

An analytical study of personal, economical, communicational and psychological characteristics of grape growers

JYOTI M DESHMUKH and SB BHANAGE

Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture

Latur 412512 Maharashtra, India

Email for correspondence: jv_mande@rediffmail.com

© *Society for Advancement of Human and Nature* 2017

Received: 18.1.2017/Accepted: 15.3.2017

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in purposively selected Nasik district having highest area under grape cultivation in Maharashtra state. Total 200 respondents were selected from four Tehsils and 20 villages on the basis of maximum area under grape cultivation. The results of the study indicated that majority of the respondents were of middle age (40 to 48 years), educated up to secondary school having low (9 to 16 years) experience in grape cultivation, too small area under grape cultivation, very low (2.5 to 29.5 tonnes) production of grapes, very low annual income (up to Rs 20.00 lakhs), small landholding, very low participation in training programmes, medium exposure to mass media, very high scientific orientation, medium marketing orientation, high risk orientation, very high economic motivation and high self-confidence.

Keywords: Personal; economical; communicational; psychological; characteristics

INTRODUCTION

Horticultural crops play a unique role in India's economy by improving the income of the rural people. Cultivation of these crops is labour-intensive and as such these generate lot of employment opportunities for the rural population. India's area under horticultural crops has touched 2.1 Mha. Grape cultivation is one of the most remunerative farming enterprises in India. Presently the world production of grapes is 65486235 MT out of which India accounts for 1198399 MT making a share of 1.83 per cent of the world production and 3.00 per cent of the total fruit production in the country (Anon 2008). Area under the fruit has been increased by 50.00 per cent and its production by 7.00 per cent in the country in the last decade (1994-2004) due to its economic importance. In India there are six major grape producing states viz Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Haryana having different districts which are known as major grape pockets.

Maharashtra is the largest grape producing state in the country. Area under grapes in Maharashtra is 86 thousand hectares and annual production is around

774 thousand tonnes (<http://agriexchange.apeda.gov.in/Market%20Profile/one/GRAPES.aspx>). Therefore the present investigation on management efficiency of grape growers in Nasik district of Maharashtra was undertaken with the objective to know the profile of grape growers.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Nasik district of Maharashtra state. A purposive and proportionate random sampling technique was used for the study. Nasik was purposively selected having highest area under grape cultivation. Out of fifteen Tehsils in the district four having maximum area under grape cultivation were considered for the study. Five villages from each Tehsil were purposively selected on the basis of maximum area under grape cultivation. In total twenty villages were selected. The list of the respondents was obtained from each selected village with the help of village record, Grape Growers' Association and Department of Agriculture. By following proportionate random sampling method 200 grape growers were selected for the investigation.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

In the present study independent variables studied were personal, economical, communicational and psychological characteristics of grape growers. Arbitrary method of categorization was used to categorize the respondents except in landholding. For landholding standard categories suggested by government were used.

Personal characteristics (Table 1): Data indicate that majority (58%) of the respondents were of middle age (36-55 years) followed by young and old as also observed by Birajdar (2012). Majority (40.50%) had secondary level of education followed by 27.00 and

Table 1. Personal characteristics of grape growers

Parameter	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)		
Young (up to 35)	70	35.00
Middle (36 to 55)	116	58.00
Old (>55)	14	07.00
Education		
Illiterate	3	01.50
Pre-primary school (I to IV standard)	4	02.00
Primary school (V to VII standard)	9	04.50
Secondary (VIII to X standard)	81	40.50
Higher secondary (XI to XII standard)	54	27.00
Graduation and above	49	24.50
Experience in grape cultivation (years)		
Very low (up to 8)	48	24.00
Low (9 to 16)	79	39.50
Medium (17 to 24)	51	25.50
High (25 to 32)	20	10.00
Very high (>32)	02	01.00

24.50 per cent having higher secondary and graduation and above level. Only 1.50 per cent respondents were illiterate. Similar observations were made by Parmar (2008). Maximum number (39.50%) of the respondents had low experience in grape cultivation.

Economical characteristics (Table 2): Majority (80.00%) of the respondents had too small size of land under grape cultivation ie up to 2.5 hectares only; majority (60.00%) had been getting very low production ranging from 2.5 to 29.5 tonnes/ha followed by 22.50 per cent with low production (29.6 to 59.0 tonnes); majority (73.00%) had very low (up to Rs 20.01 lakhs) of annual income from grape cultivation. In majority of the cases (61.00%) the grape cultivation was

Table 2. Economical characteristics of grape growers

Parameter	Frequency	Percentage
Area under grape cultivation (ha)		
Too small (up to 2.5)	160	80.00
Small (2.5 to 5.0)	23	11.50
Medium (5.1 to 7.5)	12	06.00
Large (7.6 to 10.0)	03	01.50
Very Large (>10.0)	02	01.00
Production of grapes (tonnes)		
Very low (up to 29.5)	120	60.00
Low (29.6 to 59.0)	45	22.50
Medium (59.1 to 88.5)	32	16.00
High (88.6 to 118.0)	02	01.00
Very high (>118.0)	01	00.50
Annual income from grapes (lakh rupees)		
Very low (up to 20.00)	147	73.50
Low (20.01 to 40.00)	33	16.50
Medium (40.01 to 60.00)	16	08.00
High (60.01 to 80.00)	03	01.50
Very high (>80.00)	01	00.50
Land holding (ha)		
Small farmers (up to 2.00)	122	61.00
Semi-medium farmers (2.01 to 4.00)	45	22.50
Medium farmers (4.01 to 10.00)	26	13.00
Big farmers (>10)	07	03.50

preferred by farmers with small landholding followed by those with semi-medium (22.50%) landholding. The results are supported by the work of Khot (2011).

Communicational characteristics (Table 3): Majority (73.00%) of the respondents had attended only up to 22 trainings and were under very low category followed by 21.50 per cent under low (23 to 44 trainings) category. Nearly half (49.00%) of the

Table 3. Communicational characteristics of grape growers

Parameter	Frequency	Percentage
Participation in training programmes (#)		
Very low (up to 22)	146	73.00
Low (23 to 44)	43	21.50
Medium (45 to 66)	07	03.50
High (67 to 88)	03	01.50
Very high (>88)	01	00.50
Mass media exposure (score)		
Very low (up to 4)	03	01.50
Low (5 to 9)	22	11.00
Medium (10 to 13)	98	49.00
High (14 to 18)	56	28.00
Very high (>18)	21	10.50

respondents had medium level of mass media exposure followed by 28.00 per cent with high level. The results of the study are in accordance with the work of Durgga (2009).

Psychological characteristics (Table 4): Majority of the respondents (73%) were having very high scientific orientation towards grape cultivation followed by 17.50 per cent with high orientation. But wrt marketing majority (41%) had medium level of orientation. The respondents had mainly high (41.50%) level of risk orientation closely followed by medium level (34.00%). Majority (46.50%) of the respondents had very high level of economic motivation followed by 21.50 and 20.50 per cent having high and medium

levels. The data reveal that half (50.50%) of the respondents had high self-confidence followed by 29.00 and 20.50 per cent with medium and low level respectively. These results are in line with those of Patel (2006).

CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that the majority of the respondents were of middle age (36 to 55 years), studied up to secondary school and had low (9 to 16 years) experience in grape cultivation. They had too small area under grape cultivation, very low (from 2.5 to 29.5 tonnes) production of grapes and very low annual income from grapes (up to Rs. 20.00 lakhs), small landholding, very low participation in training programmes, medium exposure to mass media, very high scientific orientation, medium marketing orientation, high risk orientation, very high economic motivation and high self-confidence.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous 2008. Grape profile. ICAR-National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
- Birajdar VM 2012. A study on management efficiency of cut flower growers. PhD (Agric) thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka, India.
- Durgga RV 2009. Crisis management practices adopted in dairy farming by the farmers of Anand district of Gujarat. MSc (Agric) thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India.
- <http://agriexchange.apeda.gov.in/Market%20Profile/one/GRAPES.aspx>
- Khot AV 2011. Extent of economic gain through drip irrigation system by grape growers. MSc (Agric) thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India.
- Parmar SK 2008. Discriminate functional analysis of adoption dynamics in relation to drip irrigation system in middle Gujarat. PhD (Agric) thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India.
- Patel SR 2006. A study on managerial efficiency of aonla growers of Anand and Kheda districts of Gujarat state. PhD (Agric) thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India.

Table 4. Psychological characteristics of grape growers

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Scientific orientation (score)		
Very low (up to 7)	05	02.50
Low (8 to 10)	06	03.00
Medium (11 to 13)	08	04.00
High (14 to 16)	35	17.50
Very high (>16)	146	73.00
Marketing orientation (score)		
Very low (up to 7)	15	07.50
Low (8 to 10)	29	14.50
Medium (11 to 13)	82	41.00
High (14 to 16)	38	19.00
Very high (>16)	36	18.00
Risk orientation (score)		
Very low (up to 7)	09	04.50
Low (8 to 10)	21	10.50
Medium (11 to 13)	68	34.00
High (14 to 16)	83	41.50
Very high (>16)	19	09.50
Economic motivation (score)		
Very low (up to 7)	05	02.50
Low (8 to 10)	18	09.00
Medium (11 to 13)	41	20.50
High (14 to 16)	43	21.50
Very high (>16)	93	46.50
Self confidence (score)		
Low (up to 3)	41	20.50
Medium (4 to 6)	58	29.00
High (>6)	101	50.50