Anand Kumar Mishra
Research Scholar, Faculty of
Agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

Dr. Amit Kumar Mishra
Assistant Professor, Faculty of
agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

SP Singh
S.M.S (Horticulture) KVK
Belipar Gorakhpur, Uttar
Pradesh, India

Socio-economic status, and communication behaviour of organic farmers in Uttar Pradesh

Anand Kumar Mishra, Dr. Amit Kumar Mishra and SP Singh

Abstract
The organic farming is a form of agriculture that depends on various techniques such as vermicomposting, crop rotation, green manure, animal husbandry, bio fertilizers and biological pest control the majority of respondents were middle aged and literate including formal and informal education. General caste farmers were dominantly engaged in farming enterprises and belonging to nuclear family system in existence having 5 to 8 members in their families. Maximum respondents were marginal farmers and reported agriculture as their main occupation. Mixed type of houses were more. Almost all the farmers were above the poverty line. Pumping set/tube well and Electric motor were dominant farm power along with farm implements. The cycle was main conveyance with all farmers. The mobile phone (91.00%) followed by T.V. possessed by majority. Good extension contact was observed. The majority of respondents (43.00%) were having membership of two organizations/office bearer. The majority of respondent's main formal source of information was gram pradhan, under informal source of information, family members and television in mass media.

Keywords: Socio economics status, communication behavior, organic farmers

Introduction

The organic farming is a form of agriculture that depends on various techniques such as vermicomposting, crop rotation, green manure, animal husbandry, bio fertilizers and biological pest control. The organic farming is the form of doing crop/plant cultivation by using organic manures which are eco-friendly manures that supports the life of soil and other useful organisms in the soil. The organic farming is an adopted practice in developing countries, where farmers use animals for tilling the land and manures prepared by dung and other waste material of animals. The organic farming supports the crop yield and quality of production. Most of the developed countries use synthetic chemicals to protect from insects, pests and other plant diseases.

Organic farming system emphasizes on the use of organic matter for enhancing soil properties, minimizing food chain associated health hazards and attaining closed nutrient cycles, the key factors for sustainable agriculture. Organic farming is a production system which includes agriculture with biodiversity, ecosystem and biological cycle and excludes all chemical and synthetic inputs. It avoids chemical fertilizers, hormones, feed additives and pesticides and promotes natural techniques like crop rotation, animal manure, off-farm waste, crop residues, plant protection and nutrient mobilization.

Methodology

The study was conducted in purposively selected Sitapur district of Uttar Pradesh. There are 19 community development blocks in this district out of that is two block Khairabad, Biswan was selected purposively. This block has 10 Nyay Panchayat, 66 gram panchayat and 114 villages, covering an area of 25361 hectares. The number of villages was 114 from which 5 villages were selected purposively, and then the list of total farmers was prepared for each selected villages. Thereafter 200 farmers were selected as respondents though random sampling techniques with respect to the categories of the farmers for each selected village. Data were collected with the help of semi-structured interview schedule specially developed on standard scales with some modifications in the light of objectives and analyzed with suitable statistical methods respectively.

Corresponding Author:
Anand Kumar Mishra
Research Scholar, Faculty of
Agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

Result and Discussion

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of age

S. No.	Categories (years)	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Young age (up to 34)	19	9.58
2.	Middle age (35-55)	148	74.16
3.	Old age (56 and above)	33	16.25
	Total	200	100.00

The above Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents (74.00%) belonged to middle age group (35-55 years) followed by (16.50%) of respondents belonged to old age group (56 and above) and only (9.50%) of respondents belonged to the young age group (Up to 34), respectively. The age of the selected respondents ranged from 28 to 72 years. The mean age of the respondents was observed to be 45.01 years. A similar finding was also reported that majority of the respondents was observed in the middle age.

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of education

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
A.	Illiterate	24	12.00
B.	Literate	174	87.00
I.	Primary school	20	10.00
II.	Middle school	32	16.00
III.	High school	36	18.00
IV.	Intermediate	84	42.00
V.	Graduate & Post graduate	30	15.00

The Table 2 reveals that the majority of the respondents (87.00%) were literate and 12.00 percent illiterate. Further, the educational level was worked out and given in descending order as 42.00%, 18.00%, 16.00%, 15.00% and 09.00% intermediate, high school, middle, graduate & post graduate, and primary school, respectively.

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of caste

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	General caste	90	45.00
2.	Other Backward classes	48	24.00
3.	Scheduled caste	62	31.00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table 3 depicts that majority of respondents (45.00%) belonged to general caste, followed by scheduled caste (31.00%) and other backward caste category (24.00%), respectively.

Table 4: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of family type

S. No.	Family type	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Nuclear/Single family	104	52.00
2.	Joint family	98	48.00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table 4 shows that nuclear/single families were more in number than joint families. In terms of percentage, 52.91% respondents belonged to nuclear/single families, while, remaining 47.08% belonged to joint families.

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of family size

S. No.	Categories (members)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Small (up to 4)	58	29.00
2.	Medium (5-8)	114	57.00
3.	Large (9 and above)	28	14.00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table 5 shows that a maximum number of respondents (56.66%) belonged to medium category of those had 5-8 members in their families followed by (28.75%) and (14.58%) to the category of (up to 4) and (9 and above) members in their families, respectively.

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of land holding (hectares)

S. No.	Categories (hectares)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Marginal farmers	96	48.00
2.	Small farmers	76	38.00
3.	Medium + Large farmers	28	14.00
	Total	240	100.0

The Table 6 depicts that 48.33 per cent of respondents were having less than 1 ha of land that belonged to marginal farmer's category. Respondents belonged to small farmers and medium + large farmers were 38.33 per cent and 14.00 per cent, respectively.

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of annual income (Rs.)

S. No.	Annual income (Rs.)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Small (up to 93623)	36	18. 00
2.	Medium (93624-295483)	126	63. 00
3.	High (295484 and above)	38	19. 00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table 7 reveals that maximum number of the respondents (63.00%) belonged to the annual income of Rs. (93624-295483) whereas, (19.00%) and (18.00%), respondents were found belonging to income range from Rs. (295484 and above) and Rs. up to 93623, respectively.

Table 8: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of housing pattern

S. No.	Housing pattern	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Kuchcha	26	13. 00
2.	Semi- Pucca/Mixed	114	57.00
3.	Pucca	60	30.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is apparent from the data shown in the Table 8 pertaining to type of house possession. The mixed type of habitation was observed to be (57.00%) followed by (30.00%) pucca houses and (13.00%) kuchcha house, respectively.

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of social participation

S. No.	Participation	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	No participation in any organization	36	18.00
2.	As a member in one organization	80	40.00
3.	As a member of two organizations/office bearer	84	42.00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table 9 shows that 42.00 per cent of the respondents were found having membership of two organizations/office bearer, while 40 per cent were the member of one organization. In this way, 82.00% of respondents were associated with the organizations like panchayats, cooperatives, youth-club, religious and political organization, while 18.00% of organic farming farmers did not take participation in any organization.

Table 10: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of farm power

S. No.	Farm power	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Bullock	08	4.00
2.	Pumping set/ Diesel engine	74	37.00
3.	Electric motor	60	30.00
4.	Tractor	22	11.00

The Table 10 presents the possession of farm power machinery among the respondents. It shows that 37.00 per cent of respondents had their own pumping set/ diesel engine, 30 per cent respondents possessed electric motor, 11.00 per cent owned tractor and 4.00 per cent owned bullock, respectively. The similar findings were also reported by Singh *et al.* (2012).

Table 11: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of Agriculture implements

S. No.	Farm implements	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Thresher	20	10.00
2.	Sprayer	24	12.00
3.	Deshi plough	06	3.00
4.	Chaff cutter	162	81.00
5.	Seed drill	04	2.00
6.	Rotavater	14	7.00
7.	Khurpi	200	100.00
8.	Duster	12	6.00
9.	Pata	66	33.00
10.	Kudal	200	100.00
11.	Shovel	184	92 00
12.	Cultivator	18	9.00
13.	Potato planter	06	3.00
14.	Sickle	200	100

The Table-11 clearly indicates that cent per cent members were reported having cots and crockery each followed by fan/cooler (91.00%), wrist watch (88.00%), chairs (82.00%), solar lantern (74.00%), bed (71.00%), gas cylinder and gas chullah each (69.00%), electric press (61.00%), pressure Cooker (58.00%) sewing machine (37.00%), stove (28.00%), heater (23.00%) and dressing table (7%), respectively. The condition of house hold materials seems to be good.

Table 12: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of communication media possession

S. No.	Communication media	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Radio	92	46.00
2.	T.V.	164	82.00
3.	Tape Recorder/ VCD Player	56	23.00
4.	Newspaper	46	19.00
5.	General Magazines	20	10.00
6.	Agriculture Books	14	7.00
7.	Mobile Phone	182	91.00
8.	Computer/Laptop	30	15.00
9.	Internet Connection	24	12.00
10.	Agril. Journals/ Magazines	12	6.00
11.	D.T.H./ Dish Cable	164	82.00

The Table 12 indicates that overwhelming majority of respondents (91.00%) observed possessing mobile phone with them. The respondents who had other communication media with them were in descending order as T.V. and D.T.H./Dish Cable (82.00%), Radio (46.00%), Tape Recorder/ VCD Player (23.00%), Newspaper (19.00%), Computer/Laptop (15.00%), internet connection (12.00%), Agriculture Books (7.00%) and Agril. Journals/ Magazines (6.00%), respectively. Thus, it can be inferred that mobile, T.V. and radio were found to be main sources of information and recreation purposes.

Table 13: (F) Distribution of the respondents on the basis of overall material possession

S. No.	Categories (score value)	Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 32)	50	25.00
2.	Medium (33-44)	112	56.00
3.	High (45 and above)	38	19.00
	Total	200	100.00

The Table-13 revealed that highest number of the respondents (56.00%) were observed in the medium category (33 to 44) of materials possession followed by (25.00%) low (up to 32) and (19.00%) high (45 and above), respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that the materials possession of respondents was appreciably better. The mean of scores for materials possession was observed to be mean 38.10, with a minimum 27 and maximum 54 scores. The similar finding was also reported by Singh *et al.* (2012).

Conclusion
The socio-economic profile of Organic farmers included the personal profile of respondents in terms of their age, educational status, caste, marital status, occupation, type of family, size of family, land holding size, irrigation facilities, farm assets, home appliances, information source,

transportation facility and annual income. The maximum numbers of the respondents were found in the middle age group i.e. 35-55 years. It is observed that the maximum numbers of the respondents were found to the other General caste. The maximum respondents were educational status up to the Intermediate level. Nuclear families were found more in numbers. It is observed that the respondents were having 5 to 8 members in their families (medium). It is observed that the majority of the respondents were found that they were participated in two organizational membership. It is observed that the maximum numbers of organic farmers were reported having Semi pucca houses.

Reference

1. Ananthnag K. A study On Socio-economic status of farmers practicing organic farming in eastern dry zone of Karnataka, Online Journal of Bio Sciences and Informatics. 2014;1(1):2.
2. Anithamary A. Prospects for organic farming among farmers – A critical analysis. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore; c2006.
3. Anup U, Tarique Ahmed, Singh AK. Evaluation of farmers field school on All India Radio about organic farming. Journal of Communication Studies. 2010;27:377-421.
4. Boruah R, Borua S, Deka CR, Borah D. Entrepreneurial behavior of tribal winter vegetable growers in Jorhat district of Assam. Inter. Res. J Ext. Edu. 2015;15(1):65-69.
5. Chouhan S, Daniel S, David AA, Paul A. Analysis socioeconomic status of farmers adopted agroforestry of Basavanapura and Hejjige village, Nanjangud, Damor.2013.Attitude of farmers towards organic farming. (Unpublished). M.Sc. (Agri) thesis. AAU, Anand India. Inter. J Curr. Micro. App. Sci. 2017;6(7):1745-1753.
6. Desai CP. A study on techno-economic consequences in adoption of drip irrigation system by mango orchard growers of Junagadh district in Gujarat stat. Ph.D. Thesis (Unpublished), Gujarat Agricultural University, Sardar Krushinagar; c1997.
7. Fakayode SB, Rahji MAY, Adeniyi ST. Economic analysis of risks in fruit and vegetable farming in Osun State, Nigeria. Bang. J Agril. Res. 2012;37(3):473-491.
8. Gerad Middendorf. Challenges and information needs of organic growers and retailers. Journal of Extension. 2007;45:4-7.
9. Gopichand B, Banerjee PK. Vendible propriety of vegetable growers in Telangana. Inter J Agril. Sci. Res. 2017;6(7):303-310.
10. Hasan Kamrul, Rahman MZ, Abul Kashem M. Participation in farming activitiesby organic farmers. Ind. J of Ext. Edn. 2009;45(1 & 2):10-15.
11. Kaur J, kalra RK. A case study on organic farming in Punjab. Journal of Maharashtra agricultural universities. 2006;10(3):411-419.
12. Maurya AS, Yadav RN, Singh DK, Singh D, Singh VK, Kaushal P, *et al*. Socio-economic status of brinjal growers in Bulandshahr district of Western Uttar Pradesh, India. Inter. J Curr. Microb. App. Sci. 2017;6(8):361-365.
13. Mahesh P, Bhanuprakash M, Nirajkumar S. Farmers empowerment through participatory On Farm Trials in rainfed rice ecosystem of Koderma, Jharkhand. Indian Journal of Extension Education. 2011;9(2):23-29.
14. Maraddi GN, Sathish HS, Rajeshwari. An empirical study on farmers knowledge and adoption of improved paddy cultivation practices. i-scholar. 2014;9(1):139-144.
15. Meena MS. Socio- economic study of organic farming in irrigated North Western plain zone of Rajasthan. Agricultural Science Digest. 2010;30:94-97.
16. Mishra D, Ghadei K. Socio-economic profile of vegetable farmers in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Iner. J Agril. Alli. Sci. 2015;1(2):1-16.
17. Neha Sarthi, Chaturvedi MK, Yogendra Shriwas. Economic assessment of Farmers Field School training programme with adoption of IPM practices by the rice growers of Korba district of Chhattisgarh, India. Plant Archives. 2015;15(1):565-569.
18. Ogunmefun SO, Achike AI. Socioeconomic characteristics of rural farmers and problems associated with the use of informal insurance measures in Odogbolu local government area, Ogun State, Nigeria. RJOAS. 2015;2(38):1-14.