

***SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITION OF FARMERS AT PUKPUI COMMUNITY***

*Submitted for the partial fulfilment of Bachelor of Social Work, 2023*

Submitted by

Joel Zomawia Royte

BSW V – Semester

Roll NO- 2123BSW007

Supervisor

Vanlalmangaihi

Department of Social Work

Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram

Kawmzawl Lunglei- 796691

## CONTENT

CHAPTER NO		LIST OF CONTENT	PAGE
		<b>ITEMS</b>	
		Certificate	[2]
		Declaration	[3]
		Acknowledgement	[4]
<b>1</b>		<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>1.1</b>	National scenario	<b>2</b>
	<b>1.2</b>	Statement of the problem	<b>2</b>
	<b>1.3</b>	Objectives of the study	<b>2</b>
<b>11</b>		<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>III</b>		<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV</b>		<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	
	<b>1</b>	Profile of the respondent	<b>7-8</b>
	<b>2</b>	Amenities owned	<b>9-10</b>
	<b>3</b>	Challenges	<b>10-11</b>
	<b>4</b>	Support	<b>12</b>
	<b>5</b>	Major crops cultivated	<b>12-16</b>
<b>V</b>		<b>CONCLUSION</b>	
	<b>5.1</b>	Major findings	<b>17</b>
	<b>5.2</b>	Conclusion	<b>18</b>
<b>VI</b>		<b>REFERENCES</b>	
	<b>6.1</b>	Appendices	

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the research in “**Socio-economic condition of farmers** ” submitted by Joel zomawia Roye for the partial fulfilment of the Bachelor of Social Work is carried out under my guidance and incorporates the student's bonafide research and this has not been submitted for any award for any degree in this or any other university or institution of learning.

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2023

Place : Lunglei



**(R. LALLIANZELA)**

Head of Department

Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram



**(VANLALHMANGAIHI)**

Supervisor

Department of Social Work  
Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the research work presented in the project entitled “Socio-economic condition of farmers” has been carried out by me, submitted for the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Bachelor of Social Work. The dissertation is an authentic piece of work carried out under supervision of Vanlalmangaihi, HATIM

**(JOEL ZOMAWIA ROYTE)**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Firstly I would like to thank head of the department R.Lallianzela for to conduct research project on the title “Socio-economic condition of farmers”.

My acknowledgement continues by mentioning the names of my parents Mr Liandinga Royte and Mrs Sanghluani for their financial support and most precious through prayers.

I owe a heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor Vanlalmangaihi, Department of Social Work, Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram who had lectured me and imparted knowledge in this research project. She is a person to motivate me to complete this research project. She developed confidence in me and showed patience towards me which helped me to feel happy and joy during the course of my study.

I am so indebted to the farmers of Pukpui community for rendering a cheerful corporation while collecting data. I really appreciate their availability and helping attitude and efforts given by them during the process of field work and data collection. I also extend my gratitude to the Local leaders for facilitating each of our work throughout the Fieldwork.

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Socioeconomic status is the position of an individual or group on the socioeconomic scale, which is determined by a combination of social and economic factors such as income, amount and kind of education, type and prestige of occupation, place of residence, and—in some societies or parts of society—ethnic origin or religious background.

Examinations of socioeconomic status often reveal inequities in access to resources, as well as issues related to privilege, power, and control. Social and economic factors include factors such as income, education, employment, community safety and social support. The choices that are available in a community are impacted by social and economic factors. These choices include our abilities to afford medical care and housing and to manage stress.

Agriculture farmer is a person engaged in agriculture, raising living organisms for food or raw materials. The term usually applies to people who do some combination of raising field crops, orchards, vineyards, poultry, or other livestock. A farmer might own the farm land or might work as a laborer on land owned by others.

Socio economic conditions of agriculture farmers Access to agricultural services promotes agricultural production and livelihoods of smallholders in most developing countries. The purpose of this study was to analyze the socioeconomic determinants that influence the application of agricultural practices in peasant families in northern Colombia. Categorical and numerical variables of demographic information were evaluated at 200 Agricultural Production Units (APU) in the five prioritized municipalities. With the data obtained, multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) and principal component analysis (PCA) were performed. The results indicated heterogeneity in terms of farmer cooperative, socioeconomic factors and agricultural practices. The study found that education level, income from agriculture, farmer cooperative and credit were determinant factors for most of the agricultural practices that were considered. The results also indicate that non-agricultural income did not influence household well-being. It was found that extension services in the area of the study are insufficient and that farmers face difficulties in having access to credit and loans. Understanding of these factors is essential for the formulation and implementation of intervention strategies aimed at improving the quality of life of these communities, and to preserve and manage human, social, agricultural and financial capital.

According to Foguesatto et al. (2020), the adoption of various agricultural practices can be an alternative that generates changes not only at the local level but also at the regional level. They improve soil fertility, water retention capacity, reduce the level of residues to the product and increase carbon sequestration; thus maintaining agroecosystemic resilience (Jara-Rojas et al., 2012, Ehiakpor et al., 2021, Mogaka et al., 2021). The decision to apply agricultural practices by small peasant farmers is strongly influenced by the socio-economic level of the farmer (Mazvimavi and Twomlow, 2009, Mogaka et al., 2021), cultural practices (Zugravu-Soilita et al., 2021) and in many cases the availability of natural resources (Asfaw and Neka, 2017, Handavu et al., 2019, Benitez-Altuna et al., 2021

**National scenario(India):** In totality, the study revealed that 26.67 per cent of farmers belonged to low SES category, 55 per cent of farmers belonged to medium SES category and 18.33 per cent farmers belonged to high SES category

Agriculture plays a vital role in India's economy. 54.6 of the total workforce is engaged in agriculture and allied sector activities (Census 2011) and accounts for 18.8% (First Advance Estimates) of country's Gross Value Added (GVA) for the year 2021-22 (at current prices). Given the importance of the agriculture sector, Government of India has taken several steps for its development in a sustainable manner. Steps have been taken to improve the income of farmers.

**Land Use Statistics:** As per the Land Use Statistics 2018-19, the total geographical area of the country is 328.7 million hectares, of which 139.3 million hectares is the reported net sown area and 197.3 million hectares is the gross cropped area with a cropping intensity of 141.6%. The net area shown works out to be 42.4% of the total geographical area. The net irrigated area is 71.6 million hectares.

### **Statement of the problem**

Farming is not just an occupation for the tribal people but can be said that it is in their lifestyle that is embedded in their culture agricultural farming has been practiced from generation to generation. For the mizo's farming has been part of them for decades, but the hills of Mizoram have a rough terrain for farmers to practice farming. The farmers own fragments of land due to the rough terrain, lack of capital and lack of man power farmers cannot have large farms, this keeps them away from developing economically and socially.

As farmer still use traditional method of farming i.e., shifting cultivation which is not very profitable way of farming although it may provide daily needs but is not productive enough for savings for the farmers as this method use primitive tools and techniques for farming.

North-eastern state like Mizoram farmers may face challenges in different areas as in various district scarcity of water has risen which effect the product of crops, and due to climate change many crops were affected recently in various ways and if marketing is not up to expectation farmers can face challenges financially and hinder social life

### **Objectives of the study**

1. To profile the respondents
2. To identify the challenges faced by farmers at Pukpui community
3. To study the socio-economic conditions of farmers at Pukpui community.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to Tom Brewer et al. 2019, risks related to agriculture are dispersed, complicated, and interconnected. In order to ensure stable livelihoods and global food security, there is a great demand for and need to improve understanding of the relationship between agricultural risks, how farmers deal with the risk, factors that affect the perception and management of their risk, and barriers hindering the way they manage risks. We have examined the literature in this intellectual area in order to shed light on what has been recognized and what is still unknown. It had revealed several astounding inconsistencies and points of interest, such as the paucity of study on a vast array of developmental gradients and the small amount of unrelated research on biosecurity risk management the apparent disparity between perceived hazards and management actions, the clustering of risks and risk management measures, and socioeconomic aspects related to biosecurity concerns. More cooperative approaches to managing future risk may be possible with a greater understanding of farmers' risk perceptions, risk management techniques, variables influencing those practices, and obstacles to such practices.

According to J. A. Echetamal (2016), despite the fact that the majority of farmers lacked formal education, they are highly aware of climate change and are able to recognize its effects. Tree planting, early crop maturity, mixed farming, improved crop varieties, increased use of family labour, participation in complementary or diverse livelihoods, cover cropping, adjustments to planting and harvest dates, irrigation techniques, crop rotation, riverside/bank cultivation, and increased frequency of weeding are just a few of the measures farmers in the area have taken to combat the effects of climate change as they perceive it.

The results are solid and have a range of significant insights. Gender has a significant inverse relationship with agricultural production when all the variables entered into the model are considered, which means that if there are more males than females participating in agricultural production activities, farmers' output will decrease by 211.1 kg. Age and the level of a farmer's output are positively and significantly correlated. Claiming that an increase of one year in the farmers' ages will result in an increase of 102.3 kg in their output. The level of a farmer's output is positively correlated with marital status. indicating that there is a one-person rise in the number of married farmers. It will produce more by 57.2 kg. Educational background has a strong correlation and it has been shown that Positive indication that a year's worth of further schooling will result in a 50.8kg increase in farmer productivity. An increase in farming experience of one year will result in a 22.9kg rise in the farmer's output, according to a positive association between farming experience and output levels. Farm size and output are positively correlated, suggesting that an increase in farm size of one hectare will result in a 23.3 kilogram increase in the farmer's output. Nnadozie, B., and Ibe, E. (2000) found that there is an inverse link between household size and farmer output levels, showing that when household size increases by one person, output levels fall by 14.9 kg.



Long-term challenges and restrictions negatively affect the entire production. Since then, several studies focused on significant and minor difficulties affecting agricultural productivity have been carried out in numerous different nations. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the crop production issues faced by Somali farmers in the Afgoye district. The study discovered that Somali farmers faced both major and minor obstacles. The major obstacles include unpredictable weather, a lack of water, pests damaging crops, inadequate transportation, issues with land tenure and ownership, fear of conflict between rebels and the government, and the existence of some individuals who are politically active crop looting after harvest. The study also discovered minor obstacles like difficulty using seeds and fertilizers, a lack of funding for inadequate irrigation investment, and a lack of knowledge and expertise for all farmers, such as high postharvest crop losses caused by inadequate storage structures and access to pesticides, inadequate market access for both crops and vegetable products, and a lack of readily available crop chemicals.

A person's or a population's socioeconomic position is influenced by a number of things. In the current study, the economic situation and literacy level of agricultural employees were used to describe their status. They were forced to quit school as children before completing their primary education. Some of them could read and write, but the majority struggled to finish their schooling because of their dire financial circumstances. They had to labour in agriculture to support their family. The workers' lack of knowledge about occupational diseases, their treatments, or preventative measures was a result of their poor educational levels.

According to Chamhuri Siwar (2013), agricultural land utilisation is also progressively declining. Even within the total agricultural area, industrial crops have taken up the majority of the land, and the proportion of industrial to food crops is growing. Malaysia's primary food crop is paddy, but due to its low production, farmers only work part-time. Therefore, it would appear that knowledge of the socioeconomic traits of paddy farmers, their means of subsistence, and agricultural sustainability is essential for the implementation and assessment of policy. Based on primary data, this study examines the current profile of the paddy farmers in the Malaysian region of North-West Selangor's Integrated Agricultural Development Area (IADA). Through the use of a questionnaire survey, the data was gathered. The study's findings imply policy proposals and strategies for enhancing the farmers' way of life. The study's conclusions are significant for relevant organizations and policy makers.

According to Joyce Tamaga Chitja, microbial contamination of fresh produce is a known result of certain farming techniques and practices. This case study revealed that the primary areas of variation among the evaluated farming systems related to the types of fertilizers and irrigation water sources employed, as well as the techniques for fertilizer preparation. These variations are significant for the production of fresh produce since they have been previously identified as potential sources of microbial contamination, which may have an impact on market accessibility, food security, and safety. This study also sheds insight on the potential impact of socioeconomic and demographic traits on farm One of the

demographic factors that influenced farming techniques the most was gender. Taking into account that women make up the majority of farmers in both the semi-organic

According to W Y Ramrao, S P Tiwari, and P Singh (2015), the study's findings showed that integrating several businesses on a 3.5-acre plot of land was theoretically feasible. In addition, mixed farming with bullocks, cows, buffaloes, and goats was found to utilize land, water, input resources, and output resources more effectively than arable farming alone. Based on the current study, an effort was made to create a schematic model that would reflect the many configurations of the mixed agricultural system.

Shittu, Femi Oluwatusin<sup>1</sup> 80% of the sampled households were in their economically active working years, according to descriptive statistics. Additionally, it was discovered that men made up 84.2 per cent of the research area's responders, while women made up 15.8 per cent. In addition, the analysis of the production function revealed that the primary factors influencing yam production performance in the research areas were the farmers' age, education, farming experience, farm distance, and income level, all of which had statistically significant positive coefficients. However, although not being statistically significant, household size had a negative impact. This disproves the presumption.

## CHAPTER-3

### METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the description of methodology is presented. This chapter deals with the methodological aspects such as objectives, research design, sampling method of data collection and data processing and analysis.

1. **Universe of the study:** the universe of the study is Pukpui community. The unit of the study is socio economic condition of agriculture farmers.
2. **Research design:** The study is exploratory in nature. The data mainly consist of primary data collected using quantitative method.
3. **Sampling:** Proportionate stratified random sampling procedure is employed for the selection of sample. The sample size of the research is 60 in number
4. **Data collection:** data was collected using quantitative method. Primary data was collected using pre-tested questionnaire.
5. **Data processing and analysis:** The quantitative data collected from the respondent is processed using MS Excel and SPSS. Data is interpreted and presented in the form of simple percentage.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**1 Profile of the respondents :** to study the profile of the respondent the variables taken for study are age, gender, education, marital status, monthly income economic category

**1.2 Gender:** The genders of the respondent are classified into male and female. Majority of the respondent are male 68% followed by female 37%.

**1.3 Religion :** the religion of the respondent are classified as Christian, Hindu, Muslim all the respondent opted Christian which make the percentage 100

**1.4 Educational qualification:** The educational qualifications of the respondent are classified into primary, middle, high school, higher secondary and graduate. . middle (42%) comprise the highest and is followed by high school (28%) ,primary (24%), graduate 4%) and high secondary(2%).

**1.5 Occupation :** the types of occupation of the respondent are classified as farming, labor and others. There are 96% of the respondent who opted farming for occupation followed by labor (4%)

**1.6 Family type:** the family type of the respondent are classified as nuclear family and joint family. Majority of the respondent belongs to nuclear family (66%) followed by joint family (34%)

**1.7 Monthly income:** The monthly income in the present study is classified into the amount between Rs10000-30000, Rs30001-50000, Rs50001 above. The monthly income between Rs10000-30000(56%) constitutes the highest income followed by Rs30001-50000(38%), Rs50001 above (6%)

**1.8 Type of house :** The house type of the respondent are classified as pacha, kutcha and others. Among the respondent 96% lived in pacha house followed by kutcha(4%)

**1.9 Ownership of the house :** The given option of this statement are owned and rented. There are 92% of the respondent who owned their house followed by rented house (8%)

**1.10 Economic category :** The economic category of the respondent are classified as Non-NFSA, BPL and AAY. Majority of the respondent opted BPL (88%) followed by AAY and Non-NFSA at 6%

**Table 1**

<b>Profile of the Respondents</b>			
<b>SI no.</b>	<b>Particular</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>Gender</b>		
	Male	34	68%
	Female	14	37%
<b>II</b>	<b>Religion</b>		
	Christian	50	100%
	Hindu	0	0
	Muslim	0	0
<b>III</b>	<b>Educational Qualification</b>		
	Primary	12	24%
	Middle	21	42%
	High school	14	28%
	Higher SS	1	2%
	Graduate	2	4%
<b>IV</b>	<b>Occupation</b>		
	Farming	48	96%
	Labour	2	4%
	Others	0	0
<b>V</b>	<b>Family Type</b>		
	Joint	17	34%
	Neuclear	33	66%
<b>VI</b>	<b>Monthly Income</b>		
	Rs10000-30000	27	56%
	Rs30001-50000	19	38%
	Rs50001 above	4	6%
<b>VII</b>	<b>Type of House</b>		
	Patcha	48	96%
	Kutchu	2	4%
	Others		
<b>VIII</b>	<b>Ownership of the House</b>		
	Owned	46	92%
	Rented	4	8%
<b>IX</b>	<b>Economic Category</b>		
	Non-NFSA	3	6%
	BPL	44	88%
	AAY	3	6%

**1.11 Owned computer/laptop:** The option given for this statement is yes or no. almost all of the respondent opted no 90% followed by yes (10%)

**2.1 Refrigerator:** The option given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (86%) followed by no (14%)

**2.2 Microwave oven :** There are two options developed yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no (86%) followed by yes (14%)

**2.3 Television :** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted yes (90%) followed by no (10%)

**2.4 Mobile phones:** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted yes 96% followed by no 4%

**2.4 Washing machine:** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted yes 84% followed by no 16%

**2.5 Fan:** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted yes 58% followed by no 42%

**2.6 Gas stove:** The options given are yes and no. Almost all of the respondent opted yes 94% followed by no 6%

**2.7 Gas connection:** The options given are yes and no. Almost all of the respondent opted yes 98% followed by no 2%

**2.8 Bike/ Scooty:** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted yes 58% followed by no 42%

**2.9 4-wheeler:** The options given are yes and no. More than half of the respondent opted no 86% followed by yes 14%

**Table 2**

Amenities Owned			
		Yes	No
1.	computer/ laptop	10%	90%
		5	45
2.	Refrigerator	86%	14%
		43	7
3.	Microwave oven	14%	86%
		7	43
4.	Television	90%	10%
		45	4
5.	Mobile phones	96%	4%
		48	2
6.	Washing machine	84%	16%

		42	8
7.	Fan	58%	42%
		29	21
8.	Gas stove	94%	6%
		47	3
9.	Gas connection	98%	2%
		49	1
10.	Bike/ Scooty	58%	42%
		29	21
11.	4 Wheeler	14%	86%
		7	43

**4. Challenges :** The challenges faced by the respondent are identified through different question

**4.1 The distance of house to farm is far:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted agree (68%), followed by disagree (26%), strongly agree (4%) and strongly disagree (2%).

**4.2 I face transportation problems:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted disagree (56%), followed by agree (30%), strongly agree (8%) and strongly disagree (6%).

**4.3 Rate of production is enough :** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. More than half of the respondent opted agree (60%), followed by disagree (34%), strongly disagree (6%)

**4.4 Animal spoil crops :** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Almost all of the respondent opted agree (90%), followed by disagree (6%), strongly disagree (2%) and strongly agree (2%).

**4.5 Marketing is stable:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted agree (86%), followed by disagree (14%) .

**4.6 Soil fertile is enough for cultivation:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. Two third of the respondent opted agree (80%), followed by disagree (20%).

**4.7 Income from agriculture is not enough to feed family:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted agree (60%), followed by disagree (8%), strongly disagree (2%).

**4.8 I am content with the tools that I have:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Almost all of the respondent opted agree (76%), followed by disagree (24%).

**4.9 I find the require tools for farming:** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted agree (68%), followed by disagree (32%).

**4.10 Moving from one place to another is troublesome :** the options given are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly disagree. Majority of the respondent opted agree (64%), followed by disagree (36%).

**Table 3**

	Challenges		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.	The distance of house to farm is far	Percentage	2%	26%	0	2%
		Frequency	1	13	34	2
2.	I face transportation problems	Percentage	8%	56%	30%	6%
		Frequency	3	28	15	4
3.	3 Rate of production is enough	Percentage	0	34%	60%	6%
		Frequency	2	17	30	1
4.	animal spoil crops	Percentage	2%	6%	90%	2%
		Frequency	1	3	45	1
5.	marketing is stable:	Percentage	0	14%	86%	0
		Frequency	0	7	43	0
6.	soil fertile is enough for cultivation	Percentage	0	20%	80%	0
		Frequency	0	10	40	0
7.	income from agriculture is not enough to feed family	Percentage	2%	8%	60%	0
		Frequency	1	19	30	0
8.	8 I am content with the tools that I have	Percentage	0	24%	76%	0
		Frequency	0	12	38	0
9.	I find the require tools for farming	Percentage	0	32%	68%	0
		Frequency	0	16	34	0
10.	oving from one place to another is troublesome	Percentage	0	36%	64%	0
		Frequency	0	18	32	0



**5. Supports:** the questions ask whether the respondent received support from government and what types through various questions

**5.1 Do you received any kind of government support:** the options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no 88% followed by yes 12%

**5.2 if yes how much:** this statement is for the respondent who received support , while 6% of the respondent received rs25000 for support, 2% of the respondent received rs250000.

**5.3 What kind of support do you received:** the options given are NLUP, SEDP, KVK, SAMETI . While there is 92% of respondent who doesn't received support any support from government 8% of the respondent received support from SEDP.

**Table 4**

	<b>Supports</b>				
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1.	Do you received any kind of government support	Percentage		12%	88%
		Frequency		6	44
2.	if yes how much:	Percentage		92%	
		Frequency		46	
3.	What kind of support do you received	1.NLUP 2. <b>SEDP</b> 3.KVK 4.SAMETI	<b>SEDP</b>	100%	

## **6. Major crops cultivated:**

### **a)CEREAL**

**6.1 Wheat:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(86%) followed by yes (14%)

**6.2 Maize:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(98%) followed by yes (2%)

**6.3 Rice:** The options given are yes and no. All of the respondent opted no(100%).

**6.4 Barely:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(96%) followed by yes (4%)

**Table 5**

Sl.No	CEREAL		Yes	No
1	Wheat	Percentage	( 14%)	(86%)
		Frequency	7	43
2	Maize	Percentage	(2%)	(98%)
		Frequency	1	49
3	Rice	Percentage	(0)	(100%)
		Frequency	0	50
4	Barley	Percentage	(4%)	(96%)
		Frequency	2	48

**b) VEGETABLES**

**6.5 Brinjal:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (92%) followed by no (8%)

**6.6 Pea :** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (62%) followed by no (38%)

**6.7 Pumpkin:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (76%) followed by no (24%)

**6.8 Tomato:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (66%) followed by no (34%)

**6.9 Cabbage :** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (76%) followed by no (24%)

**6.10 Yam:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (54%) followed by no (46%)

**6.11 cauliflower:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (76%) followed by no (24%)

**Table 6**

Sl.No	VEGETABLES			
			Yes	No
1	Brinjal	Percentage	92%	8%
		Frequency	46	4
2	Pea	Percentage	62%	38%
		Frequency	31	19
3	Pumpkin	Percentage	76%	24%
		Frequency	38	12
4	Tomato	Percentage	66%	34%
		Frequency	33	17
5	Cabbage	Percentage	76%	24%
		Frequency	38	12
6	Yam	Percentage	54%	46%
		Frequency	27	23
7	Cauliflower	Percentage	76%	24%
		Frequency	38	12

**FRUITS**

**6.12 Banana:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted yes (78%) followed by no (22%)

**6.13 Dragon fruit:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(86%) followed by yes (14%)

**6.14. Mango:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no (54%) followed by yes (46%)

**6.15 Orange :** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(60%) followed by yes (40%)

**6.16 Pineapple:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(76%) followed by yes(34%)

**6.17 Lemon:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(86%) followed by yes (14%)

**6.18 Pear:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no (92%) followed by yes (8%)

**Table 7**

Sl.No	FRUITS		Yes	No
1	Banana	Percentage	78%	22%
		Frequency	39	11
2	Dragon fruit	Percentage	14%	54%
		Frequency	7	43
3	Mango	Percentage	46%	54%
		Frequency	23	27
4	Orange	Percentage	40%	60%
		Frequency	20	30
5	Pineapple	Percentage	34%	76%
		Frequency	12	38
6	Lemon	Percentage	14%	86%
		Frequency	7	43
7	Pear	Percentage	8%	92%
		Frequency	4	46

**d)TREE CROPS**

**6.19 Coffee:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no(64%) followed by yes (36%)

**6.20 Oil palm:** The options given are yes and no. All of the respondent opted no (100%)

**6.21 Teak:** The options given are yes and no. All of the respondent opted no (100%).

**6.22 Rubber:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no (98%) followed by yes (2%)

**6.23 Stinky bean:** The options given are yes and no. All of the respondent opted No (100%).

**6.24 Khanghu:** The options given are yes and no. majority of the respondent opted no (62%) followed by yes (38%)

**Table 8**

SL.No	TREE CROPS			
			<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1	Coffee	Percentage	36%	64%
		Frequency	18	32
2	Oil palm	Percentage	0	100%
		Frequency	0	50
3	Teak	Percentage	0	100%
		Frequency	0	50
4	Rubber	Percentage	2%	98%
		Frequency	1	49
5	Stinky bean	Percentage	0	100%
		Frequency	0	50
6	Khanghngu	Percentage	38%	62%
		Frequency	19	31

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 Major Findings**

The study indicates that majority of the farmers were male and it was comparatively distributed between male and female. All of them (farmers) were sharing the same religion which is Christianity.

It had been found out that the primary occupation was farming. The educational qualification of the respondents is relatively middle belonging to middle school followed by high school. Majority of the respondents' family belong to nuclear family and most of them had an income average amount of Rs 10000-30000. The socio-economic conditions of the respondents' family is classified into three categories Non-NFSA, BPL, AAY where majority of the respondents belong to BPL.

Amenities owned in the present study is analyzed to understand the economic background and family stability, two third of the respondents lived in pacha house and majority of them owned the house that they lived in.

Crops cultivated are classified into four kinds Cereals, Vegetables, Fruits, Tree crops. Among them brinjal is the most cultivated crops followed by Banana also tree crops like Khanghu, rubber and coffee were also cultivated.

## 5.2 Conclusion

According to the study, farmers' income from agriculture is insufficient to support their families, and many are dissatisfied with the tools they now own or have not been able to find. Unmet needs can have a variety of negative effects on the pace of output. Cultivators must relocate to a new location, which may be farther away than their previous one, in order to continue cultivating. They discover that transferring is difficult.

Since the study focuses on socioeconomic conditions, the socioeconomic conditions of the respondents are taken into consideration. The majority of the respondents are above the poverty line (APL), and their family's primary source of income is farming, with government employment coming in second. Their family's annual income is the second highest among those with incomes between rs15,000 and rs 30,000. The socioeconomic status of the respondents' families was determined by studying the household amenities they had. The majority of the respondents owned a mobile phone, a gas stove, a gas connection, a refrigerator, a television, and a two-wheeled bike or scooter.

As the major producers of food, farmers hold a significant position in the primary sector. Farmers are the ones who generate the food resources, regardless of where we live or how we get by. Their labor force always makes a difference and influences the community's economy, nutrition, health, and marketing. For the cultivators in the Pukpui community, shifting cultivation is a way of life that is deeply ingrained in their culture, not merely their line of work. They do it because it is a part of their lifestyle, not just a way to accumulate cash. Agriculture and farming have been done for many generations, and carrying on with it can help preserve their culture and customs.

While shifting cultivation may be considered one of the factors affecting our environment, it is also one of the most sustainable forms of agriculture because it is easily generated and regenerated, helping the ground regain lost nutrients. Because of this change in farming, there is no risk of flooding or animal damage to crops. In Mizoram, shifting farming is a significant source of revenue and a common employment for marginal farmers.

## REFERENCES

- Abdulrahman, S. (2013) Expenditure on Agricultural Sector and Food Security in Nigeria. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (Nigerian Chapter)*, 1(3), 41-53.
- Anyanwuocha, R.A.I (2006). *Fundamentals of Economics Onitsha-Nigeria*, African first Publishers Ltd. Bakare A. S. (2013), An econometric analysis of sustainable agriculture and rural development in Nigeria: A Vector Autoregressive Approach (VAR). *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development*, 2(5), 184-193.
- Bakare, A. S. (2013). An econometric analysis of sustainable agriculture and rural development in Nigeria: A Vector Autoregressive Approach (VAR). *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development*, 2(5), 184-193.
- Bao, T. (2008). *Cobb-Douglas Production Function*. Cobb-Douglas.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cobb\\_douglas](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cobb_douglas). Chukwuemaka, E. E. O. (2002). *Research Method and Thesis Writing: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Enugu, HRV Publishers
- Cohen, A.J. and Harcourt, G.C. (2003) "Retrospectives: Whatever Happened to the Cambridge Capital Theory Controversies?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(1), 199-214. Daly, H (1997). "Forum on Georgescu-Roegen versus Solow/Stiglitz". *Ecological Economics*, 22 (3), 261– 306.
- Enoma A. (2010), *Agricultural Credit and Economic Growth in Nigeria: An Empirical Analysis*. *Business and Economics Journal*, 14, 1-7.
- Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics*. New York, America. McGraw-Hill Education. Ibe. A.C. (2002). *Successful Management of Cooperatives Awka*. Sell York International Company.
- Ijere, M.O. and Mbanabor, J. (2000), *Agribusiness Development and Nigeria Agriculture*. In Nwosu, AC et al (ed) *Agricultural Transformation in Nigeria*. Owerri. Novelty Industrial Enterprises Limited.
- Michael, M. C., Des-Oparaku, L. & Oparaku, D.C (2012). *Basic Tools in Research Method and Project Writing*. Hornicorn Int'l.
- Mundi Index (2012) *Country facts and Figures*. Retrieved on 15th Janiuary, 2013 from <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/nigeria>. Time 9:45 Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow*
- Nnadozie, B and Ibe, E. (2000). Effect of Fertilizer Treatment and Harvest stage on seed Yield Protein and Fat Content of Soybean. In Nwosu, AC et al (ed) *Agricultural Transformation in Nigeria*. Owerri. Novelty Industrial Enterprises Limited
- Nwankwo, F.O. (2008). Impact of Informal Credit on Agricultural Production in Awka South L.G.A Anambra State. Nigeria. *Journal of Cooperative Economics and Management*,



Obinyan, E. (2000) The Private Sector and Agricultural Transportation. Nwosu, A.C. et al. Agricultural Transformation in Nigeria. Owerri: Noelty Industrial

Olayide S.O. & E.O. Heady (1982): Introduction to Agricultural production Economics. Ibadan University Press, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Olubanjo O.O. & Oyebanjo O.(2005), Determinants of profitability in rain-fed paddy rice production in Ikenne Agricultural Zone, Ogun State, Nigeria. African Crop Science Conference Proceedings

Onugu, C. U (2008). Advancing Women Participation in Agricultural Development Through Cooperative Societies: The Case of Women in Agriculture Programme in Anambra State, Nigeria. Nigerian, Journal of Cooperative Economics and Management

Uchendu, S. O. (1998). Fundamentals of Cooperative Business Enterprise. Enugu-Nigeria: Re-joint Communication Ltd. Uzoagulu, A. E (1998).

Practical Guide to Writing Research Project Reports in Tertiary Institutions. Enugu, John Jacob's Classic Publishers.

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AGRICULTURE

### I. PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

1	Name	1. 60-70 2. 75-85 3. 85 above
2	Age	
3	Gender	1. Male 2. Female
4	Religion	1.Christian. 2.Muslim. 3.Hindu. 4.Others.
5	Education Qualification	1. Primary 2. Middle 3. High school 4. Higher sec school 5. Graduate 6. Post graduate
6	Occupation	1. Farming 2. Govt. servant 3. Labour 4. Others
7	Family type	1.Joint family 2. Nuclear family

### II. ECONOMIC STATUS OF FAMILY

1	Monthly income of family from all source	1. 10000-30000 2. 30001-50000 3. 50001 and above
2	Type of house	1. Kutcha 2. Pacha
3	Ownership of the house	1.Owned 2.Rented
4	Economic category	1.Non- NFSA 1. BPL 2. AAY

### III. HOUSEHOLD POSSESSION

	Household possession	yes	No
1	Computer/laptop		
2	Refrigerator		
3	Microwave oven		
4	Television		
5	Mobile phone		
6	Washing machine		
	Fan		
	<b>Gas stove</b>		
1	Gas connection		
2	Bike/scooty (2 wheeler)		
	4 wheeler		
1			
2	What treatment did you take		
3	How often do you consult doctor		
4	Who accompanies you to the doctor		
5	Do you face any difficulties in obtaining treatment		
6	If yes, then what types of difficulties		

### IV. CHALLENGES

SI NO	Criteria	Strongly agree	agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The distance of house to farm is far				
2	I face transportation problem				
3	Rate of production is enough				
4	Animals spoil crops				
5	Marketing is stable				
6	Soil fertile is enough for cultivation				
7	Income from agriculture is not enough to feed family				
8	I am content with the tools that I have				

9	I find the require tools for farming				
10	Moving from one place to another is trouble some				

## V. SUPPORTS

Sl.NO	SUPPORTS	YES	NO
1	Do you receive any kind of government support		
2	If yes how much		
3	What kind of support do you receive	1.NLUP 2.SEDP 3.KVK 4.SAMETI	
4			

## VI. MAJOR CROPS CULTIVATED

Sl.no	Cereal	
1	Wheat	
2	Maze	
3	Rice	
4	Barley	

Sl.no	Vegetable	
1	Brinjal	
2	Pea	
3	Pumpkin	
4	Tomato	
5	Cabbage	
6	Yam	
7	Cauliflower	

Sl.no	Fruits	
1	Banana	
2	Dragon fruit	
3	Mango	
4	Orange	
5	Pineapple	
6	Lemon	
7	Pear	

Sl.no	Tree crops	
-------	------------	--

1	Coffee	
2	Oil palm	
3	Teak	
4	Rubber	
5	Stinky bean	
6	Khanghu	