

Association of Socio-economic Status with Economic Motivation of the Farmers

D.K. Singh¹, A.K. Singh², V.P. Yadav³, R.B. Singh⁴, R.S. Baghel⁵ and Mayank Singh⁶

1. Asstt. Prof.(Ag. Ext.), S.V.B.P.U.A & Tech., Meerut, 2.. ZPD, Zone II (ICAR), Kolkata, 3. Asso. Prof. (Ag. Ext), KVK, Faridabad , 4 & 5. Asso. Prof., CSAUA&T, Kanpur, 6. Ex-P.G. Student, RBS College, Bichpuri, Agra
Corresponding author E-mail: dksingh.ag.ext@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Jaunpur District of Uttar Pradesh state to find out the association of socio-economic status with economic motivation of the farmers. 100 contact farmers were selected as respondent. The independent variables, such as caste, education, land holding, social participation and socio-economic status, were measured by the scale of Trivedi (1963). While for economic motivation the scale of Supe (1969) was used for the purpose. Study revealed that majority of farmers belonged to medium socio-economic status followed by 18.0 percent belonged to low socio-economic status, while 16.0 percent farmers possessed high score category of socio economic status. It was observed that except education, age, land holding and socio-economic status have been found to have significant association with economic motivation. Whereas, main source of information of the farmers were the Kisan Sahayak, followed by radio, input dealers and demonstration which was used frequently by the farmers.

Key Words : Socio-economic status; Economic motivation; Communication behaviour; Contact farmers;

The agriculture sector is the backbone of the country's economy and all time shelter for bulk of the population which provides employment throughout the year and partially restricts the flow of population from rural to urban areas. In 2007-08, agriculture accounted for 17.8 percent of India's Gross National Product (GNP) while 70.0 percent of India's workforce was engaged in farming (Anonymous, (2008).

Farmers adopted improved farming practices only for economic gain. The economic gain of the farmer depends upon the farmer's age, education, size of holding socio-economic status and their progressiveness because progressive outlook motivates the farmers to adopt the new ideas or agricultural technology for economic gains. The study was conducted with the following objectives:

1. To find out personal socio-economic characteristics of the farmers.
2. To find out the association of socio-economic status with economic motivation of the farmers.
3. To know the communication behaviour of the farmers.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Jaunpur District of Uttar Pradesh state. Of the total 26 development blocks in

Jaunpur district, two development blocks, namely Machchalisahar and Shahganj were selected for the study. From each of these blocks, five villages were randomly selected. A random sample of ten contact farmers was taken from each of the ten villages. Accordingly 100 contact farmers constituted the respondents for the study. The independent variables, such as caste, education, land holding, social participation and socio-economic status, were measured by the scale of Trivedi (1963). While for economic motivation the scale of Supe (1969) was used for the purpose. Farmers were categorized in to three categories viz. High, medium and low. Communication behaviour was measured with the help of schedule developed. The required information for the study was collected with the help of an interview schedule developed and analyzed with the help of frequency, percentage and chi-square test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table-1 reveals that majority of contact farmers (48.0%) belonged to middle age group. Majority of respondents were having junior high school level of education. Under land holding trait, 50.0 percent belonged to small category. 46.0 percent of contact farmers were of backward caste followed by the upper caste. It is evident from the table that all the farmers (100.0%) have

agriculture as their main occupation. Only 25.0 percent farmers were having business (19.0%) or service (6.0%)

Table 1. Distribution of farmers according to their personal socio-economic characteristics

S.N.	Traits	Category	Frequency	%
1.	Age	Young (30-35)	27	27.0
		Middle (36-50)	48	48.0
		Old (above 50)	25	25.0
2.	Education	Illiterate	06	06.0
		Primary	25	25.0
		Junior High school	24	24.0
		Highschool	18	18.0
		Intermediate	23	23.0
		Graduate and above	04	04.0
3.	Caste	Upper	34	34.0
		Backward	46	46.0
		Lower	20	20.0
4.	Land Holding	Marginal	48	48.0
		Small	50	50.0
		Big	02	02.0
5.	Occupation	Main - Agriculture	100	100.0
		Subsidiary - Business	19	19.0
		- Service	02	02.0
6.	Farm Power	No any farm power	32	32.0
		Bullocks	21	21.0
		Diesel engine/electric motor	36	36.0
		Tractor	11	11.0
7.	Material Possession	Cycle	89	89.0
		Motor Cycle	15	15.0
		Jeep/ Car	03	03.0
		Radio	83	83.0
		Television	29	29.0
		Agric. Implements	46	46.0
8.	House	Kachcha	48	48.0
		Mixed	31	31.0
		Pucca	21	21.0
9.	Family Type	Joint	77	77.0
		Single	23	23.0
10.	Social Participation	No social participation	34	34.0
		Member of one organization	49	49.0
		Member of more than one organization	11	11.0
		Office bearer	06	06.0

as their subsidiary occupation. It indicates that 75.0 percent of farmers did not associate any subsidiary occupation. With regard to farm power, majority of the respondents (36.0) had diesel engine/ electric motor, 21.0 percent have bullocks and only 11.0 percent used a tractor as farm power. 32.0 percent respondents had no farm power. It is revealed that majority owned cycle, radio and agricultural implements. Majority of the farmers had Kachcha house and they were living in joint family concept. 49.0 percent farmers were member of one organization.

Table 2. Distribution of the farmers according to their socio-economic status

S.N.	Categories	No. of farmers	Percentage
1.	High (Score above 25)	16	16.0
2.	Medium (Score 18-34)	66	66.0
3.	Low (Score up to 17)	18	18.0
	Total	100	100.0

It is evident from the Table 2. that majority of farmers belonged to medium socio-economic status (66.0%) followed by 18.0 percent to low socio-economic status, while 16.0 percent farmers possessed high score category of socio economic status.

Table 3. attempts on the association between age, education, land holding and socio-economic status with economic motivation. Except education, age, land holding and socio- economic status have been found to have significant association with economic motivation.

Table clearly illustrates that the age and economic motivation are dependent to each other. In other words age is an influencing and important factor in the pursuit of state of economic motivation of a person. The data of the table absolutely shows the trend towards high economic motivation group. It may be true that as the age of individual's increases, their need and requirements also increases which motivates them in regard to earn more and more. The similar findings were also given by Singh, R. and Sohal, (1969).

The education and economic motivation does not seem to have positive bearing and insignificantly associated with each other. It means that both are independent to each other. Table 3 at a glance reflects the uneven distribution of farmers regarding their educational level. It may be inferred that education is in no way related to influence economic motivation. Only

Table 3. Association between age, education, land holding and socio-economic status with economic motivation of farmers

S.N.	Attributes	Economic motivation		Total	x ² value
		6-12	13-18		
1.	Age (Years)				11.01*
	20-35	8	19	27	
	36-50	6	42	48	
	Above50	12	13	25	
2.	Education				4.05
	Primary	0	6	6	
	Illiterate	12	13	25	
	J.H.	8	16	24	
	H.S.	5	13	18	
	Intermediate	9	14	23	
	Graduate & above	0	4	4	
3.	Land Holding				6.36*
	Marginal	18	30	48	
	Small	8	42	50	
	Big	0	2	2	
4.	S.E.S.				6.56*
	Low	9	9	18	
	Medium	15	51	66	
	High	2	14	16	

x²= Chi-squire value

* Significance at 0.05 level of probability.

educational level did not guarantee to motivate individual to seek and enforce them to opt and do those work which is economically profitable.

So far as land holding is concerned, it seems to have positive association with economic motivation which was found to be statistically significant. The size of holding affects the state of economic motivation. It may be due to the fact that almost all were small and marginal land holders and engaging themselves in intensive cultivation. They want to earn more income from limited area. This indicated the positive association between the variables.

Regarding socio-economic status, there was significant association with economic motivation. It may be true because majority were socio-economically sound. Good socio- economic status acts as supplementary factor to influence state of motivation regarding good earnings. The farmers are unevenly distributed among various socio-economic status groups. It means that they have been differing in their perception from time to time and from other factors of socio-economic status.

Thus, overall situation reflects that the variables

mentioned in the table act as complimentary and supplementary factors still they seems to possess some degree of difference among themselves.

Table 4 reveals that the majority (79.0%) of the Kisan Sahayaks frequently met farmers. Findings of Upadhyay and Hansra (1986) are supported as radio was next to them frequently used source by the farmers(63.0%), followed by input dealers and demonstration (37.0%) respectively. Extension officers, scientists, television and leaflets, folders etc. were not used as a source of information frequently. Majority of A.E.Os. (81.0%) followed by block officials (53.0%) and input dealers (48.0%) respectively were occasionally used. Others were used as source of information below 35.0 percent. Only 7.0 percent said that scientists were the source of information. While all farmers seldom used leaf let, folder, etc, followed by 93.0 percent scientists, farmers fair / Kisan Gosthi (88.0%), news paper (82.0%), S.D.O(A.E.) (81.0%) respectively.

Table 4. Distribution of the farmers according to their communication behaviour.

S.N.	Source of Information	Extension contact		
		Frequently	Occasionally	Never
1.	Kisan Sahayak	79 (79.0)	21 (21.0)	- -
2.	A.E.Os.	8 (08.0)	81 (81.0)	11 (11.0)
3.	S.D.O. (A.E.)	- -	19 (19.0)	81 (81.0)
4.	Block Officials	11 (11.0)	53 (53.0)	36 (36.0)
5.	Input Dealers	37 (37.0)	48 (48.0)	15 (15.0)
6.	Scientists	- -	7 (07.0)	93 (93.0)
7.	Demonstration	37 (37.0)	34 (34.0)	29 (29.0)
8.	Radio	63 (63.0)	20 (20.0)	17 (17.0)
9.	Television	- -	28 (28.0)	72 (72.0)
10.	News Paper	5 (05.0)	13 (13.0)	82 (82.0)
11.	Farmers Fair/ Kisan Gosthies	- -	12 (12.0)	88 (88.0)
12.	Leaf lets, folders etc.	- -	- -	100(100.0)

Figures in the parenthesis indicates percentage

Thus it is clear that main source of information for the respondents were the Kisan Sahayak, radio and input dealers.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the majority of the respondents were middle aged, primary educated,

belonged to backward class, small land holding and agriculture as their main occupation, and thus, belonged to medium socio-economic status.

The age and economic motivation were dependent on each other. The education and economic motivation does not seem to have positive bearing and insignificantly associated with each other. Land holding is having positive association with economic motivation which was found

to be statistically significant. The size of holding affects the state of economic motivation. Socio-economic status was significantly associated with economic motivation. Good socio- economic status acts as supplementary factor to influence state of motivation regarding good earnings. The main source of information to the respondents was the Kisan Sahayak followed by radio and input dealers.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous (2008). Economic indicators, Yojana, **53** (8):6
2. Singh, R. and Sohal, (1969). Size of holding as related to acceptance of crop plans, extension contacts and education of farmers *Indian J. Extension Education*, **5** (1&2):42-48
3. Supe, S.V. (1969). Factors related to different degrees of rationality in decision making among farmers. Ph.D. thesis (unpub.), Division of Agril. Extension, I.A.R.I., New Delhi.
4. Trivedi, G. (1963). Measurement and analysis of socio-economic status of rural families, Ph.D. Thesis, Division of Agril. Extension, I.A.R.I., New Delhi.
5. Upadhyay, K.P. and Hansra, B.C. (1988). Evaluation of agricultural broadcast of radio Nepal in adoption of improved agricultural technology by Nepalese farmers. *Journal of Research*, **23** (1):143-145.

