



**Research Paper**

# Socio-economic analysis of small and marginal farmers in Jaipur district of Rajasthan

■ Mohan Lal Jat, P.S. Shekhawat and Sonu Jain

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :

**Sonu Jain**

Department of Agricultural Economics, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur (Rajasthan) India  
Email: [sonujain.ageco@sknau.ac.in](mailto:sonujain.ageco@sknau.ac.in)

**ABSTRACT :** The study was conducted in Jaipur district of Rajasthan to know the socio-economic status of small and marginal farmers. A total of 60 farmers (30 farmers in each small and marginal category) were selected for the present investigation. The primary data relating to various socio-economic variables were collected from the sample farmers by personal interview method using semi-structured schedules and questionnaires for the purpose. Composite scales analysis like Udai Pareek revised scale-2019 and Modified BG Prasad scale-2019 were used to analyze the socio-economic status of small and marginal farmers, which have combinations of social and economic variables. The study revealed that, the socio-economic condition of small farmers was better than socio-economic condition of marginal farmers, according to composite scales analysis. On the basis of Udai Pareek revised scale, majority of marginal farmers (about 47.00%) belonged to lower middle class whereas, majority of small farmers (about 53.00%) belonged to middle class. Study further found that, in both categories of farmers, no farmer belonged to the lower and upper class. As per BG Prasad modified scale which is based on monthly income of household, majority of marginal farmers (50.00%) belonged to upper middle class while, majority of small farmers (60.00%) belonged to upper class. In both categories of sample farmers, no farmer belonged to lower and lower middle class.

**KEY WORDS :** Socio-economic, Udai Pareek revised scale, Modified BG Prasad scale, Farmers

**HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER :** Jat, Mohan Lal, Shekhawat, P.S. and Jain, Sonu (2020). Socio-economic analysis of small and marginal farmers in Jaipur district of Rajasthan. *Internat. Res. J. Agric. Eco. & Stat.*, **11** (2) : 170-175, DOI : 10.15740/HAS/IRJAES/11.2/170-175. Copyright@2020:Hind Agri-Horticultural Society.

**Paper History :**

Received : 11.06.2020;

Revised : 11.07.2020;

Accepted : 13.08.2020

## INTRODUCTION :

Agriculture continues to hold the place of pride in Indian economy since time immemorial. It is well known that agriculture in India is the major occupation supporting more than 50 per cent of the population for their livelihood and it contributed 15.4 per cent of gross domestic product to total GDP of the country (Economic Survey, 2017-18). Small and marginal farmers accounted for nearly 86.00 per cent of the total operational holdings in the

country, cultivating about 47.00 per cent of the total area (Agriculture census, 2015-16). Thus, these farmers are the numerically strong but economically weaker sections of the rural community. In India, an average size of operational holding of small and marginal farmers is about 1.40 hectare and 0.38 hectare, respectively (Agriculture census, 2015-16).

In Rajasthan state, the proportion of classified land holdings of marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and

large holdings to total land holdings was 40.12 per cent, 21.90 per cent, 18.50 per cent, 14.79 per cent and 4.69 per cent, respectively during the year 2015-16. The large land holdings have witnessed a significant decline because of an increase in number of mutations due to splitting of joint families. The average size of operational land holdings in the state was 2.73 hectare during 2015-16 as compared to 3.07 hectare in 2010-11, showing a decline of 11.07 per cent.

Small and marginal farmers are faced with the difficulties to operate the high risk of farming. The risks are related to weather uncertainties, uneven access to technologies and natural resources, unreliable input supplies, stressed infrastructure in power and irrigation and uncertain marketing arrangements which responsible for less bargaining power in input and output marketing of Indian farmers in present economic scenario. The increase in population, subdivision and fragmentation of land holdings due to breakdown of joint family system encouraging conversion of semi-medium and medium group of farmers into group of small and marginal farmers, which resulting an un-economic land holdings. In future, Indian agriculture will be dominated by marginal and small holdings, on which application of new agricultural technologies would become more difficult (Rao, 1989). However, opportunities are also widely open to marginal and small farmers in adoption of diversification and integrated farming systems such as fruits and vegetables cultivation, dairy, fishery, goat and sheep rearing etc.

Keeping this in view, the paper has been made with the study of socio-economic status of the small and marginal farmers.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS :

### Sampling unit:

The study was purposively confined to Jaipur district of Rajasthan during the year 2017-18. Jaipur district is divided in sixteen tehsils. Out of these, two tehsils, namely Jamwaramgarh and Shahpura were selected randomly. Two villages from each selected tehsil were selected randomly. In Jamwaramgarh tehsil, Dangarwara and Birasana villages were selected. The Khoraladkhani and Mamtorikalan villages were selected in Shahpura tehsil. Thus, total four villages were selected for detailed investigation. Fifteen (15) farmers from each selected village were selected. Out of these, the small and marginal farmers were selected at random in proportion

to their total number in each category of farmers. Thus, total 60 farmers (30 farmers in each small and marginal category) were selected for the present investigation.

### Nature and source of data:

The primary data relating to various socio-economic variables like-caste, occupation, education, land holding, social participation, houses, farm power, material possessions, family type and monthly income of the respondents were collected from the sample farmers by personal interview method using semi-structured schedules and questionnaires for the purpose.

### Analytical tools and techniques:

Composite scales analysis like Udai Pareek revised scale- 2019 and Modified BG Prasad scale-2019 were used to analyze the socio-economic status of small and marginal farmers, which have combinations of social and economic variables. These scales for the socio-economic status of farmers were categorized as upper class, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class and lower class.

## RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS :

The results are presented and discussed into the following two parts as follows:

### Socio-economic status of small and marginal farmers:

The socio-economic status refers to an individual's position within a hierarchical social structure. It consists of land holding, caste, education, occupation, family size, family type and types of houses, farm power and machinery, social participation as member of PACS (Gram seva sahkari samiti), milk producer co-operative society etc., member of Gram panchayat/ Panchayat samiti/ Zilla parisad, material possessions like mobile phone, television, refrigerator etc., livestock ownership and per capita monthly income of the farmers. The variables of socio-economic status of sample farmers of different size group farmers (small and marginal farmers) are given in Table 1.

Per cent of total number of sample farmers of respective category with respective variables

Table 1 shows that the average size of the land holding of marginal and small farmers in the study area was 0.82 and 1.56 ha, respectively. Among the categories

<b>Table 1 : Socio-economic status of the sample farmers</b>					
Sr. No.	Variables	Marginal farmers (n=30)		Small farmers (n=30)	
		Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Average land holding (ha.)	0.82	-	1.56	-
2.	<b>Caste</b>				
	SC	6	20.00	3	10.00
	ST	8	26.67	4	13.33
	OBC	12	40.00	15	50.00
	UR	4	13.33	8	20.00
3.	<b>Education</b>				
	Illiterate	8	26.67	6	20.00
	Primary	10	33.33	10	33.33
	Middle	5	16.67	6	20.00
	High school	3	10.00	5	16.67
	Graduate	8	26.67	3	10.00
4.	<b>Primary occupation</b>				
	Agriculture	30	100.00	30	100.00
	Other	-	-	-	-
5.	<b>Secondary occupation</b>				
	Livestock	16	53.33	18	60.00
	Laborer	7	23.33	3	10.00
	Service	-	-	-	-
	Shop keeping	4	13.33	3	10.00
	Driving	3	10.00	6	20.00
6.	<b>Family size</b>				
	Small (1-4 member)	18	60.00	20	66.67
	Medium (5-7 member)	12	40.00	10	33.33
	Large (>8 members)	-	-	-	-
7.	<b>Family type</b>				
	Nuclear	30	100.00	26	86.67
	Joint	-	-	4	13.33
8.	<b>Houses</b>				
	Kutcha house	8	26.67	3	10.00
	Pucca house	2	6.67	10	33.33
	Mixed house	20	66.67	17	56.67
9.	<b>Farm power</b>				
	None	24	80.00	22	73.33
	5-6 draught animals/Tractor	6	20.00	8	26.67
10.	<b>Social participation</b>				
	None	18	60.00	12	40.00
	Member of one organization	6	20.00	10	33.33
	Member of more than one organization	6	20.00	8	26.67
11.	<b>Material possessions</b>				
	Mobile phone	11	36.67	5	16.67
	Television	12	40.00	15	50.00
	Refrigerator	7	23.33	10	33.33
12.	<b>Lives tock ownership</b>				
	Cows	20	66.67	24	80.00
	Buffaloes	24	80.00	30	100.00
	Calves	6	20.00	10	33.33
	Goats	28	93.33	16	53.33
13.	Average monthly income (Rs.)	4764	-	8106	-

of caste variable of the marginal sample farmers, 40.00 per cent belonged to OBC category followed by 26.67 per cent of ST, 20.00 per cent of SC and 13.33 per cent of UR category and in case of small farmers, 40.00 per cent belonged to OBC category followed by 26.67 per cent of ST, 20.00 per cent of SC and 13.33 per cent of UR category. About 33.33, 16.67, 10.00 and 26.67 per cent of the marginal farmers were primary, middle, high school and graduate educated, respectively and 26.67 per cent farmers were illiterate. Whereas in case of small farmers, 33.33, 20.00, 16.67 and 10.00 per cent farmers were primary, middle, high school and graduate educated, respectively and 20.00 per cent were illiterate. The main occupation of the total sample farmers was agriculture. In case of secondary occupation 53.33, 23.33, 13.33 and 10.00 per cent marginal farmers engaged with livestock, labour, shop keeping, respectively and 60.00, 10.00, 10.00 and 20.00 per cent small farmers engaged with livestock, labour, shop keeping, respectively. In case of marginal farmers, all were having relatively nuclear sized family (100%), whereas in case of small farmers, they were having 86.67 per cent nuclear family and 13.33 per cent had joint family. Under house type variable, it was observed that only 6.67, 26.67 and 66.67 per cent of marginal sample farmers had pucca, kutcha and mixed houses, respectively and in case of small farmers, 33.33, 10.00 and 56.67 per cent farmers had pucca, kutcha and mixed houses. In variable of farm power, 20.00 per cent marginal farmers had tractor as farm power and 26.67

per cent small farmers had tractor. In case of marginal farmers, 20.00 per cent farmers were member of one social organization and member of more than one organizations, whereas, in case of small farmers, 33.33 and 26.67 per cent farmers were member of one social organization and member of more than one organizations. It was seen that, 40.00, 36.67 and 23.33 per cent of marginal farmers had television, mobile phone and refrigerator, respectively and in case of small farmers, 50.00, 16.67 and 33.33 per cent farmers had same material. An average monthly income of marginal farmers was Rs. 4764 whereas; average monthly income of small farmers was Rs. 8106.

### Composite scale analysis of socio-economic status of small and marginal farmers:

According to Udai Pareek revised scale, distribution of the sample households in different categories of household classes on the basis of socio-economic variables is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 reveals that, from a sample of marginal farmers, 14 farmers (46.67%), 12 farmers (40.00%) and 4 farmers (13.33%) belonged to lower middle, middle and upper middle class, respectively, whereas, no farmer belonged to lower and upper class. In case of small farmers, 9 farmers (30.00%), 16 farmers (53.33%) and 5 farmers (16.67%) of sample farmers belonged to lower middle, middle and upper middle class, respectively, whereas, no farmer belonged to the lower and upper class.

Sr. No.	Category	Score on scale	No. of households	
			Marginal	Small
1.	Upper class	>43	-	-
2.	Upper middle class	33-42	4 (13.33)	5 (16.67)
3.	Middle class	24-32	12 (40.00)	16 (53.33)
4.	Lower middle class	13-23	14 (46.67)	9 (30.00)
5.	Lower class	<13	-	-

Sr. No.	Category	Per capita monthly income (Rs./month)	No. of households	
			Marginal	Small
1.	Upper class	>7008	6	18
2.	Upper middle class	3504-7007	15	12
3.	Middle class	2102-3503	9	-
4.	Lower middle class	1051-2101	-	-
5.	Lower class	<1050	-	-

Appendix –I : Udai Pareek revised scale - 2019		
Sr. No.	Components	Score
<b>Caste</b>		
1.	Schedule caste	1
2.	Lower caste	2
3.	Artisan caste	3
4.	Agriculture caste	4
5.	Prestige caste	5
6.	Dominant caste	6
<b>Occupation</b>		
1.	None	0
2.	Labourer	1
3.	Caste occupation	2
4.	Business	3
5.	Independent profession	4
6.	Cultivation	5
7.	Service	6
<b>Education</b>		
1.	Illiterate	0
2.	Can read only	1
3.	Can read and write	2
4.	Primary	3
5.	Middle	4
6.	High school	5
7.	Graduate	6
8.	And above	7
<b>Land</b>		
1.	No less	0
2.	< 0.40 ha	1
3.	0.40 – 2.02 ha	2
4.	2.02 – 4.04	3
5.	4.04 and above	4
<b>Social participation</b>		
1.	None	0
2.	Member of one organization	1
3.	Member of more than one organization	2
4.	Office holder in such an organization	3
5.	Wide public leader	4
<b>House</b>		
1.	No house	0
2.	Hut	1
3.	Kutcha house	2
4.	Mixed house	3
5.	Pucca house	4
6.	Mansion	5
<b>Farm power</b>		
1.	No draught animals	1
2.	1-2 draught animals	2
3.	3-4 draught animals	3
4.	5-6 draught animals or tractor	4

Appendix –I : Contd.....

Appendix –I : Contd		
<b>Material possessions</b>		
1.	Bullock cart	1
2.	Cycle	2
3.	Radio	3
4.	Chairs	4
5.	Mobile phone	5
6.	Television	6
7.	Refrigerators	7
<b>Family type</b>		
1.	Single	0
2.	Joint	1
3.	Extended	2
4.	Size up to 5	3
5.	Any other distinctive features	4
<b>Classification</b>		
	Category	Score on scale
1.	A - upper class	Above 43
2.	B - upper middle class	33-42
3.	C - middle class	24-32
4.	D - lower middle class	13-23
5.	E - lower class	Below 13

According to BG Prasad modified scale, which is based on monthly income of household, distribution of households in various classes of households is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 shows that, from a sample of marginal farmers, 9 farmers (30.00%), 15 farmers (50.00%) and 6 farmers (20.00%) belonged to middle, upper middle and upper class, respectively, whereas, no farmer

Appendix –II : Modified BG Prasad scale- 2019		
Socio-economic class	Per capita monthly income (in 1961)	Revised for 2019 (In Rs./ month)
Upper class	≥ 100	7008 and above
Upper middle class	50-99	3504-7007
Middle class	30-49	2102-3503
Lower middle class	15-29	1051-2101
Lower class	< 15	1050 and below

belonged to lower and lower middle class. In case of small farmers, 12 farmers (40.00%) and 18 farmers (60.00%) of sample farmers belonged to upper middle and upper class, respectively, whereas, no farmer belonged to lower, lower middle and middle class.

### Conclusion:

Following conclusions are drawn from the results

of the study:

– The study revealed that, the socio-economic conditions of small farmers were better than socio-economic conditions of marginal farmers, according to Udai Pareek revised scale - 2019.

– It was found on the basis of Udai Pareek revised scale that majority of marginal farmers (about 47.00%) belonged to lower middle class, whereas, majority of small farmers (about 53.00%) belonged to middle class. But, in both categories of farmers, no farmer belong to the lower and upper class.

– It was observed on the basis of modified BG Prasad scale-2019 that, the socio-economic conditions of small farmers were good as compared to socio-economic conditions of marginal farmers.

– As per BG Prasad modified scale (based on monthly income of household), the result was showed that the majority of marginal farmers (50.00%) belonged to upper middle class. While, majority of small farmers (60.00%) belonged to upper class. In both categories of sample farmers, no farmer belonged to lower and lower middle class.

Authors' affiliations:

**Mohan Lal Jat and P.S. Shekhawat**, Department of Agricultural Economics, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, **Jaipur (Rajasthan) India**

**LITERATURE CITED :**

Ananthnag, K., Ali, K., Mahatab, M. and Vinaya, H. M. Kumar (2014). A study on socio - economic status of farmers practicing organic farming in eastern dry Zone of Karnataka. *J. Bio-Sci. & Informatics*, **1**(2): 75-84.

Chidi Igboji, Anozie, R. O. and Nneji Chinaza, Priscilia (2015). Analysis of socio-economic factors and profitability of rice production among small scale farmers in Ebonyi State. *IOSR J. Agriculture & Veterinary Science*, **8**(2): 20-27.

Folayan, J. A. (2013). Socio-economic analysis of fadama farmers in Akure South Local Government area of Ondo

State, Nigeria. *American J. Humanities & Social Sciences*, **1**(1): 10-17.

Garces, A.L. and Sing, Le Xuen (1996). Socio-economic analysis of fish farming households in Mekong Delta region: some preliminary findings. *WES Newsletter*, **4**: 11-12.

Habib, Nusrat and Muhammad, Zubair Anwar (2014). An Analysis of Socio-economic profile of rural sugarcane farmers in District Muzaffargarh, Pakistan. *J. Small Business & Entrepreneurship Development*, **2**(1): 191-199.

Kumar, Amar, Sah, R. B., Singh, B. K. and Oraon, P. R. (2018). Socio-economic analysis of tribal farmers in the Gumla district of Jharkhand from existing agro-forestry practices. *Internat. J. Current Microbiology & Applied Science*, **7**(6): 595-604.

Prasad, N., Chamuah, J. K., Khate, K. and Perumal, P. (2017). Socio-economic profile of mithun farmers of Nagaland. *Advance of Animal Veterinary Science*, **5**(4): 148-154.

Roy, M. L., Nirmal, Chandra, Kharbikar, H. L., Joshi, Pratibha and Jethi, Renu (2013). Socio-economic status of hill farmers: An exploration from Almora district in Uttarakhand. *Internat. J. Agriculture & Food Science Technology*, **4**(4): 353-358.

Samarpitha, A., Vasudev, N. and Suhasini, K. (2016). Socio-economic characteristics of rice farmers in the combined state of Andhra Pradesh. *Asian J. Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, **13**(1):1-9.

Sharma, V., Lal, H., Rajput, A. S. and Sharma, I. (2019). Socio-economic analysis of potato growing farmers in Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh. *Internat. J. Agriculture Sciences*, **11**(3): 7844-7848.

Singh, Mrinila, Maharjan, Keshav Lall and Maskey, Bijan (2014). Socio-economic analysis of organic and inorganic farmers in Chitwan district of Nepal. *J. Internat. Development & Cooperation*, **20**(3): 45-55.

Singh, T. P., Kumbhar, Vidya and Kumari, Sneha (2016). Study of socio-economic status of farmers in drought prone regions of Maharashtra, India- A case study. *Internat. J. Current Research*, **8**(6): 304-306.

11<sup>th</sup>  
Year  
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★