

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 8; Issue 5; May 2025; Page No. 803-807

Received: 26-02-2025
Accepted: 29-03-2025

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Study the socio-economic profile and knowledge level of agricultural techniques of Ballia district, Uttar Pradesh

Nitesh Kumar and Dheerendra kumar

Department of Agriculture Extension Education & Communication, Career Point University, Kota, Rajasthan, India

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2025.v8.i5k.1983>

Corresponding Author: Nitesh Kumar

Abstract

The study was conducted in Bansdih, Chilkahar, Hanumanganj, Pandah and Rasra blocks of Ballia district Uttar Pradesh selected purposely. A total number of 500 respondents were selected through random sampling. The structured schedule was developed keeping in view the objectives and variables under study. The respondents were contacted personally for data collection. The percentage, mean, standard deviation and correlation were used for calculation and drawing the inferences. Results reveals that majority of respondents were found in middle age category (48.75%), secondary school (16.25%), other backward caste (66.25%), nuclear families (41.25%), small size of family (26.25%), having marginal size of land holding (37.50%), annual income up to Rs. 100000 (45.00%), Knowledge (66.25%), Farm materials (100%), Social Participation (30.0%), Canal and electric tube well (51.25%), Middle dairy (22.50%) have medium economic motivation (60.67%), medium degree of scientific orientation (55.33%), kisan sahayak had ranked (I), Gram Pradhan rank (II), in mass media TV had rank (I) respectively for the majority of farmers.

Keywords: Socio-economic status, mass media, farmers, random sampling

Introduction

India lives in its "villages"-Mahatma Gandhi. Literally and from the social, economic and political perspective the statement is valid even today. Around 65% of the State's population is living in rural area. People in rural areas should have the same quality of life as is enjoyed by people living in sub urban and urban areas (Ramakrishna, H. 2013) [7]. Further there are cascading effects of poverty, employment, poor and inadequate infrastructure in rural areas on urban centers causing slums and consequential social and economic tensions manifesting in economic deprivation and urban poverty (Hossain, M. S., 2006; Roy, M., *et al.*, 2011; Patel, B., & Shah, R., 2018) [4, 8, 6]. Hence Rural Development which is concerned with growth and social justice, improvement in the living standard of the rural people by providing adequate and quality social services and minimum basic needs becomes essential (Ramakrishna, H. 2013) [7]. The strategy of rural development mainly focuses on poverty alleviation, better livelihood opportunities, provision of basic amenities and infrastructure facilities through innovative programmes of wage and self-employment (Gangopadhyay, D., Mukhopadhyay, A. K., & Singh, P., 2008) [3]. The above goals will be achieved by various programme support being implemented creating partnership with communities, non-governmental organizations, community based organizations, institutions (Seixas, C. S., & Berkes, F., 2009) [10] while the Department of Rural Development will provide logistic support both on technical and administrative side for programme implementation. Other aspects that will ultimately lead to transformation of rural life are also being

emphasized simultaneously (Bhaskar, I., & Geethakutty, P. S., 2001) [1].

Rural development is need of the hour for a country like India, which is on the threshold of being a big world power with the capacity to influencing the course of events on our planet (Sachs, J., 2011) [9]. However, this is a dream which we can realize only when we are a country with no internal dissensions and strife, a country with a fair economic system and cohesive social order. In fact the essence of development lies not in a regimented system where none dares to disagree but in all - inclusive dispensation in which everyone plays an equal role (Mathur, P., 2006) [5]. The quest for rural development must lead us in the direction of empowering those sections of society who are in the need of being empowered (Cavaye, J., 2001) [2]. This is the real meaning of democracy and this is the area in which media can and media must play an important role.

Methods and Materials

A random survey of socio-economic status in five major block viz., Bansdih, Chilkahar, Hanumanganj, Pandah and Rasra block of Varanasi Uttar Pradesh in which selected five village each block and 25 responded from each village were randomly selected to constitute the total sample size of 500 respondents for survey of socio-economic and technical gap knowledge of responded. A total of 25 villages covering 5 block in Ballia districts were surveyed. Primary data and information on various aspects of agriculture and socioeconomic condition of selected farmers in Ballia district have been obtained through a pre-tested questionnaire through survey method. General observation

was conducted with the villagers, key persons of the villages, panchayat pradhans and NGO functionaries their helping hand for collection of data and information the total sample size of collection of data and information was 500 from Ballia district. The baseline survey was conducted during the year 2023-24.

Result and Discussion

Land utilization pattern of Ballia District has been provided in Table 1. The total area was 316800 ha in Ballia District. The Net area sown and grass cropped area was 215,498 ha and 376,300 ha respectively of total area. The agricultural Rainfed area was 0.0 ha of total area. The area under non-agricultural use and permanent pastures it was only 22419 ha and 0.0 ha respectively of total area. The area under Cultivable wasteland and Net irrigated area and uncultivable land was 1248 ha and 252200 ha respectively of total area. Cropping intensity of Varanasi district has been 160.6% percent. According to that results study to Singh, A., et. al. (2023).

Table 1: Land utilization pattern of Ballia Varanasi (2018-19)

S. No.	Particulars	Area (ha)
1	Total area	316800
2	Net area sown	215,498
3	Gross cropped area	376,300
4	Rainfed area	0
5	Cropping intensity %	160.6%
6	Land under non-agricultural use	22419
7	Permanent pastures	-
8	Cultivable waste land	1248
9	Net irrigated area	252200
10	Total fodder crop area	3652

Primary data

Age

The following table present the age distribution of the head of the farm families as obtained from the sample under study. The above Table. 2 shows that majority of respondents (48.75 per cent) belong to the middle age group (36 to 51 years) followed by 40.00 per cent respondents with the age group (up to 35 years), whereas 11.25 per cent respondent belongs to the age group of old age group (above 51 years). It is thus clear from the table that maximum respondents i.e. 48.75 percent belong to the age group between (36 to 51 years). The old age groups of above 51 years are mostly family of head therefore, they work less but they supervise, guide and take decision for developmental activities.

Education

The following table presents the educational status of the respondents. The Table 2 shows that majority (33.75 percent) of respondents have educational level up to high school followed by 18.75 percent respondents of middle school, 16.25 percent Secondary level, 5.0 percent graduate, 7.5 percent illiterate, however only 3.75 percent respondents were PG & Above. Thus table concludes that 92.50 percent respondents were educated while only 7.5 percent were illiterate.

Caste

Caste is another important factor which pervades all fields

of social action in the rural societies. One's position in the caste hierarchy in a large measure, determines his behavior in society. Caste categories are divided into three i.e. General, Backward and Schedule caste. The above table indicates that maximum number of respondents belong to backward caste constituting 66.25 per cent, while 20 per cent and 13.75 per cent respondents belong to upper cast and schedule caste group respectively. It is clear from the table that the majority of the respondents belong to backward caste and schedule tribe caste is zero per cent.

Land holding

Land is a major factor which helps in fixing the socio-economic status of an individual. Findings are given in the Table 2 shows that as regards land ownership, majority (47.5 percent) of respondents have medium size of land holding i.e. 2-4 ha followed by marginal and small (37.5 percent) whereas, 15 percent respondents belong to large category of land holding. It is clear from the table land holding is decreasing with the increasing number of farm families.

Family type

The following table 2 shows the structure of the farming families as obtained from the sample under study. The data of above table shows that majority of respondent 58.75 percent have joint family structures, while remaining 41.25 percent respondent have nuclear family structure. Thus study indicates that system of Joint family in rural society appears to be stable and dominant over nuclear family.

Family size

The above table 2 indicates that majority (53.75 percent) respondents belonged to middle family size, while 26.25 percent and 20 percent respondent belong to small and large family size respectively. It is clear from table that majority of respondent belong to middle family size which indicates joint family concept in the rural society.

House type

House types are categorized into three groups viz. kachcha, mixed and pukka. Observations are given in the Table 2 that majority (88.75 percent) of respondents have pukka house, 8.75 percent of respondent have mixed house and 2.5 percent respondent have kachcha house. It is clear from the above discussion that majority of respondents 88.75 percent have their pukka house.

Live stock

It is clear from above Table 2 the majority (56.25 percent) of respondent have small dairy, while 22.5 percent respondent have middle dairy and 11.25 and 10 percent respondent have large dairy and have not any animal respectively.

Irrigation facility

As regards irrigation facility in the above Table 2 majority of the respondents 55 percent have electric tube well, 47.5, 32.5 percent have canal and diesel tube well, and 27.5 percent have a Govt. tube well used as a irrigation facility.

Material Possessions

The respondents are grouped on the basis of material they

possess. The distribution of the respondents are presented in the table 2 reveals that 97.5 percent respondent have TV, 95 percent have cycle, 91.25 percent have motor cycle, 82.5 percent have radio, 40 percent have refrigerator, 20 percent have sofa, 10 percent have washing machine and 6.25 percent have car.

Farm machinery and equipment

As regards farm machinery and equipment in the Table 2. majority of the respondents (57.5%) have sprayer, 55 percent have electric motor, 47.5 percent have bullock cart and land leveller, 45 percent have chaff cutter, 38.75 percent have tractors and trolley, 33.75 percent have thresher, 32.5 percent have diesel pumping set, 20 percent have cultivator, 15 percent have harrow and 10 percent have winnower. The maximum respondents possess as medium level of farm machinery and equipment for their need.

Social Participation

It clear from the above Table 2 the majority of respondent that 56.25 percent have no any social participation followed by 30 percent respondent member of one organization, while 7.5 and 6.25 percent respondent were member of more than one organization and office bearer respectively.

Income

Income of the respondents are categorized in to three groups i.e. up to 50,000, 50,001 to 1,00,000 and above 1,00,000. The table 4.13 shows that of the large no. respondents i.e. 45 percent belong to the income group of 50,001 to 1,00,000 per annum, while 35 percent respondent belong to Income

group of above 1,00,000/- per annum followed by 20 percent respondent belong to the Income group of Rs up to 50,000/-per annum Income group. It is also clear from the table that the majority of respondents belong to Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000 per annum income group.

Socio- economic status

It was measured with the help of socio-economic status scale developed by as per schedule. Respondents were categorized in three categories viz. high, medium and low. The distribution of farmers in three categories are given in Table 2 that majority (43.75 percent) of respondents belonged to medium socio- economic status followed by 41.25 percent belong to high socio-economic status, while 15 percent respondent possess low score category of socio-economic status.

Level of knowledge

Knowledge of the respondent regarding various development issue i.e. rural development, agricultural development and development of women and child in rural areas. Six programmes of rural development, seven programmes of agricultural development and six programmes of women and child development were taken in to account to know their knowledge level. The findings are presented in the Table 2 indicates that majority (66.25 percent) had fair knowledge about rural development followed by 23.75 percent respondents have good knowledge, while 10 percent respondents had poor knowledge regarding various rural development programmes.

Table 2: Data of Socio-economic status

Variable	Responds	
	F	%
1. Age (in years)		
Young age (Up to 35)	200	40.00
Middle age (36 to 51)	243.75	48.75
Old age (Above 51 years)	56.25	11.25
2. Level of Education		
High School	168.75	33.75
Middle School	93.75	18.75
Secondary	81.25	16.25
Primary School	68.75	13.75
Illiterate	37.5	7.50
Graduation	31.25	6.25
PG and Above	18.75	3.75
3. Category		
General caste	100	20.00
Backward caste	331.25	66.25
Schedule caste	68.75	13.75
Schedule tribe	0	0
EWS	0	0
4. Land holding		
Marginal and Small (up to 2 ha)	187.5	37.50
Medium (2-4 ha)	237.5	47.50
Large (above 4 ha)	75	15.00
5. Type of family		
Joint	293.75	58.75
Nuclear	206.25	41.25
6. Size of family		
Small (up to 4 members)	131.25	26.25
Middle (5- 6 members)	268.75	53.75

Large (above 6 members)	100	20.00
7. House type		
Kachcha	12.5	2.50
Mix	43.75	8.75
Pukka House	443.75	88.75
8. Live stock		
Nil	50	10.00
Small dairy (below 4 animals)	281.25	56.25
Middle dairy (4 to 6 animals)	112.5	22.50
Large dairy (above 6 animals)	56.25	11.25
9. Irrigation Facility		
Govt. tube well	137.5	27.50
Canal	237.5	47.50
Electric tube well	275	55.00
Diesel tube well	162.5	32.50
10. Non-farm material		
Radio	412.5	82.50
T.V	487.5	97.50
Cycle	475	95.00
Motor cycle	456.25	91.25
Car	31.25	6.250
Refrigerator	200	40.00
Sofa	100	20.00
Washing machine	50	10.00
11. Farm material		
Bullock cart	50	10.00
Tractor	193.75	38.75
Trolley	193.75	38.75
Cultivator	100	20.00
Harrow	75	15.00
Land leveler	237.5	47.50
Thresher	168.75	33.75
Winnower	50	10.00
Chaff cutter	225	45.00
Sprayer	287.5	57.50
Pumping set (electric)	275	55.00
Pumping set (diesel)	162.5	32.50
12. Social Participation		
No any Social Participation	281.25	56.25
Member of one organization	150	30.00
Member of more than one organization	37.5	7.50
Office bearer	31.25	6.25
13. Annual income (in Rs.)		
Up to 50,000	100	20.00
50,001-1,00,000	225	45.00
Above 1,00,000	175	35.00
14. Categories		
Low (score up to 17)	75	15.00
Medium (18-34)	218.75	43.75
High (above 35)	206.25	41.25
15. Knowledge		
Poor (0-6)	40	10.00
Fair (7-12)	265	66.25
Good (13 and above)	95	23.75

F= frequency, % = percent

Conclusion

The study's primary focus is farmers' socioeconomic status. The study found that most farmers were middle-aged, literate, and had both formal and informal education. Most farmers belonged to other castes that were considered backward. It was discovered that most nuclear family arrangements have fewer than five family members. Small-scale farmers made up the majority of replies. We found

farmers earning less than Rs. 100,000. Farm power was dominated by electric motors and pump sets in addition to farm implements. The majority of people own a television, DTH, internet, and cell phone. The majority of farmers took part in one group. For the majority of respondents, family members served as informal sources of information, while Kissan Sahayak and Gram Pradhan served as formal sources.

References

1. Bhaskar I, Geethakutty PS. Role of non-governmental organizations in rural development: A case study. *J Trop Agric*. 2001;39(1):52-4.
2. Cavaye J. Rural community development—New challenges and enduring dilemmas. *J Reg Anal Policy*. 2001;31(2).
3. Gangopadhyay D, Mukhopadhyay AK, Singh P. Rural development: A strategy for poverty alleviation in India. *India Sci Technol (Online)*. 2008.
4. Hossain MS. Urban poverty and adaptations of the poor to urban life in Dhaka City, Bangladesh [dissertation]. Sydney (AU): UNSW Sydney; 2006.
5. Mathur P. Media, technology and rural development. *Indian Media Stud J*. 2006;1(1):53-63.
6. Patel B, Shah R. Study of improving rural infrastructure to transform village into Smart Village—A case study of Kolavada Village, Dist-Gandhinagar. *Int J Adv Res Eng Sci Technol*. 2018;5(3):141-7.
7. Ramakrishna H. The emerging role of NGOs in rural development of India: An assessment. *Int J Soc Sci Interdiscip Res*. 2013;2(4):43-51.
8. Roy M, Guy S, Hulme D, Jahan F. Poverty and climate change in urban Bangladesh (CLIMURB): An analytical framework. *Brooks World Poverty Inst Work Pap*. 2011;(148).
9. Sachs J. The end of poverty: How we can make it happen in our lifetime. London: Penguin UK; 2011.
10. Seixas CS, Berkes F. Community-based enterprises: The significance of partnerships and institutional linkages. *Int J Commons*. 2009;4(1).