



Research Article

SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE AND COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOUR OF THE RICE GROWING TRIBAL FARMERS IN NORTHERN HILLY REGION OF CHHATTISGARH

PAINKRA S.K.¹, SINGH S.P.², PAINKRA K.K.², PATEL B.¹ AND RATHIA G.R.¹

¹College of Agriculture and Research Station, Raigarh, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, 492012, Chhattisgarh, India

²CAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Raigarh, 496001, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, 492012, Chhattisgarh, India

*Corresponding Author: Email - spsinghsahab@gmail.com

Received: May 03, 2020; Revised: May 19, 2020; Accepted: May 20, 2020; Published: May 30, 2020

Abstract: The present study was on the socio-economic profile and communication behaviour of tribal farmers of Jashpur district, Chhattisgarh. The total geographical area of district is 645741 ha. in which 341131 ha of land come under agriculture. According to census survey, 2011 the total population of the district is 851669. Out of which, 424747 are males and 426922 are females. The average sex ratio is 1005 of the districts. Out of total population, 62.30 percent come under tribal community. Oraon, Kanwar, Nagesia, Gond, Korwa, Birhor, Munda and Khadiya are major tribes of the district. Rice is a major crop covering about 177.632 thousand ares in *kharif* (rainy season) in the district. The study revealed that majority of the 64.17 percent tribal farmers were having belonged to medium socio-economic status. So, there is to be made proper strategy with the help of Rural Agriculture Extension Officers (RAEOs) at village level for vegetable cultivation, dairy and goat keeping along with improved rice cultivation technology so that farmers could be enhanced their socio-economic status. Similarly, 51.67 percent tribal farmers were having medium communication behaviour. It means there should be prepared programme with proper time so that farmers utilize more communication facilities for enhance their communication behaviour.

Keywords: Socio-economic, Communication, Rice, Tribal farmers

Citation: Painkra S.K., *et al.*, (2020) Socio-Economic Profile and Communication Behaviour of The Rice Growing Tribal Farmers in Northern Hilly Region of Chhattisgarh. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 12, Issue 10, pp.- 9862-9864.

Copyright: Copyright©2020 Painkra S.K., *et al.*, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Academic Editor / Reviewer: Nimit Kumar

Introduction

Chhattisgarh is known as tribal state in India. There are 46 tribal community live in the state. Jashpur district is situated in North eastern corner of the state of Chhattisgarh which is adjoining the border of Gumla and Simdega district from Jharkhand and Sundargarh district from Odisha state. The total geographical area of district is 645741 ha. in which 341131 ha of land come under agriculture. According to census survey, 2011 the total population of the district is 851669. Out of which, 424747 are males and 426922 are females. The average sex ratio is 1005 of the districts. Out of total population, 62.30 percent come under tribal community. Oraon, Kanwar, Nagesia, Gond, Korwa, Birhor, Munda and Khadiya are major tribes of the district. Rice is a major crop covering about 177.632 thousand ares in *kharif* (rainy season) in the district [1]. The Fertilizers consumption rate of N P K is 4.97, 3.57 and 1.00 Kg ha⁻¹ in the district. Communication is the basic activity of human for exchange the knowledge and idea in the society. It is the base of the development of the people. No person can be survived in the society without communication. Therefore, communication is the activity of human being which is being run since birth to till date of the human. The farmers utilise many sources of information other than agriculture extension workers part of these rendered by the neighbours, friends, relatives, member of panchayat etc. Important of these agencies are in the dissemination of information, it is with the agricultural extension agencies and particularly the village level workers name as Rural Agriculture Extension Workers. In Jashpur district, tribal farmers do not have adopted improved rice technology due to which productivity is very low (15.29 qt ha⁻¹) as compare to Chhattisgarh state (19.76 qt ha⁻¹). More productivity of rice is depending upon the adoption rate of new technology which may be through using sources of communication with proper time by the tribal farmers. Keeping this view the present study was designed of the following objectives

To study the personal and socio-economic characteristics of Tribal farmers.
To study the communication behaviour of tribal farmers.

Material and Methods

The study was conducted in Jashpur district of Chhattisgarh. There are comprises 08 blocks namely Jashpur, Manora, Duldula, Kunkuri, Bagicha, Pathalgaon, Kansabel and Farsabahal in the district. Out of which, two blocks namely Pathalgaon and Kansabel block were selected purposively. Two village from each block i.e., Pemla and Jamagi "B" from Pathalgaon and village - Tangargaon and Barjor from Kansabel block were selected randomly. Similarly, 30 tribal farmers from each village were selected randomly. Thus, total 120 tribal farmers as respondents were selected randomly for the purpose of the study. The data were collected personally through pre- tested interview scheduled especially for developed on standard scale with slight modification in in light objectives. The socio- economic status were measured by SES scale Trivedi (1963) [2] and communication was measured by Vijayraghvan (1976) [3].

Results and Discussion

On the basis of socio- economic and personal characteristics of tribal farmers age, education al level, types of family, size of family, size of land holding, social participation and annual income were taken under independent variables to the study purposes.

Table-1 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their age.

SN	Age (in year)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Young(18-35)	29	24.17
2.	Middle(35-52)	61	50.83
3.	Old (0 Above 52)	30	25.00
	Total	120	100.00

From [Table-1], it is revealing that majority of the rice growing tribal farmers 50.83 percent had middle age group followed by old and young age group *i.e.*, 25.00 and 24.17 percent respectively. It may be reason behind that job opportunity is very less in govt. and private sectors as well division of the land in family due to law of inheritance in next generations. Another reason could be majority of the respondents know about improved rice production technology. The results are line with the research findings reported [4-7].

Table-2 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their education

SN	Educational level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Illiterate	06	5.00
2.	Primary School	26	21.67
3.	Middle School	32	26.67
4.	High School	21	17.50
5.	Intermediate	18	15.00
6.	Graduate	12	10.00
7.	Post Graduate	05	4.16
	Total	120	100.00

From [Table-2] shows that majority of the tribal's farmers *i.e.*, 26.67 percent those who cultivate rice are belonging to middle school while by 21.67 and 17.50 percent were primary school and high school. Whereas graduate and post graduate tribal's farmers were 10.00 and 4.16 percent and only 3.00 percent were having found illiterate level. The reason behind that more number of tribal farmers educated due to availability of educational facilities at village level provided by the State Govt. Similar findings were reported by Patil (2005) [8] as well as the table also indicate that literacy rate was found increased in the fields of agriculture due to limited job opportunity in Govt. and private sectors. These results of the present study are also similar to More (2000) [9], Mandal and De (2010) [10], Prasad, et al., (2010) [11].

Table-3 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their Family

SN	Types of family	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Nuclear	85	70.83
2.	Joint	35	29.17
	Total	120	100.00

[Table-3] reveals that two types of family *i.e.*, nuclear and joint family at village level. The data showed that majority of the farmers 70.83 percent having nuclear family and 29.17 percent belonged to joint family system. The reason may be increasing of nuclear family is the reason growth of populations due to which land is fragmented as well as migration from the village to cities for wages and employees. The findings are in line with those of Prabha (1988) [12], Anonymous (1995) [13] who reported that majority of the respondents belonged to nuclear family followed by joint family.

Table-4 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their size of Family

SN	Size of family	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Small (up to 04)	29	24.17
2.	Medium (05-07)	66	55.00
3.	Large (08 and above)	25	20.83
	Total	120	100.00

The [Table-4] shows that 65 percent tribal farmers were having 05-07 family members where as 24.17 percent farmers having up to 04 members in family and 20.83 percent belong to large size of family. It may be awareness about family planning system in the tribal farmers in case of small and medium family. The findings are similar with the findings of Raut and Sale (1995) [14].

Table-5 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their social participation.

SN	Social participation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	No participation	43	35.83
2.	Member of one organization	69	57.50
3.	Member more than one organization	08	6.67
4.	office beares	-	-
5.	Public leader MP/MLA	-	-
	Total	120	100.00

The results from this table, indicates that 35.85 percent were having not participated any institutions/Organizations. While 57.50 percent rice growing tribal farmers were having membership of one organization like village and block level Co-operative society. Only 6.67 percent rice growing tribal farmers were having membership one more than one organization. There were no any farmers belonging to office bearers and representative like MP/MLA etc. The reason behind that membership of the farmers in organizations like Co-operative society at

village and block levels which more facilitates likes seed and fertilizers and purchasing of rice in Govt rate provided by. The same type of result was given by Wadekar, et al., (2016) [15].

Table-6 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their size of land holding.

SN	Size of land holding (Category)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	< 1 ha (Marginal)	49	40.83
2.	1-2 ha (Small)	35	29.17
3.	2-4 ha (Semi medium)	19	15.83
4.	4-10 ha (Medium)	11	9.17
5.	> 10 ha (Large)	06	5.00
	Total	120	100.00

The [Table-6] shows that highest percentage (*i.e.*, 40.83 percent) of the tribal farmers belonged to having marginal category size of land holding (less than 01 ha) while marginal small and semi medium tribal farmers *i.e.*, 29.17 and 15.83 percent category 1-2ha and 2-4 ha, 9.17 percent farmers were considered as medium category having size of land holding. 4-10 ha size of land holding category. Only 5.0 percent farmers were having large size of land holding (>10 ha). The similar finding reported by Sunilkumar (2004) [16], Gill, et al., (2009) [17] who reported that 115 million operation holding belong in the category about 80.00 percent farmers are come under small and marginal category. This is reason behind that in India, day to day population are rapidly growing and size of land holding by per family with next generation brings down due to law of inheritance in the society. Another reason may be land is divided due to law of inheritance after marriage in the tribal society.

Table-7 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their annual income.

SN	Annual income (in thousands)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	0-50	52	43.33
2.	50-100	35	29.17
3.	100-150	19	15.83
4.	15-200	09	7.50
5.	200 and above	05	4.17
	Total	120	100.00

The observation from [Table-7] reveals that majority of the tribal farmers 43.33 percent having annual income up to 50 thousand only while 29.13 percent of the tribal farmers from were having thousand income groups between 50 to 100 thousand, 15.83 and 7.50 percent farmers having up to 100-150, 15-200 thousand income group and only 4.17 percent tribal farmers having their annual income group more than 2.00 lakh. The reason may be income of the farmers depends in the size of land holding. Rice is cultivated in this area in rainy season only. They do not have adopted improved rice cultivation practices. Due to which, they gain less productivity at their fields and their income level is very low. Some farmers income is high this may be due to fact that large size of holding is higher to the total production as the income of the tribal farmers. One another reason may be, where irrigation facility available in this area, they cultivate vegetables in upland situation. So, there their annual are high as compare to other groups of tribal farmers. The finding is the similar with the finding of Wadekar, et al., (2016) [15].

Table-8 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their Socio- economic status.

SN	Socio- economic status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Low <(Mean-SD)	27	22.50
2.	Medium in between (Mean+SD)	77	64.17
3.	Large> (Mean+ SD)	16	13.33
	Total	120	100.00

Maximum Score-117, Minimum Score-21, Range- 96, Mean-48.13, SD- 18.97

In order to find out the socio-economic status of the tribal famers Socio-economic scale [2] was used. the score obtained under each nine items (Age, Educational level, Land holding, Types of family, Size of family, Annual income, Farm implements, Farm power and social participation) was used. The score obtained was divided into three categories *i.e.*, low, medium and high. The criteria of the division have been in the table presented above. Observation from [Table-8] reveals that majority of the farmer's *i.e.*, 64.17 percent having belonged to the medium socio- economic status followed by low socio- economic status group's *i.e.*, 22.50percent. The previous table concluded that majority of the farmer's belonged to small and marginal category and annual income of Rs. less than 1.0 lakh. The reason fact that socio- economic status measured of the basis of nine criteria already been mentioned above.

Table-9 Distribution of farmers on the basis of their communication behaviour.

SN	Level of communication behaviour	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Low (Mean-SD)	37	30.83
2.	Medium in between (Mean+SD)	62	51.67
3.	Large (Mean+ SD)	21	17.50
	Total	120	100.00

Maximum Score-97, Minimum Score-25, Range- 72, Mean-48.21, SD- 17.43

The findings are in evidence with [18] who reported that majority of the farmers were found to be medium and low-level socio- economic category. The [Table-9] revealed that majority of the respondent's i.e., 51.67 percent having medium communication behaviour followed by low communication behaviour i.e., 17.50 percent and 30.83 percent farmers were having considered as high level of communication behaviour respectively. The reason may be due to fact behind that farmers know the utility of new information about agriculture and they received new information from different sources, which helping them their production and productivity in the fields of rice cultivation. The same findings reported by Sandhu and Lal (1973) [19], Bordolai, et al., (2004) [20], Lal Banarasi (2006) [21].

Conclusion

The study was concluded that majority of the rice growing tribal farmers had medium socio-economic status. So, there is to be needed of vegetables cultivation as well as Dairy, poultry and Goat keeping along with improved rice cultivation so that farmers could enhance their socio-economic status from increasing productivity of rice as well as generating supplementary income from vegetables, dairy, goat and poultry keeping. The similar data majority of the tribal farmers were found medium level in case of communication behaviour. Therefore, it should be made proper strategy at village level with the help of Rural Agriculture Extension Officers (RAEOs) at village level so that farmers utilize more communication sources with proper time for enhance their communication behaviour.

Application of research: The socio-economic profile and communication behaviour study may be required for uplift livelihood of rice growing tribal farmers in northern hilly region of Chhattisgarh.

Research Category: Socio-economic profile and communication behaviour.

Abbreviations: Nil

Acknowledgement / Funding: Authors are thankful to Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, 492012, Chhattisgarh, India

****Research Guide or Chairperson of research:** Dr S. K. Painkra

University: Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, 492012, India

Research project name or number: Research station study

Author Contributions: All authors equally contributed

Author statement: All authors read, reviewed, agreed and approved the final manuscript. Note-All authors agreed that- Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to publish / enrolment

Study area / Sample Collection: Northern Hilly Region of Chhattisgarh

Cultivar / Variety / Breed name: Rice

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Ethical approval: This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Ethical Committee Approval Number: Nil

References

- [1] Anonymous (2019) *Annual progress report, Deputy Director of Agriculture, Jashpur (C.G.)*, 6-7.
- [2] Trivedi G. (1963) *Ph.D. Thesis, Division of Agricultural Extension, IARI, New Delhi*.
- [3] Vijayraghvan K. (1976) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 641003, Tamil Nadu, India*
- [4] Arun M. and Balamakatti (1993) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, University of Agriculture Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka 580005, India*.
- [5] Nagdev B. and Venkataramaih P. (2007) *The Andhra Agriculture Journal*, 54 (3 and 4), 240-42.
- [6] Jadhav Y.V. (2008) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, Dr Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra 415712, India*
- [7] Salunkhe V. P. (2009) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, Dr Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra 415712, India*
- [8] Patil N. (2005) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, University of Agriculture Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka 580005, India*.
- [9] More S.V. (2000) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, Dr Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra 415712, India*
- [10] Mandal B. K. and De D. (2010) *Journal of Communication Studies*, 29 (3), 120-26.
- [11] Prasad N., Verma S.K., Singh K.M., Singh L.B. and Sahu R.P. (2010) *Journal of Communication Studies*, 29 (3), 03-10.
- [12] Prabha S. (1988) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand 263153, India*.
- [13] Anonymous (1995) *Proceeding of state level workshop on KVKs of Uttar Pradesh, ICAR, New Delhi*.
- [14] Raut S.C. and Sale D.C. (1995) *Tribal research bulletin*, 14 (2), 13-16.
- [15] Wadekar R.P., Mehta P.G., Mardane R.G. and Dhenge S.A. (2016) *Advances in Life Sciences*, 5 (18), 7306-09.
- [16] Sunilkumar G.M. (2004) *M.Sc. Agriculture Thesis, University of Agriculture Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka 580005, India*.
- [17] Gill M.S., Singh J.P. and Gangwar K.S. (2009) *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 52 (2), 128-39.
- [18] Kardak V.N., Kashid N.V., Kamble M.S. and Kardak S.N. (2004) *Annals of Agricultural Research*, 25 (2), 292-96.
- [19] Sandhu A.S. and Lal D. (1973) *Kurukshetra*, July, 7.
- [20] Bordolai R.M., Makhija M.K. and Laharia S.N. (2004) *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 30(1), 18-22.
- [21] Lal Banarasi (2006) *PhD Thesis, Department of Extension Education, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, BHU, Varanasi (U.P.)*.