

# 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**

15/2/19 ✓ 1 COPY (11) 2016-17

# 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 backbone of the national livelihood security stem. Responding to this Dr. Manmohan Singh, the former Prime Minister called for second green revolution. The package of first green revolution was favored for large farmers and particularly succeeded in irrigated area. The program was cost oriented also. Hence Dr. Singh suggested covering the marginal and small farmers through various programs and also mentioned that 55 percent of the farmers were passed by the first green revolution and poverty still remained among the farming community.

## Significance of the study

Tamil Nadu receives 7.4 percent of GSDP from agriculture sector and provides employment opportunity to more than 40 percent of the people. The State has received Krishi Karman Award from the Government of India for the achievement of high record production in food grains of 10.1 million tons during 2011-12. As per the latest Agricultural Census 2010-11, marginal and small holdings of less than 2 hectares accounted for 61.0 percent of the total holdings and 61.0 percent of the total operated area. They in turn are unsuitable for conventional technology and machinery use to boost agricultural production. This led to a process of marginalization of small and marginal farmers and casualization of agricultural laborers.

Theni is one of the southern districts of Tamil Nadu 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.

THIRD CONCEPT, FEBRUARY 2017.

ample technique. The study is based on both primary and secondary sources. For the purpose of primary data Theni district is taken as universe, the blocks and villages of the districts are taken as strata and the farmers are the ultimate unit. Primary data were collected using stratified random sampling by using proportionate probability random sampling technique during the year 2015-2016 from November 2015 – March 2016. The block wise number of farmers list was obtained from the Deputy Director of statistics, Theni, for the present study.

### Sample Design

The total sample size is 1200 which is statistically significant number. The total respondents are distributed among marginal, small, medium and large farmers based on the size of the holding. According to the census 2011, Theni District has high proportion of marginal farmers, followed by small farmers and followed by medium and large farmers. All the records of agricultural statistics referred by the researcher showed that large farmers are found very minimum in total farming community. Among 1200 farmers, 624 are marginal farmers, 288 are small farmers and the medium and large farmers are 144,144 respectively.

Five blocks were selected based on the agricultural population from which one revenue village 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**

**Table 1-Block Wise Classification of the Sample Respondents**

Type of Respondents (Farmers)

THIRD CONCEPT, FEBRUARY 2017

### 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 40 percent of the rural people. In the district viz. Uthamapalayam and Periyakulam, fruits and vegetables are grown and supplied to other districts and northern states also. But paddy is 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 sources on the various websites of the agriculture department of Theni District and the Economic 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 14400 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 1200 farmers from Theni District for the study. The primary data were collected from the farmers through interview schedule exclusively designed for them. Pre test and pilot study was made before finalizing the interview schedule. 3.5% of the farmers have been selected from the farmers' population. Due to financial constraint the researcher has chosen 1200 farmers

| Name of the blocks | Marginal         | Small           | Medium          | Large           | Total            |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Periyakulam        | 120<br>(19.2 %)  | 60<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 240<br>(20.0%)   |
| Theni              | 120<br>(19.2 %)  | 60<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 240<br>(20.0%)   |
| Aandipatti         | 144<br>(23.1%)   | 48<br>(16.7%)   | 24<br>(16.7 %)  | 24<br>(16.7%)   | 240<br>(20.0%)   |
| Chinnamanur        | 120<br>(19.2%)   | 60<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 240<br>(20.0%)   |
| Bodinayakanur      | 120<br>(19.2%)   | 60<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 30<br>(20.8%)   | 240<br>(20.0%)   |
| Total              | 624<br>(1000.0%) | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 1200<br>(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 farmers 120, farmers 60, 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**

| Gender | Type of Respondents (Farmers) |             |             |             |              |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
|        | 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<br>(7.7%)                  | 24<br>(8.3%)    | 0<br>(.0%)      |
| 30-40    | 54<br>(8.7%)                  | 06<br>(2.1%)    | 0<br>(.0%)      |
| 40-50    | 114<br>(18.3%)                | 108<br>(37.5%)  | 12<br>(08.3%)   |
| 50-60    | 234<br>(37.5%)                | 78<br>(27.1%)   | 78<br>(54.2%)   |
| Above 60 | 174<br>(27.9%)                | 72<br>(25.0%)   | 54<br>(37.5%)   |
| Total    | 624<br>(100.0%)               | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) |

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total Age wise

The age wise classification of the sample respondents are given in table 4. From the total sample respondents 432 fall in the age in 50-60, 96 fall in the age between above 60 followed by 240, 72 and 60 falling in the age group 40-50, 30-40 and 20-30 respectively. It is very clear

that the respondents who are more or less experienced years are more or less experienced. The age group belongs to 50-60 in the total sample size. Age group who are in the age of 30-40 shows same trend. It is very important to note that farmers fall in the age of 50-60, medium and large type. While 50% of farmers based on the age group are marginal and small farmers.

**Table 4-Source of the Household income of the Sample Respondents**

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

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

Source: Primary data  
 Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

Table 4 shows the sources of income of the sample respondents. In the total respondents 53.5 percent fall in the source main and others. This is the highest percentage when compared with other two sources. Taking into account of other two types of farmers medium farmers have recorded 41.7 percent and the larger farmers have recorded 25.0 percent. It is also seen from the table that main and subsidiary occupation being 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**

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

| Involvement of the sample respondent in agriculture | Type of Respondents (Farmers) |                 |                 |                 | Total            |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|   | Marginal                      | Small           | Medium          | Large           |                  |
| Traditional   | 516<br>(82.7%)                | 186<br>(64.6%)  | 78<br>(54.2%)   | 126<br>(87.5%)  | 755<br>(75.5%)   |
| Induced by you individual                           | 102<br>(16.3%)                | 84<br>(29.2%)   | 60<br>(41.7%)   | 18<br>(12.5%)   | 264<br>(22.0%)   |
| Induced by friends and relatives                    | 6<br>(1.0%)                   | 18<br>(6.3%)    | 6<br>(4.2%)     | 0<br>(.0%)      | 30<br>(2.5%)     |
| Total   | 624<br>(100.0%)               | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 1200<br>(100.0%) |

Source: Primary data. Figures in brackets shows percentage to total. It can be observed from the sample table that three-fourth of the sample respondents have been involved in agriculture sector traditionally. In terms of percentage 75.5 percent of the total sample respondents have involved in agriculture traditionally. 22.0 percent farmers have been induced by themselves and taken up on their own. Mere 2.5 percent of the sample respondents have been induced by friends and relatives.

**Table- 7 Experience Wise Classification of the Sample Respondents**

| EXPERIENCE     | Type of Farmers |                 |                 |                 | Total            |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                | Marginal        | Small           | Medium          | Large           |                  |
| Less than 5yrs | 30<br>(4.8%)    | 6<br>(2.1%)     | 0<br>(.0%)      | 0<br>(.0%)      | 36<br>(3.0%)     |
| 5-15yrs        | 60<br>(9.6%)    | 30<br>(10.4%)   | 0<br>(.0%)      | 0<br>(.0%)      | 90<br>(7.5%)     |
| 15-20yrs       | 126<br>(20.2%)  | 114<br>(39.6%)  | 24<br>(16.7%)   | 24<br>(16.7%)   | 288<br>(24.0%)   |
| Above 20yrs    | 408<br>(65.4%)  | 138<br>(47.9%)  | 120<br>(83.3%)  | 120<br>(83.3%)  | 786<br>(65.5%)   |
| Total          | 624<br>(100.0%) | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 1200<br>(100.0%) |

Source: Primary data. It can be inferred from the table 7 that 65.5 percent of the total sample respondents comprised by all types of farmers having than 20 years of experience in agriculture. Likewise 24.0 percent of the total sample respondents have 15- 20 years of experience. 9.6 percent of the total sample respondents has in all types. The farmers with 10- 15 years of experience is recorded about 7.5

percent. It is very important to note that in the category no farmers fall from medium and large type. Just 3.0 percent of the respondents have minimum experience with less than 5 years. In this category also no farmers fall from medium and large type.

**Table-8 Nature of the Ownership of the Sample Respondents**

... of the farmers have irrigated land ... by 33.5 percent of the farmers having ... types of land. As far as irrigated land is ... marginal farmers have recorded 78.8 percent followed by small farmers 62.5 percent and 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 21.2 percent by large, medium, small and marginal respectively.

**Table -10 Types of Seed Used By Respondents**

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

Source: Primary data. Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

It is inferred from the table that 65.5 percent of the total sample respondents have used farm seed and 34.5 percent of the sample respondents have used company seeds. It is to be noted that while comparing farm and company seed users according 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**

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

Source: Primary data. Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

It could be observed from the table 11 that 66.0 percent of the sample respondents have purchased seed in the open market. About 34.0 percent of the sample respondents have purchased in the government 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          | Large           |
| Owned               | 270<br>(43.3%)                | 132<br>(45.8%)  | 84<br>(58.3%)   | 114<br>(79.2%)  |
| Leased              | 330<br>(52.9%)                | 120<br>(41.7%)  | 36<br>(25.0%)   | 6<br>(4.2%)     |
| Both                | 24<br>(3.8%)                  | 36<br>(12.5%)   | 24<br>(16.7%)   | 24<br>(16.7%)   |
| Total               | 624<br>(100.0%)               | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) |

Source: Primary data Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

It can be inferred from the table that 50 percent of the sample respondents have own land. 41.0 percent of the sample respondents possess leased land. It is seen that the difference in the ownership between owned and leased is only 9 percent. There is no wide difference between them. Mere 9.0 percent of the farmers have both type of ownership. Further, it is evident from the table that large farmers have recorded highest percent in the owned land followed by 16.7 percent and 4.2 percent fall in to both and leased category.

In next to large farmers medium farmers have recorded owned, lease and both as 58.3 percent,

25.9 percent and 16.7 percent respectively. Followed by them small farmers have recorded 45.8 percent 41.7 percent and 16.7 percent respectively. As far as marginal farmers concerned the ownership of leased land, the farmers who owned land, the table shows that 52.9 percent of the marginal farmers are having owned land ownership, 41.7 percent are having leased ownership and 3.8 percent are having both type of ownership.

On the whole, it is inferred that large farmers have recorded very low percent in leased category while comparing other categories of farmers. It is further reported that 16.7 percent of the marginal farmers have recorded 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<br>(.0%)                    | 6<br>(2.1%)     | 0<br>(.0%)      | 0<br>(.0%)      |
| Wet land                | 492<br>(78.8%)                | 180<br>(62.5%)  | 66<br>(45.8%)   | 792<br>(66.0%)  |
| Both                    | 132<br>(21.2%)                | 102<br>(35.4%)  | 78<br>(54.2%)   | 90<br>(62.5%)   |
| Total                   | 624<br>(100.0%)               | 288<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) | 144<br>(100.0%) |

Source: Primary data- Figures in brackets shows percentage to total

The table 9 reveals that only 6 percent of total sample respondents are having dry land.

THIRD CONCEPT, FEBRUARY

...all types of ...  
...in response to ...  
...that both medium ...  
...distributed viz ...  
...and 29.2 respectively ...  
...with ...  
...32.7, 39.6 and ...  
...medium ...  
...subsidy in ...  
...33.5 percent consists all ...

very important to note that all the sample ...  
...are aware of the company seed ...  
...it is recorded 100 percent.

evident from the table-14 that 64.0 percent ...  
...comprising by all types have ...  
...Only 36.0 Percent of the farmers have ...  
...It is also important that the number and ...  
...of the farmers with cattle no is greater ...  
...cattle yes.

details of the agricultural implements and ...  
...possessed by the farmers. The ...  
...percentage belong to category yes is ...  
...highest percentage as 65.0. It consisting ...  
...at all types of farmers. Particularly medium ...  
...farmers fall in to the category yes has ...  
...ference in percentage. While comparing ...  
...and small farmers marginal farmers have ...  
...62.5 percent which much higher than ...  
...farmers' percentage 35.0. It is also inferred ...  
...the table that it is not to be wondered that ...  
...medium and large farmers are having any

...conclusion

### 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 2014 and 2015 Retrieved from [www.eand.s.dacnet.nic.in](http://www.eand.s.dacnet.nic.in)
4. [www.districts.nic.in](http://www.districts.nic.in)

