

A Social-Economic Study of Small and Marginal Farmer in Resent Scenario

Mr. Naitik J. Patel*

Research Scholar

Abstract – India is an agricultural country. The majority of the farmer are small and marginal farmers having a land below 5 acres. These farmers are living on or below poverty line. The income of farmers determined by the size of holding. Higher the size of holding is higher the income potential. Higher is the income potential higher is socio-economic status. Present Study is related with the group of small and marginal farmers in Bhuj taluka of kutch district in the state of Gujarat. This study is devoted to an analytic study of social aspects of Socio-Economic conditions of the small and marginal farmers.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

India is vast country spread from Kasmir to Kanya kumari and from Arbean sea to Bay of Bangal. This is one of the largest countries in world. The bounty of nature has made this country rich in all aspect.

The rich black soil, the minerals, the forests, the rivers and lakes have made possible habitations of men and animal alike. This vast continent has lies in the northern hemisphere at the foot of the Himalaya. There are normally three season in the year.

The season varies from region to region. There are coldest Himalayan ranges as well as hottest Deccan plains. There are place where there is no rain like Thar desert as well as there are place like Cherapunji where there is highest rainfall.

The Country is having dense population of over 110 crore inhabited by people of different races, religions, castes, faiths etc. Variety and diversity is the identity of this land. But there is a theme of unity among this diversity that gives a sense of oneness. Due to this oneness the flow of Indian culture has stood to test of history.

History records that this land and people were one of richest continent in the world supplying the needs of rest of the world. It was called 'Sone Ki Chidiya'. But now this is one of poorest countries in the world. A large number of population live below poverty line. The poverty has created number of problems like Schooling, Literacy, Nutrition Health, Unemployment, politics, Bribery and so on.

The small and marginal farmers are economically as well as Socially weaker sections of the society, Who

are mainly agricultural laborers have been deprived of opportunities in various walks of life for ages.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Objective of this paper is to study the socio-economic conditions of small and marginal farmers. The study is based upon primary data collected through questionnaires and the same was analyzed for drawing conclusions.

Therefore 100 respondents have been selected from the different corners of Bhuj Taluka. In this taluka the researcher has selected randomly five villages.

1. Socio-Economic Conditions of Small and Marginal Farmers:

The researcher has studied the socio economic conditions of the small and marginal farmers according to durables of sample with reference to following points:

- I. Study of type of housing
- II. Study of holding of furniture

1. Classification according to types of Housing:

Types of housing decides the socio-economic conditions of farmers. A good house gives a higher social status. Where a bad house gives lower social status. A Type of house is decide the income levels. The observation are presented in the following Table No 1.

Table 1: Types of Housing

No	Particular	1		2		3		4		5		Total	%	Ave
1	Hut Dwelling	6	30	3	15	4	20	0	0	1	5	14	14	2.8
2	Tin Dwelling	7	35	8	40	8	40	9	45	7	35	39	39	7.8
3	Kuccha House	3	15	5	25	4	20	8	40	10	50	30	30	6
4	Paccka House	2	10	4	20	2	10	3	15	1	5	12	12	2.4
5	Other	2	10	0	0	2	10	0	0	1	5	5	5	1
6	None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	20	20	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	100	100	20

Following observation can be made from table 1 regarding type of housing of sample.

Out of the sample of 20 from the first village 16 farmers representing 30% of group are having Hut Dwelling, Whereas 7 farmers representing 35% of group are having Tin shed Dwelling, 3 farmers representing 15% of the group are having Kutchcha house, 2 farmers representing 10% of the group having some other housing. None of farmer are without having any house.

Out of the sample of 20 from second village 3 farmers representing 15% of the group are having Hut Dwelling, whereas 8 farmers representing 40% of the group are having Tin shed Dwelling, 5 farmers representing 25% of the group are having kutchcha house, 4 farmers representing 20% of the group are having Paccka Housing. None of farmer are having some other Housing or are without any house.

Out of the sample of 20 from third village 4 farmers representing 20% of the group are having Hut Dwelling; whereas 8 farmers representing 40% of the group are having Tin shed Dwelling. 4 farmers representing 20% of the group are having Kutchcha house, 2 farmers representing 10% of the group are having Paccka House. 2 farmers representing 10% of the group are having some other Houseing. None of farmers are without any house.

Out of the sample of 20 from forth village 9 farmers representing 45% of the group are having Tin shed Dwelling, 8 farmers representing 40% of the group are having Kutchcha House, 3 farmers representing 15% of the group are having Paccka House, None of farmers are having Hut Dwelling, some other Housing or are without any Housing.

Out of the sample of 20 in fifth village 1 farmer representing 5% of the group is having Hut Dwelling, whereas 7 farmers representing 35% of the group are having Tin shed Dwelling, 10 farmers representing 10% of the group are having Paccka House. 1 farmer representing 5% of the group are having some other Housing. None of the farmers are without any House.

Thus it can be observed that out of the total sample 14 farmers are having Hut Dwelling, the average farmers in this group of from 5 sample village is 2.8, whereas 39 farmers are having Tin shed Dwelling, the average of farmers in this group of from 5 sample village is 7.8, whereas 30 farmers are having Kutchcha House the average of farmer in this group of 5 village sample is 6, whereas 12 farmers are having Paccka House, the average of farmers in this group of from five sample village 2.4, whereas 5 farmers are having other housing, the average of farmers in this group of 5 village sample is 1. None of the farmer are without having any house. Therefore it can be said that majority of the small and marginal farmers are either having Tin shed Dwelling (39%) or Kutchcha House (30%)

2. Classification According to the type of Furniture

Furniture is one of the essential parts of house keeping it also decide the social status. Good furniture gives good social status, the observation are presented in following Table 2.

Table 2: Types of Furniture

No	Particular	1		2		3		4		5		Total	%	Ave
1	Table-chair	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Sofa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Cupboard/Wood	7	35	3	15	5	25	4	20	2	21	21	21	4.2
4	Cupboard/ Steel	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	4	4	4	0.8
5	Other	0	0	1	5	0	0	4	20	0	5	5	5	1
6	None	12	60	16	80	15	75	10	50	17	70	70	70	14
	Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	100	100	20

Following observations can be made from the above table 2 regarding types of furniture of the sample.

Thus it can be observed that out of the sample of 20 from first village 7 farmers representing 35% of the group are having wooden Cupboard whereas 1 farmer representing 5% of the group are having Steel cupboard, whereas 12 farmers representing 60% of the group are not having any furniture.

Out of sample 20 from second village 3 farmers representing 15% of the group are having wooden Cupboard whereas 1 farmer representing 5% of the group are having other furniture, whereas 16 farmers representing 80% of the group are not having any furniture.

Out of sample 20 from Third village 5 farmers representing 25% of the group are having wooden Cupboard whereas 15 farmer representing 75% of the group are having no furniture.

Out of sample 20 from forth village 4 farmers representing 20% of the group are having wooden Cupboard whereas 20 farmer representing 10% of the group are having steel cupboard. Whereas 4 of

farmer representing 20% of the group are having other furniture. Whereas 10 farmer representing 50% of the group are having no furniture.

Out of sample 20 from Fifth village 2 farmers representing 10% of the group are having wooden Cupboard whereas 1 farmer representing 5% of the group are having Steel Cupboard, Whereas 17 farmers representing 85% of the group are not having no furniture.

Thus it can be said that majority (70%) of the small and marginal farmers are having none of the furniture, only few (21%) are having wooden cupboard and negligible number are having other furniture.

CONCLUSION:

The Research has in this studied the socio-economic conditions of small and marginal farmers according to durable of the sample of housing and holding of furniture in the backward are of Gujarat. It is also observed that the socio-economic condition of the farmers dependent on social as well as economic status. The social condition of the farmer can be improved by adopting various social schemes for the upliftment of down trodden masses. The money is not only the solution for solving the problems of farmers but mindsets is needed for the uplift of the masses.

REFERENCES

- Journal of Commerce and Trade. Vol 4 No 2 Oct. 2009.
Bio-annual Publication of society for Advanced
Management studies. Meerut. (U.P).
- Kamble N. D. (1979). Poverty within Poverty. Sterling
Pub. Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. pp. 02.
- Rudar Datt and Sundram (2010). Indian Economy, S.
Chand and Co. Ltd. New Delhi. pp. 470

Corresponding Author

Mr. Naitik J. Patel*

Research Scholar

E-Mail – naitik.patel008@gmail.com