ISSN 0970-7247

2016 - 2017

THIRD CONCEPT

English Monthly
Annual Subscription Rs. 200

Vol. 30 | No. 360 | FEBRUARY 2017 | Rs. 20.00

- Jakarta Gubernatorial Elections 2017
- Moldova's Geopolitical Dilemma
- Brazil's Locomotive Breath
- Corruption in Sino-World
- Corruption in India
- Ancient Temples of Kashmir

Agriculture Profile of the Farmers in Theni Dist

S. Velanganni* M. Akina Barween** & Dr. D. Jeba Selvi Anitha***

Agriculture in our economy is based on the technology of production by the masses. As a consequence, it is the ckbone of the national livelihood security stem. Responding to this Dr.Manmohan Singh, e former Prime Minister called for second een revolution. The package of first green volution was favored for large farmers and rticularly succeeded in irrigated area. The ogram was cost oriented also. Hence Dr. Singh ggested covering the marginal and small rmers through various programs and also entioned that 55 percent of the farmers were passed by the first green revolution and poverty still remained among the farming community.

gnificance of the study

mil Nadu receives 7.4 percent of GSDP from riculture sector and provides employment portunity to more than 40 percent of the people. ıe State has received Krishi Karman Award ım the Government of India for the achievement high record production in food grains of 10.1 illion tons during 2011-12. As per the latest gricultural Census 2010-11, marginal and small ldings of less than 2 hectares accounted for ..0 percent of the total holdings and 61.0 percent the total operated area. They in turn are ısuitable for conventional technology and achinery use to boost agricultural production. ıis led to a process of marginalization of small ıd marginal farmers and casualization of ricultural laborers.

ıeni is one of the southern districts of Tamil ıdu and is an agrarian region having more than 20,000 land holders. The cultivable land area in Theni district has declined over the past 15 years due to number of factors. The major problems are monsoon failure, lack of irrigation and high cost of production. Different studies have been made on the impact of globalization on Indian economy and agriculture in general. However few studies are available on the impact of globalization on production performance of principal crops, land uses and farmers. Hence the present study is an attempt made by the researcher to analyze the production performance and land utilization pattern of Tamil Nadu and to investigate the various issues related to farmers with special reference to globalization.

High cost of production, low price for the agriculture produces, conversion of traditional crops to cash crops, poor irrigation facility, low productivity due to monsoon failure and ecological vulnerability have made the farmers to become even agricultural labors and commit suicide. So the researcher has concentrated on these issues very particularly. Another important issue to be considered, while studying or analyzing the issues related to agriculture, is the socioeconomic and agricultural status of the farmers; because they are the land owners, operate their activities, partially depend on the nature and partially depend on the government for input, subsidy, price and marketing. Hence an attempt has been made to know the agriculture profile of the sample respondents (Farmers) in Theni District. Agriculture profile includes the type of farmers, size of land holding, type of land holding, agriculture implements posses, cattle posses, type of seed used, sources of seed used and awareness about private company seed.

Objective: To study the agriculture profile of the sample respondents

Assistant Professor of Economics,
Professors of Commerce,
* Jayaraj Annapackiam College for Women, Periyakulam, Theni Dist.

ample technique. The study is based on both rimary and secondary sources. For the purpose f primary data Theni district is taken as universe, ne blocks and villages of the districts are taken s strata and the farmers are the ultimate unit. rimary data were collected using stratified andom sampling by using proportionate robability random sampling technique during he year 2015-2016 from November 2015 – Aarch 2016.The block wise number of farmers ist was obtained from the Deputy Director of tatistics, Theni, for the present study.

Sample Design

The total sample size is 1200 which is tatistically significant number. The total espondents are distributed among marginal, mall, medium and large farmers based on the ize of the holding. According to the census 2011, Theni District has high proportion of marginal armers, followed by small farmers and followed y medium and large farmers. All the records of gricultural statistics referred by the researcher howed that large farmers are found very inimum in total farming community. Among 1200 farmers, 624are marginal farmers, 288 are mall farmers and the medium and large farmers re 144,144 respectively.

Five blocks were selected based on the gricultural population from which one revenue illage was selected. Since paddy is the principal food crop cultivated almost in all the villages and Blocks in the District. Hence the farmers who cultivated paddy were selected based on the crop data obtained from the Assistant Director of Statistics, Theni. According to the crop data, an intensive study was made by the researcher through field survey during the period 2015-2016

Tool adopted in the study: Simple percentage analysis

Agriculture profile of Theni District

The district enjoys salubrious climate conducive for agriculture and horticulture. In addition to that 40 percent of the economy is received from agriculture sector it provides employment opportunity to nearly 40 percent of the rural people. In the hill viz. Uthamapalayam and Periyakulam, fine vegetables are grown and supplied to districts and northern states also. But paddy the first rank in food crop cultivation and comes next to paddy.

As per the crop data taken from the Compendium of Agriculture Statistics, 1950-51 to 2007-08 Chennai and the recently published source the various websites of the agriculture department of Theni District and the Economics and Statistics Department of Tamil Nadu and the cultivation of paddy has decreased from 19029 hectares in 1996-1997 to 14400 hectares in 2007-2008 and further increased to hectares in 2014-2015.

Agriculture population of Theni district the census data

Year	Cultivators
2001	50,436
2011	36371

Source : Census data : 2011

Hence, the researcher has chosen ex Theni District for the study. The prim were collected from the farmers through interview schedule exclusively des them. Pre test and pilot study was ma finalizing the interview schedule. 3.5 farmers have been selected from farmers' population. Due to financial constraint the researcher has chosen o farmers

Table 1-Block Wise Classification of the Sample Respondents

Type of Respondents (Farmers)

Name of the blocks	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Periyakulam	120 (19.2 %)	60 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	240 (20.0%)
Theni	120 (19.2 %)	60 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	240 (20.0%)
Aandipatti	144 (23.1%).	48 (16.7%)	24 (16.7 %)	24 (16.7%)	240 (20.0%)
Chinnamanur	120 (19.2%)	60 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	240 (20.0%)
Bodinayakanur	120 (19.2%)	60 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	30 (20.8%)	240 (20.0%)
Total	624 (1000.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 100.0%)

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

The table 1 shows the block-wise classification of the sample respondents. The compositions of all types of farmers are shown in the table. It could be observed from the table that the total numbers of sample respondents are 1200 and the compositions of the sample respondents are marginal, small, medium and large farmers. They are equally distributed in all blocks as 240 per block. The distribution shows that marginal farmers are 624 which is a high number in the total sample respondents. Next to marginal farmers, small farmers are 288, followed by medium and large farmers are 144, 144 respectively. It is also recorded in the table that except Andipatti block, all other blocks have the equal distribution of sample respondents' viz. marginal farmers120, farmers60, medium farmers 30 and large farmers 30. The reason for more number of marginal farmers in Andipatti is attributed with the size of agricultural population. The percentage shows that marginal farmers in Andipatti are recorded 23.1 when compared with all other blocks.

Table-2 Gender Wise Classification of the Sample Respondents

	Type of Respondents (Farmers)				
Gender	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Male	474(76.0%)	216(75.0%)	120(83.3%)	132(91.7)	942(78.5%)
Female	150(24.0%)	72(25.0%)	24(16.7%)	12(08.35)	258(21.5%)
Total	624(100.0%)	288(100.0%)	144(100.0%)	144(100.0%)	1200(100.0%)

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

Table 2 reveals the gender wise classification of the sample respondents. It could be observed from the table that in the total sample respondents 942 respondents are male which and 258 are female respondents. The percentage shows that 78.5 percent are male and 21.5 percent are female represents. It is understood from the table that three fourth are the male and one fourth are female respondents.

Age	Type of Respondents (Farmers) Marginal	Small	Medium	
20-30	48 (7.7%)	24 (8.3%)	0 (.0%)	
30-40	54 (8.7%)	06 (2.1%)	0 (.0%)	
40-50	114 (18.3%)	108 (37.5%)	12 (08.3%)	
50-60	234 (37.5%)	78 (27.1%)	78 (54.2%)	
Above 60	174 (27.9%)	72 (25.0%)	54 (37.5%)	
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	

ource: Primary data Figures in brackets
ıows percentage to total Age wise

he age wise classification of the sample
spondents are given in table 4. From the total
mple respondents 432 fall in the age in 50-60,
96 fall in the age between above 60 followed
y 240, 72 and 60 falling in the age group 40-50,
)-40 and 20-30 respectively. It is very clear that the respondents who
years are more or less eq
The age group belongs to
in the total sample size.
who are in the age of 30-
same trend. It is very imp
farmers fall in the age of
medium and large type. W
of farmers based on the
marginal and small farmers

Table 4-Source of the Household income of the Sample Respo

Source of the household income	Type of (Respondents)Farmers Marginal	Small	Medium	Large
Main/other	384 (61.5%)	162 (56.3%)	60 (41.7%)	36 (25.0%)
Main/ subsidary	180 (28.8%)	120 (41.7%)	0 (.0%)372	72 (50.0%)
Main/subsidiary/others	60 (9.6%)	6 (2.1%)	84 (58.3%)	36 (25.0%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

HIRD CONCEPT. FEBRUARY 2017

Figures in

ource: Primary data
rackets shows percentage to total

able 4 shows the sources of income of the ample respondents. In the total respondents 53.5 ercent fall in the source main and others. This s the highest percentage when compared with ther two sources. Taking in to account of other wo types of farmers medium farmers have ecorded 41.7 percent and the larger farmers ave recorded 25. 0 percent It is also seen from he table that main and subsidiary occupation eing the source of income for about 31.0 percent in the total respondents. At the same time it is very important to note that no medium farmers fall in this category. Only 15.5 percent of the sample respondents consisting of all types of farmers have all the three sources. But the medium and large farmers ranks first and second and recorded 58.3 percent and 25.0 percent respectively. While comparing the marginal and small farmers, it is revealed that 9. 6 percent of marginal farmers have all the three sources. Mere 2.1 percent of the small farmers fall in the third type source of income.

Table 5 Annual Income of the Sample Respondents

Type of (Respondents) Farmers

Annual Income	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Less than 50,000	186 (29.8%)	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	186 (15.5%)
50,000-1,00,000	372 (59.6%)	222 (77.1%)	6 (4.2%)	0 (.0%)	600 (50.0%)
1,00,000-1,50,000	66 (10.6%)	66 (22.9%)	18 (12.5%)	0 (.0%)	150 (12.5%)
1,50,000-2,00,000	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	60 (41.7%)	78 (54.2%)	138 (11.5%)
Above 2 lakhs	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	60 (41.7%)	66 (45.8%)	126 (10.5%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0%)

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

The annual income of the sample respondents are shown in the table 4.12. Of the total sample respondents, half of them, except large farmers, fall in the range of income Rs. 50,000- 10,0000. 15.5 percent of the sample respondents earn less than Rs. 50000 annually. Next to them the other three ranges of income holders recorded more or less same trend with slight change as 12.5, 11.5 and 10.5 percent respectively. There is a high difference in the income range between Rs. 100000 -150000 and above 150000- 200000. In the range of Rs. 100000 -150000 small and medium farmers have recorded 22.9 and 12.5 percent respectively. No large farmers fall in this range. Whereas no farmers belong to marginal and small type fall in the range of income Rs 150000- 200000. It is also inferred from this that it is shared by marginal and medium farmers as 54.2 and 41.7 percent respectively. It is proved that only large and medium farmers earn above Rs 2 lakhs annually and they have recorded 45.8 and 41.7 percent respectively.

Table-6 Involvement In Agriculture By Respondents

olvement of the sample pondent in agriculture	Type of Respondents (Farmers) Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
ditional	516 (82.7%)	186 (64.6%)	78 (54.2%)	126 (87.5%)	(75.5%)
iated by you ividual	102 (16.3%)	84 (29.2%)	60 (41.7%)	18 (12.5%)	264 (22.0%)
iated by friends l relatives	6 (1.0%)	18 (6.3%)	6 (4.2%)	0 (.0%)	30 (2.5%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0%)

ce: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

uld be observed from the sample table that -fourth of the sample respondents have been lved in agriculture sector traditionally. In is of percentage 75.5 percent of the total sample respondents have involved in ag traditionally. 22.0 percent farmers have by themselves and taken up on their own Mere 2.5 percent of the sample respond induced by friends and relatives

Table- 7 Experience Wise Classification of the Sample Respondents

Type of Farmers

XPERIENCE	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
ss than5yrs	30 (4.8%)	6 (2.1%)	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	36 (3.0%
-15yrs	60 (9.6%)	30 (10.4%)	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)	90 (7.5%
-20yrs	126 (20.2%)	114 (39.6%)	24 (16.7%)	24 (16.7%)	288 (24.0
bove 20yrs	408 (65.4%)	138 (47.9%)	120 (83.3%)	120 (83.3%)	786 (65.5
otal	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0

rce: Primary data

inferred from the table 7 that 65. 5 percent ie total sample respondents comprised by all es of farmers having than 20 years of erience in agriculture. Likewise 24.0 percent ie farmers have 15- 20 years of experience. so has in all types. The farmers with 10- 15 rs of experience is recorded about 7.5 percent. It is very important to note tha category no farmers fall from medium a type. Just 3.0 percent of the respondent minimum experience with less than 5 y this category also no farmers fall from and large type.

Table-8 Nature of the Ownership S Respondents

...percent of the farmers have irrigated land followed by 33.5 percent of the farmers having two types of land. As far as irrigated land is concerned marginal farmers have recorded 78.8 percent followed by small farmers 62.5 percent followed by medium farmers 45.9 percent and large farmers 37.5 percent. It is also inferred from the table that the farmers having both types of land holding have recorded 62.5 percent, 54.2 percent, 35.4 percent and 21.2percent by large, medium, small and marginal respectively.

Table -10 Types of Seed Used By Respondents

Type of Respondents Farmers

TYPES OF SEED	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Farm seed	378 (60.0%)	204 (70.8%)	84 (58.3%)	120 (83.3%)	786 (65.5%)
Company seed	246 (39.4%)	84 (29.2%)	60 (41.7%)	24 (16.7%)	414 (34.5%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0%)

ource: Primary data Figures in brackets shows ercentage to total

is inferred from the table that 65. 5 percent of ie total sample respondents have used farm seed nd 34. 5 percent of the sample respondents have sed company seeds. It is to be noted that while omparing farm and company seed users ccording to the size of the farm large farmers, small farmers, marginal farmers and medium farmers have used 83 3 percent, 70.8 percent 60.6 percent and 58.3 percent respectively. As far as company seed is concerned, the medium farmers have recorded highest percentage as 41.7. This is the highest percent while comparing all other types of farmers. Next to them marginal, small and large farmers have recorded 39.4 , 29.2 and 16.7 percentages respectively.

Table -11 Sources of Seed Obtained By Respondents

Type of Respondents (Farmers)

Sources of seed	Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	Total	Total
Open market	390 (62.5%)	192 (66.7%)	90 (62.5%)	120 (83.3%)	792 (66.0%)	792 (66.0%)
Government	234 (37.5%)	96 (54%)	54 (37.5%)	24 (16.7%)	408 (34.0%)	408 (34.0%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0%)	1200 (100.0%)

ource: Primary data Figures in brackets shows ercentage to total

t could be observed from the table 11 that 66.0 ercent of the sample respondents have purchased eed in the open market. About 34.0 percent of he sample respondents have purchased in the overnment departments. It is also seen from the table that there is no difference among marginal, small and medium farmers in response to both sources. Same kind of changes is same kind of trend is persisting with little changes. As far as large farmers are concerned, there is a wide difference between the two sources. 83.3 percent of the large farmers have purchased in open market and 26. 7 percent have purchased in government departments.

Nature of Ownership	Type of Respondents (Farmers) Marginal	Small	Medium	
Owned	270 (43.3%)	132 (45.8%)	84 (58.3%)	114
leased	330 (52.9%)	120 (41.7%)	36 (25.0%)	6
Both	24 (3.8%)	36 (12.5%)	24 (16.7%)	24
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144

ource: Primary data Figures in brackets shows ercentage to total

can be inferred from the table that 50 percent f the sample respondents have own land.41. 0 ercent of the sample respondents possess leased and. It is seen that the difference in the wnership between owned and leased is only 9 ercent. There is no wide difference between iem. Mere 9.0 percent of the farmers have both ype of ownership. Further, it is evident from the ible that large farmers have recorded highest ercent in the owned land followed by 16. 7 ercent and 4.2 percent fall in to both and leased ategory.

lext to large farmers medium famers have ecorded owned, lease and both as 58.3 percent, 25.9percent and 16.7 percent Followed by them small farmers ownership under own, lease 45.8percent 41.7percent and respectively. As far as marginal concerned the ownership of lease the farmers who owned land. shows that 52.9 percent of the are having owned land ownership percent are having leased ownership 3.8percent are having both type of

On the whole, it is inferred that have recorded very low percent category while comparing other farmers. It is further reported that percent of the marginal farmers have of land ownership

Table -9 Type of the Landholding Sample Respondents

Type of the landholding	Type of respondents (Farmers) Marginal	Small	Medium	Large
Dry land	0 (.0%)	6 (2.1%)	0 (.0%)	0 (.0%)
Wet land	492 (78.8%)	180 (62.5%)	66 (45.8%)	792 (66.0%)
Both	132 (21.2%)	102 (35.4%)	78 (54.2%)	90 (62.5%)
Total	624 (100.0%)	288 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)	144 (100.0%)

ource: Primary data- Figures in brackets shows ercentage to total

The table 9 reveals that only 6 pe total sample respondents are havi

Conclusion

Based on the above analysis, it is proved that majority of the farmers are marginal and small and have no sound economic background. Most of the farmers are illiterate and their income is between Rs. 50,000 to 1,00,000. Most of the farmers belong to all the four types which have been involved in agriculture traditionally. Marginal and small farmers find very difficult in getting agricultural subsidy and hence they expect that the government should relax the rules and regulations and monitor the sanctioning authorities whether they are farmers friendly or not. They also stated that collective support from the government, public, dealers and agents would enable them in the midst of all crises. The perception of the above stakeholders should be farmers' welfare-centric.

References

1. *Indian economy*, Gaurav Datt and Sundharam, S. Chand & Company, New Delhi, 2012, p. 505
2. Tamil Nadu State Appraisal, Retrieved from http:/ www. tn.stat.gov.in
3. Agriculture Statistics at a Glance 2014and2015 Retrieved from www e and s. dacnet.nic.in
4. www.districts. nic.in

◆◆