# Socioeconomic characteristics and varietal preferences of groundnut growers in Kolhapur district of Maharashtra

## JM BORSE, M MISHA MADHAVAN\* and UD JAGDALE

Extension Education Section, College of Agriculture Kolhapur 416001 Maharashtra, India \*Dairy Extension Division, National Dairy Research Institute Karnal 132001 Haryana, India

Email for correspondence: mishamadhavanmsy4@gmail.com

© Society for Advancement of Human and Nature 2017

## **ABSTRACT**

The efforts were made to study the selected personal and socioeconomic characteristics of the groundnut growers and their preferences for different varieties in Kolhapur district of Maharashtra. Karveer Hatkanangale and Gadhinglaj Tehsils were selected for the study on the basis of maximum area under groundnut. Proportionate random sampling procedure was adopted and thus 120 respondents were selected from 12 villages. The study noticed that majority of the respondents were from middle age group of 32 to 59 years (60.00%) and secondary level of education (28.34%); 65.00 per cent respondents had medium size of family (4 to 7 members), medium usage of sources of information (60.84%), small size of landholding (44.16%), medium farming experience (55.83%) and medium annual income (67.50%). Majority of the respondents had medium cropping intensity (65.00%), always used Gramsevak as formal personal source of information (89.16%) and used TV among the mass media sources of information (72.50%). It was also found that majority of the farmers followed groundnut – wheat – groundnut and groundnut – sorghum – groundnut cropping patterns in their fields. Phule Pragati variety of groundnut was noticed as highly preferred for oilcake by the growers.

**Keywords:** Groundnut; varietal preferences; growers; socioeconomic characteristics

# **INTRODUCTION**

Groundnut or peanut (Arachis hypogaea Linn) is the second largest source of vegetable oil in the world. Groundnut is a major oilseed crop in India accounting for 45.00 per cent of oilseed area and 55.00 per cent of oilseed production. The area under groundnut in India during the year 2013-14 was 43.20 lakh ha and production was about 47.15 lakh MT (Anon 2013a). In Maharashtra under Kharif groundnut the area was 01.96 lakh ha in 2013-14, production was 02.29 lakh MT and productivity was 1168 kg/ha (Anon 2014). In Kolhapur district area under groundnut was about 57820 ha and productivity was about 1201 kg/ha in Kharif and 2049 kg/ha in summer during the year 2012-13 (Anon 2013b). The selection of varieties depends on environmental factors such as soil, climate, humidity, temperature etc as well as on purpose for which farmer selects the variety such as for edible purpose, for

livestock, for oil extraction, for selling purpose etc. In this background this study was undertaken to know the personal and socioeconomic characteristics and varietal preferences of the groundnut growers in Kolhapur district of Maharashtra.

Received: 23.2.2016/Accepted: 13.6.2016

## METHODOLOGY

The present study was undertaken in Kolhapur district of Maharashtra state; three Tehsils were taken for study namely Karveer, Hatkanangle and Gadhinglaj on the basis of highest area under groundnut crop. Proportionate random sampling procedure was adopted and thus 120 respondents were selected from 12 villages. A pre-tested structured interview schedule was used to collect the information through personal interview method. The efforts were made to know the socioeconomic characteristics and opinion of the respondents regarding the varieties viz Phule Pragati,

Phule Varna, Phule Unnati, Phule Unap, Western T-20, SB-11, TAG-26, TMV-10 and Dhanlaxmi about their suitability for different purposes. Socioeconomic variables included in the study were selected on the basis of an extensive review of literature, discussion with the experts and preliminary study conducted in the area. Only those variables which were considered to be having some relevance to the utilization of improved farm practices were selected for the study.

#### RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The results of the study obtained regarding the various socioeconomic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that a majority (60.00%) of the respondents belonged to middle age group (32 to 59 years). The observation is supported by the work of Patil (2007). Only 28.34 per cent of the respondents were secondary school educated; majority (65.00%) had medium size of family (4 to 7 members); 60.84 per cent used medium sources of information for the adoption purpose as observed by Jadhav (2013). Data show that 44.16 per cent of the respondents had small size of landholding; 55.83 per cent had medium experience of farming (9-29 years); majority (67.50%) had medium annual income (Rs 120001 to 240000) and the findigns are in line with the findings of Patil (2007). Their maximum annual income was Rs 400000 and minimum was 40000. Majority (65.00%) of them had medium level of cropping intensity.

Table 1. Socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents (n=120)

Parameter	Frequency	Mean	Standard deviation
Age (years)		45.29	14.09
Young (up to 31)	23 (19.17)		
Middle age (32 to 59)	72 (60.00)		
Old age (60 and above)	25 (20.83)		
Education		NA	NA
Illiterate (no formal education)	05 (4.16)		
Primary (I to VII class)	24 (20.00)		
Secondary (VIII to X class)	34 (28.34)		
Higher secondary (XI to XII class)	33 (27.50)		
Graduation and above (degree and post-graduation)	24 (20.00)		
Size of family (number members)	,	5.84	2.60
Small (up to 3)	18 (15.00)		
Medium (4 to 7)	78 (65.00)		
Large (8 and above)	24 (20.00)		
Usage of sources of information (score)	,	25.50	3.55
Low (up to 22)	23 (19.16)		
Medium (23 to 28)	73 (60.84)		
High (29 and above)	24 (20.00)		
Size of land holding (ha)	,	NA	NA
Marginal (up to 1.00)	41 (34.16)		
Small (1.01 to 2.00)	53 (44.17)		
Semi-medium (2.01 to 4.00)	24 (20.00)		
Medium (4.01 to 10.00)	2 (1.67)		
Large (10.01 and above)	-		
Farming experience (tenure in farming) (years)		19.03	10.96
Less (up to 8)	28 (23.33)		
Medium (9 to 29)	67 (55.83)		
High (30 and above)	25 (20.84)		
Annual income (Rs)	,	NA	NA
Low (up to 120000)	19 (15.84)		
Medium (120001 to Rs 240000)	81 (67.50)		
High (>240000)	20 (16.66)		
Cropping intensity (%)	. ()	184.46	47.77
Low (<137.00)	22 (18.34)		
Medium (138.00 to 232.00)	78 (65.00)		
High (233.00 and above)	20 (16.66)		

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage values

# Utilization of various sources of information

Table 2 reveals that majority (89.16%) of the respondents had always used Gramsevak as formal personal source of information; 62.50 per cent used representatives of Krishi Seva Kendra as their informal personal source of information. However

Table 2. Classification of the respondents according to the frequency and types of sources of information used by them (n=120)

Information source		rce	
	Always	Sometimes	Never
Formal personal source			
Gramsevak	107 (89.16)	10 (08.34)	03 (02.50)
Agricultural Assistant (Department of Agriculture)	16 (13.34)	101 (84.16)	03 (02.50)
Circle Agricultural Officer	15 (12.50)	41 (34.16)	64 (53.34)
Agricultural university scientists	30 (25.00)	50 (41.66)	40 (33.34)
SMSs (KVK)	17 (14.16)	55 (45.84)	48 (40.00)
Informal personal source			
Representatives of Krishi Seva Kendra	75 (62.50)	39 (32.50)	06 (05.00)
Progressive farmers	30 (25.00)	81 (67.50)	09 (07.50)
Relatives/neighbours	35 (29.17)	29 (24.16)	56 (46.67)
Local leaders	44 (36.66)	47 (39.17)	29 (24.17)
Group sources			
Crop demonstration	54 (45.00)	63 (52.50)	03 (02.50)
Agricultural exhibition	37 (30.84)	69 (57.50)	14 (11.66)
Farmers' tour	29 (24.16)	55 (45.83)	36 (30.00)
Group discussion	44 (36.66)	50 (41.67)	26 (21.67)
Shetkari Melawa	26 (21.66)	61 (50.84)	33 (27.50)
Participation in training programmes	27 (22.50)	39 (32.50)	54 (45.00)
Mass media			
Radio	38 (31.66)	52 (43.34)	30 (25.00)
TV	87 (72.50)	29 (24.16)	04 (3.34)
Mobile phone	52 (43.34)	40 (33.33)	28 (23.33)
Internet	24 (20.00)	32 (26.66)	64 (53.34)
Social networking (Whatsapp, Facebook etc)	23(19.16)	31 (25.84)	66 (55.00)
Print media			
Magazines	64 (53.34)	53 (44.16)	03 (02.50)
Newspapers	45 (37.50)	58 (48.34)	17 (14.16)
Krishi Darshini	16 (13.33)	73 (60.83)	31 (25.84)
Other extension literature	21 (17.50)	29 (24.16)	70 (58.34)

Table 3. Classification of the respondents according to their cropping pattern (n= 120)

Crop	Number of respondents	Percentage	Total area under crop (ha)	Average area (ha)	Total yield (q)	Average productivity (q/ha)
Kharif						
Groundnut	120	100.00	64.90	0.54	1203.21	18.53
Soybean	75	62.50	23.40	0.31	481.8	20.58
Rice	72	60.00	21.20	0.29	809.5	38.18
Sunflower	19	15.83	04.40	0.23	86.05	19.56
Green gram	15	12.50	02.90	0.19	22.40	7.72
Black gram	11	09.16	02.40	0.21	28.70	11.96
Rabi						
Wheat	73	60.83	20.95	0.28	743.55	35.49
Sorghum	71	59.16	26.10	0.36	728.70	27.92
Maize	51	42.50	17.40	0.34	637.50	36.64
Gram	47	39.16	14.50	0.30	413.00	28.48
Summer						
Groundnut	53	44.16	20.30	0.38	546.20	26.91
Brinjal	15	12.50	04.40	0.29	1483.00	337.05
Tomato	10	08.33	02.60	0.26	639.0	245.76
Cabbage	02	01.66	00.40	0.20	104.0	260.00
Annual						
Sugarcane	116	96.66	98.20	0.84	92838	945.40
Banana	06	05.00	03.30	0.55	1496.0	453.33

Table 4. Classification of respondents according to their opinion about varieties regarding use for different purposes (n= 120)

Type of preference	Variety								
	Phule Pragati	Phule Varna	Phule Unnati	Phule Unap	Western T-20	SB-11	TAG- 26	TMV- 10	Dhanlaxmi
General preference									
Oilcake	41 (34.16)	-	-	-	15 (12.50)	07 (05.84)	26 (21.66)	21 (17.50)	10 (08.34)
Roasted eating	15 (12.50)	-	-	-	36 (30.00)	32 (26.66)	-	07 (05.84)	30 (25.00)
Chatni	10 (08.34)	-	-	-	22 (18.33)	06 (05.00)	12 (10.00)	31 (25.83)	39 (32.50)
Chikki	25 (20.83)	-	-	-	11 (09.16)	-	04 (03.34)	34 (28.34)	46 (38.33)
Technical preference							,	,	
High production	46 (38.34)	05 (04.16)	-	-	12 (10.00)	06 (05.00)	37 (30.84)	08 (06.66)	06 (05.00)
Oil	28 (23.34)	-	07 (05.84)	-	-	-	30 (25.00)	32 (26.66)	23 (19.16)
Short duration	72 (60.00)	-	-	-	-	25 (20.83)	23 (19.16)	-	-
Kharif season	80 (66.66)	-	-	-	-	10 (08.34)	-	-	30 (25.00)
Summer season	-	-	-	-	44 (36.66)	09 (07.50)	34 (28.34)	12 (10.00)	21 (17.50)
Both seasons	-	-	08 (06.66)	06 (05.00)	-	19 (15.84)	09 (07.50)	-	78 (65.00)
Disease and pest resistance	65 (54.16)	-	-	04 (03.34)	-	09 (07.50)	33 (27.50)	09 (07.50)	-
Good market price	80 (66.66)	-	-	-	10 (08.34)	-	07 (05.84)	15 (12.50)	08 (06.66)
Seed availability	31 (25.84)	-	-	-	17 (14.16)	15 (12.50)	20 (16.66)	16 (13.34)	21 (17.50)

45.00 per cent of them had always used crop demonstration as a group source of information. Majority (72.50%) of the respondents used TV as mass media source of information and 53.34 per cent used magazines as printed media for their source of information.

# Cropping pattern used by the respondents

It was found that majority of the farmers followed groundnut – wheat – groundnut and groundnut – sorghum – groundnut cropping patterns in their fields. All farmers had been cultivating groundnut in Kharif season and 53 per cent in summer also. Sugarcane was also cultivated by a large majority as an annual crop (Table 3).

## Varietal preferences of groundnut growers

It was found that groundnut growers gave preference to Phule Pragati for oilcake (34.16%), high production (38.34%) and for being short duration variety

(60.00%), to Western T-20 for roasted eating purpose (30.00%), to Dhanlaxmi for Chatni (32.50) and Chikki making (38.33%) and to TMV-10 for oil making (26.66%) (Table 4).

Majority (66.66%) gave preference to Phule Pragati for Kharif season, 36.66 per cent preferred Western T-20 for summer season, 65.00 per cent preferred Dhanlaxmi for both seasons (Table 4). Of them 54.16 per cent preferred Phule Pragati for disease and pest resistance, 66.66 per cent for good market prices and 25.84 per cent for seed availability. Simtowe et al (2010) indicated that only 26.00 per cent of the sampled farmers grew at least one of the improved groundnut varieties.

### REFERENCES

Anonymous 2013a. Agricultural statistics at a glance. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.

- Anonymous 2013b. Economic survey of Maharashtra.

  Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning
  Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai,
  Maharashtra.
- Anonymous 2014. Economic survey of Maharashtra. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.
- Jadhav SR 2013. Knowledge and adoption of recommended package of practices in Rabi groundnut. MSc (Agric) thesis, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani, Maharashtra, India.
- Patil GR 2007. A study of knowledge and adoption of selected groundnut production technology by the farmers from Dhule district. MSc (Agric) thesis, Mahatama Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Maharashtra, India.
- Simtowe F, Asfaw S, Diagne A and Shiferaw BA 2010. Determinants of agricultural technology adoption: the case of improved groundnut varieties in Malawi. Contributed Paper, Joint 3<sup>rd</sup> African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) and 48<sup>th</sup> Agricultural Economics Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference, 19-23 September 2010, Cape Town, South Africa.