Category of attributes	Categories N=200	
		Small	Medium
Age	Young (up to 35 yrs)	18 (15.00)	11 (13.75)
	Middle (36-55 yrs)	46 (38.33)	56 (70.00)
	Old (above 55 yrs)	56 (46.66)	13 (16.25)
Education	Illiterate	42 (35.00)	21 (26.25)
	Can read and write	7 (5.83)	5 (6.25)
	Primary education	11 (9.16)	8 (10.00)
	Middle school	30 (25.00)	10 (12.50)
	High school	22 (18.33)	19 (23.25)
Size of land holding	Graduate & above	8 (6.66)	17 (21.25)
	Up to one acre	00 (00)	00 (00)
	Up to 5 acres	120 (100.00)	0.0 (0.00)
Type of house	Above 5 acres	0.0 (0.00)	80 (100.00)
	Kaccha	23 (19.16)	4 (5.00)
	Mixed	41 (34.17)	24 (30.00)
Occupation	Pucca	56 (46.67)	52 (65.00)
	Agriculture	64 (53.33)	7 (8.75)
	Agriculture + labour	22 (18.33)	5 (6.25)
	Agriculture + caste occupation	5 (4.17)	3 (3.75)
Annual Income	Agriculture + Service + Business	29 (24.17)	65 (81.25)
	Low income (up to Rs.70,000)	51 (42.50)	2 (2.50)
	Medium income (Rs. 70,000-1,40,000)	64 (53.33)	19 (23.75)
Size of family	High income (above Rs. 1,40,000)	5 (4.17)	59 (73.75)
	Small (up to 5 members)	33 (27.50)	18 (22.50)
	Medium (6-10 members)	75 (62.50)	52 (65.00)
Material possession	Big (above 10 members)	12 (10.00)	10 (12.50)
	Low (up to 8)	109 (90.83)	45 (56.25)
	Medium (9-13)	11 (9.17)	27 (33.75)
Social participation	High (above 13)	00 (0.00)	8 (10.00)
	Member of none organization	91 (75.83)	00 (0.00)
	Member of one organization	25 (20.83)	17 (21.25)
	Member of more than one organization	4 (3.33)	63 (78.75)

* Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

The distribution of gross annual income of saffron growers clearly indicated that, majority of the respondents was privileged to belong to the high-income group. In case of small farmers' high majority of respondents belonged to medium income group. It also specified that the majority of large farmers belonged to high-income group. On the basis of such data it can be inferred that, the medium farmers earn more than the small farmers.

The inventory of material possession showed in table 1 indicated that, 90.83 per cent were of small farmers possessed low level of material possession, while 9.17 per cent had medium level of material possession. The data also indicated that none of the respondents had high material possession where as, in the medium category, 56.25 per cent respondents belonged to low level of material possession followed by 33.75 per cent and 10.00 per cent belong to medium and high level of material possession respectively.

It can be summarized that medium holding saffron growers had higher material possession than small farmers.

The data regarding the occupation depicted in table 1 reveals that, majority 53.33 per cent of the small farmers were engaged in agriculture followed by agriculture+labour (18.33%) agriculture + caste occupation (4.17 per cent) and agriculture + service + business (24.17 per cent) respectively. Whereas, in case of medium farmers majority 81.25 per cent of respondents were engaged in agriculture along with service & business followed by agriculture (8.75 per cent), agriculture + labour (6.25 per cent) and agriculture +caste occupations (3.75 per cent) respectively.

It can conclude that the majority of medium farmers were engaged in agriculture along with the other allied profession. While majority of small farmers were dependent on agriculture alone.

The data regarding social participation indicated that, 20.83 per cent of small farmers were members of one organization. While only 3.33 per cent small farmers were members of more than one organization. It is interesting to note that majority (75.83 per cent) of small farmers were not associated with any of the organization whereas, majority of the respondents in medium category were members of more than one organization and 21.25 per cent were members of one organization.

Majority (70%) of small farmers showed a low level of economic motivation followed by medium (30%) economic motivation. None of the respondents were found in the category of high level of economic motivation. With respect to medium respondents majority (76.25%) showed a medium level of economic motivation followed by high (15%) and low (8.75%). Therefore, conclusion can be drawn that, medium farmers indicated medium level (27.30) of economic motivation while small farmers with low category of economic motivation (Table 2).

The data depicted in Table 2 revealed that, majority (63.33%) of the small respondents were indicated low level of

risk orientation and 36.67 per cent had moderate level of risk orientation. None of the small respondents was found under the category of high level of risk orientations. Whereas, medium respondents majority (91.25%) were indicating the moderate level of risk orientation and only 8.72 per cent had high level of risk orientation.

None of the medium respondent was found under the low level of risk orientation. Thus, it could be inferred on account of obtained result that, majority of medium respondents had moderate level of risk orientation and small respondents had low level of risk orientation.

It is obvious from the Table 2 that, majority (90%) of small farmers had low level of scientific orientation and 10 per cent had medium level of scientific orientation. None of the respondent was found in the category of high level of scientific orientation. While among the medium farmers category, majority 58.75 per cent had good level of scientific orientation followed by moderate 41.25 per cent. None of the respondent was found under the category of low scientific orientation. It means medium size of land holding had high level of scientific orientation whereas small farmers had low level of scientific orientation.

Table 2. Profile of respondents in respect to psychological attributes

Psychological attributes	Category of attributes	Categories of respondents	
		Small	Medium
Economic motivation	Low (up to 26)	84 (70.00)	7 (8.75)
	Medium (27-30)	36 (30.00)	61 (76.25)
	High (above 30)	0 (0.00)	12 (15.00)
Risk orientation	Low (up to 23)	76 (63.33)	00 (0.00)
	Medium (24-28)	44 (36.67)	73 (91.25)
	High (above 28)	00 (0.00)	7 (8.75)
Scientific orientation	Low (up to 21)	108 (90.00)	00 (0.00)
	Medium (22-26)	12 (10.00)	33 (41.25)
	High (above 26)	00 (0.00)	47 (58.75)
Aspiration	Low (up to 11)	34 (28.33)	00 (0.00)
	Medium (12-18)	95 (79.16)	37 (46.25)
	High (above 18)	00 (0.00)	43 (53.75)
Management orientation	Low (up to 50)	78 (65.00)	00 (0.00)
	Medium (51-58)	42(35.00)	24 (30.00)
	High (above 58)	00 (0.00)	56 (70.00)

* Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table 2. depicts that, majority 79.16 per cent of small land holdings farmers had medium level of aspiration and 28.33 per cent had low level of aspiration. None of the respondent was found in the category of high level of aspiration. While among the medium farmer category, majority 53.75 per cent had high level of aspiration followed by moderate 46.25 per cent. None of the respondent was observed under the category of low aspiration. The showed that, the medium farmers had good

level of aspiration, whereas small farmers had low level of aspiration.

Higher percentage of 64.17 per cent of small farmers had low level of mass media exposure followed by medium 31.67 per cent and high level 4.17 per cent of mass media exposure, respectively. Whereas, in case of medium farmers majority 70 per cent had medium level of mass media exposure followed by low category 20 per cent and high category 10 per cent (Table 3). It could be inferred that, majority of medium respondents had medium level of mass media exposure where as small respondents had low level of mass media exposure.

Table 3. Profile of respondents in respect to communicational attributes

Particulars	Category of attributes	Categories of respondents	
		Small	Medium
Mass media exposure	Low (up to 4)	77 (64.17)	16 (20.00)
	Medium (5-9)	38 (31.67)	56 (70.00)
	High (above 9)	5 (4.17)	8 (10.00)
Contact with development agencies	Low (up to 2)	105 (87.50)	8 (10.00)
	Medium (3 to 5)	10 (8.33)	32 (40.00)
	High (above 5)	5 (4.17)	40 (50.00)
Extension participation	Low (up to 3)	84 (70.00)	12 (15.00)
	Medium (4 to 7)	36 (30.00)	51 (63.75)
	High (above 7)	00 (0.00)	17 (21.25)

It is obvious from the data that, majority 87.50 per cent of small farmers had low level of contact with development agencies followed by medium 8.33 per cent and high 4.17 per cent respectively. In case of medium farmers, majority 50 per cent had high level of contact with the development agencies and 40.00 per cent respondents belonged to medium level of contact with development agencies. While, 10.00 per cent of the small respondents were fell into the category of low level of contact with development agencies.

Therefore, it could be inferred on the basis of such data that, medium respondents had high level of contact with development agencies than the small respondents.

The data regarding extension participation revealed (Table 3) that, majority (70.00%) of the small respondents were found under the category of low level of extension participation followed by medium 30.00 per cent of extension participation.

None of the small farmer was found under the category of high level of extension participation while, in medium category, majority 63.75 per cent of the respondents had medium level of extension participation followed by high 21.25 per cent and low 15.00 per cent level of extension participation. Thus, medium respondents had medium level of extension participation, whereas, the small respondents had low level of extension participation.

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that majority of the respondents in small category were from old age while in medium category were from middle age, medium land holding farmers were more educated as compared to small holding farmers, medium land holding respondents possessed large size of land as compared to small farmer who possessed small size of land, the data revealed that maximum number of respondents in both the categories had pucca type of house, the majority of medium farmers were engaged in agriculture along with the other allied profession. While majority of small farmers were dependent on agriculture alone, the medium farmers earn more than the small farmers, the majority of size of family ranges between 6-10 members, medium holding saffron growers had higher material possession than small farmers and majority of small farmers were not associated with any of the organization whereas, majority of respondents in medium category were member of more than one organization and also member of one organization. Further, it could be concluded that the medium farmers have better socio-economic status than the small farmers.

The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in respect of psychological attributes. The medium saffron growers depict a higher level of economic motivation, risk orientation, scientific orientation and aspiration for adoption of technologies as compared to small saffron growers. The medium farmers differ from the small farmers in the ability to receive messages related to agriculture through mass media. The farmers also mention contact with the development agencies; hence participate in the extension development programmes. While the small farmers have less exposure to mass media, low or no contact with development agencies and have low or no participation in saffron training programme.

REFERENCES

- Bali, A.S. and S.S. Sagwal (1987). Saffron a cash crop of Kashmir, *Agricultural Situation in India*, **41** (12) : 965-968
- Basker, D., D. Palevitch and E. Putievsky (1993). Saffron, the costliest spice drying and quality, supply and price. International symposium on medicinal and aromatic plants. *Tiberius on the Sea of Galilee, Israel, Acta. Horticulture* 344, 86-97.
- Singh, M.P. and Praveen Kumar (2003). Prospects of saffron cultivation in the cold arid zone of Kargil (Ladakh), *Human impact on desert environment*. pp 434-436.
- Souret, F.F., Weathers, P.J. (1999). Cultivation in vitro culture, secondary metabolite production, and phytophar macognosy of saffron. *J. of Herbs, Spices and Medicinal Plants*, **6** (4) : 99-116.

