



Current Review on Socio-Economic Traits of Mango Growers

**Ankit Kumar ^a, N. R. Meena ^a, R. K. Doharey ^a, Vinita Singh ^b
and Manoj Kumar ^{a*}**

^a Department of Extension Education, ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya (UP), India.
^b Department of Home Science, MMV BHU, Varanasi (UP), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i430851

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/73692>

Original Research Article

Received 25 August 2021
Accepted 27 October 2021
Published 18 February 2022

ABSTRACT

The current review was directed in Lucknow District of Uttar Pradesh. Malihabad and Bakshi Ka Talab were selected proportionally for the study. 120 ranchers were remembered for the example for the current examination. Results uncovers that greater part of respondents were found in larger part of the respondents (46.66 percent) were seen in the middle age classification of up to 40-60 years. Thus, most of the respondents (Farmers) fall in the class old enough gathering up to 40 - 60 years. That is majority of respondents found under the married Category 80.33 % followed by unmarried category 13.33 % and other specific 5.83 %. It revealed that the fact is majority of respondents 95.83 % belongs Joint family system. Along these lines, it is presumed that most of the respondents was found in classification of little family size. The average income was observed to Rs. 138,000 with a range of minimum Rs. 38000 and maximum Rs. 750,000. It is clear that larger part of the respondents 36.66 % were having support in multiple associations. That the vast majority of the respondents were found with medium (60%) level of logical direction followed by High 28.33 % degree and afterward finally Low (11.66 % level of logical direction. That is out of 16 variables studied. The Six variables are Attitude, Adoption, Social participation, Caste, Education; Extension contact has highly significant and positive correlation. Size of family and Age are two variables which is Highly Significant and negative correlation with knowledge. Type of Family, Risk orientation, Economic Motivation, Scientific orientation are non significant and the correlation is negative with Knowledge. Annual Income is single variable which correlated with Knowledge which is non significant and positive correlation with knowledge.

Keywords: Socio-economic traits; mango growers; extension education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the premise of throughout improvement paintings. If we fail in agriculture, it does now no longer remember what else we acquire what number of plant life we placed up our monetary improvement will now no longer be complete. Mango (*Mangifera indica*) is likewise called king of fruit. Is a fruit plant mango is used as a meals, juices, mango pulp, pickles, chutneys, jams, slice in brine. For human intake and additionally correct for fuel, farm animals feed. The tree is mango performs big position in agriculture because of its nature of fruit and play critical position Agri. meals industries [1].

India is the biggest manufacturer of mango with inside the international, contributing to almost 46% of the whole international mango manufacturing. India has an facet over different nations with regards to mango manufacturing in phrases of herbal sources required and climatic conditions (Yadav et. al. 2016). Mango includes 70 species, mainly limited in tropical Asia. Generally, mango is a deep rooted; evergreen plant bears severa branches and develops into big timber. It loves deep soils and grows luxuriously in correct and beneficial agro-climatic conditions (Yadav et al. 2016).

That need to visible as a top-notch possibility to be exploited through Indian mango cultivators. The studies famous that China and Philippines have skilled maximum boom fee (11.30per centage) and (9.08 per centage) CGR respectively, even with inside the mango manufacturing additionally. This virtually shows the reality that China has found out the awesome capability this is being hidden on this specialised quarter, i.e. mango cultivation industry, and is attempting to take advantage of the equal earlier than every other united states does. Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan and Nigeria are the nations which are experiencing big boom among four and six per centage. India, unfortunately, is the most effective united-states that has skilled a poor boom of -0.86 per centage CGR, no matter her being the pinnacle maximum manufacturer of mango (Purushottam Bung 2018).

2. METHODOLOGY

The current review was directed in Lucknow region of Uttar Pradesh considering considering the convenience of elevation of Lucknow 125

meter (410 feet), latitude 26.8465 degree and longitude 80.9466 degree. Total area of Lucknow 631 km² & population of Lucknow is 35 lakhs. Density of Lucknow 5500/km². The locale is limited on the east by Barabanki, on west by Unnao, on the south Raebareli and in north by Sitapur and Hardoi. The dirt and climatic state of this locale is generally appropriate for development of mango. Lucknow locale has 8 squares, in particular Bakshi Ka Talab, Chinhat, Gosainganj, Kakori, Mal, Malihabad, Mohanlalganj, Sarojini Nagar, out of those the Malihabad and Bakshi Ka Talab could be decided on proportionally for the study Because of the best wide variety of farmers included below Mango cultivation. A whole listing of all The fundamental mango cultivated village become organized in session with the non-public of sales and agriculture branch from the diagnosed block have been decided on from the listing so organized on the premise of most region mango cultivation. Thus general villages have been decided on for the prevailing investigation. Selection of respondents- for choice of respondents, a complete listing of mango cultivators become put together from every diagnosed village from each the block with the assist of villages patwari and agriculture officials of respective village, mango cultivators have been decided on proportionally from every village diagnosed block etc. one hundred twenty farmers have been blanketed with inside the pattern for the prevailing investigation [2-10].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, data regarding socio-economic profile are- Age, Education, Marital status, Religion, Caste status, Family type & Family size etc are included which is given as follows-

Age: On basis of age, the respondents were arranged into three classifications.

It is apparent from the Table 1 that greater part of the respondents (46.66 percent) were seen in the middle age classification of up to 40-60 years of age followed by old age above 60 years (30 percent) and young age 0-40 years (23.33 percent) respectively. In this way, most of the respondents (Farmers) fall in the classification old enough gathering up to 40 - 60 years.

It is clear from the Table 2 that greater part of both respondent were educated up to High

school and Intermediate 21.66 % followed by Middle 18.33 %, graduate 14.16 %, post graduate 14.16 %, Illiterate 6.66 % and primary education 4.28 %.

It is clear from the Table 3 that greater part of respondents found under the married Category (80.33 per cent) followed by unmarried category (13.33 per cent) and other specific (5.83 per cent).

It is obvious from the Table 4 that most extreme number of the respondents was found in planned position (50%) trailed by other in reverse standing (23.33 percent), general category (20 per cent) and scheduled Tribes (6.66 per cent). Thus, it may be said that the Scheduled caste was dominant in the study area [11-16].

It is evident from the Table 5 that the 95.83 per cent respondent's belonged to joint family system followed by 4.16 % of the respondents who belong to Nuclear family system. It revealed that the fact is majority of respondents 95.83% belongs Joint family system.

It is evident from the Table 6 that 46.66% respondent's families were observed such who had Up to 0-4 members followed by 36.66 per cent families having 5-9 members and the large size of family was observed to be (more than 10) members. The range between minimum and maximum number of family members was recorded from 1 to 18. In this manner, it is reasoned that most of the respondents was found in class of little family size.

Table 1. Distribution of the respondents as per age: n=120

| S.N. | Categories | f | % |
|------|----------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Below 40 years | 28 | 23.33 |
| 2 | 40 - 60 years | 56 | 46.66 |
| 3 | Above 90 years | 36 | 30 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f=frequency, S.D. = 16.89, Mean =52.09, max =86, min. =23.

Table 2. Distribution of the respondents as indicated by their schooling: n=120

| S. No. | Education Level | f | % |
|--------|-------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Illiterate | 8 | 06.66 |
| 2 | Literate | 112 | 93.34 |
| 1 | Primary education | 4 | 04.28 |
| 2 | Middle | 22 | 18.33 |
| 3 | High school | 26 | 21.66 |
| 4 | Intermediate | 26 | 21.66 |
| 5 | Graduate | 17 | 14.16 |
| 6 | Post Graduate | 17 | 14.16 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f=frequency, Mean = 3.47, S. D. = 1.66, max. = 6, min = 0.

Table 3. Distribution of the respondents as per their conjugal status: (n=120)

| S.N. | Categories | f | % |
|------|----------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Married | 97 | 80.33 |
| 2 | Unmarried | 16 | 13.33 |
| 3. | Other specific | 07 | 05.83 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, S.D. = 0.55, Mean = 1.25, Max. = 3, Min. =1.

Table 4. Distribution of the respondents as per their Caste status: (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|----------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Scheduled Caste | 60 | 50.00 |
| 2 | ST | 8 | 06.66 |
| 3 | Other Backward Caste | 28 | 23.33 |
| 4 | General Caste | 24 | 20.00 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f=frequency, Mean= 2.56, S. D. = 0.88, Max. = 4, Min. = 1.

Table 5. Distribution of the respondents as per their family type: (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|----------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Nuclear Family | 5 | 04.16 |
| 2 | Joint Family | 115 | 95.83 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, S.D. = 0.20, Mean = 1.04, Max = 2, Min. = 1.

Table 6. Distribution of the respondents as per their family size: (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|-----------------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Small (0-4 member) | 56 | 46.66 |
| 2 | Medium (5-9 member) | 44 | 36.66 |
| 3 | Large (more than 10 member) | 20 | 16.66 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, Mean =1.7, S.D. = 0.74, Range-Min. =1, Max. = 3.

It is apparent from the Table 7 that larger part of respondents were exist in little size ranchers classification (40%) trailed by Marginal scale ranchers 33.33 %, medium scale ranchers 23.33% and in conclusion Large scope ranchers 03.33%.

It is evident from Table 8 that maximum 60 % of the respondents were found in the pay classifications of Rs. 1,00,000- 4,00,000 followed by other categories viz., 6.66per cent (above Rs. 5,00,000), 3.33per cent (up to 1,00,000).The

average income was observed to Rs. 1,38,000 with a range of minimum Rs. 38000 and maximum Rs. 750000.

It is apparent from the Table 9 that larger part of the respondents 36.66 % were having participation in more than two organization followed by participation in one organization (26.66per cent), and participation in two organizations (26.66per cent) and very least number of respondents (10per cent) have no participation in any organization.

Table 7. Distribution of the respondents as per their land holding: (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|---------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Marginal (0-1 ha.) | 40 | 33.33 |
| 2 | Small (1 – 2ha.) | 48 | 40.00 |
| 3 | Medium (2-4 ha.) | 28 | 23.33 |
| 4 | Large (above 4 ha.) | 4 | 03.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, Mean = 1.96, S.D. = 0.83, Range - Min. = 1, Max. = 4.

Table 8. Distribution of the respondents as per their annual income: (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Up to 1,00,000 Rs. | 40 | 03.33 |
| 2 | 1,00000 Rs -400000 Rs | 72 | 60.00 |
| 3 | Above 500000 Rs | 08 | 06.66 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, Mean = 1.71, S.D. = 1.31, Min. = 0.35, Max. = 6.

Table 9. Distribution of the respondents as per their social participation: (n=120)

| S. N. | Category | f | % |
|-------|---|-----|-------|
| 1 | No Participation | 12 | 10.00 |
| 2 | Participation in one organization | 32 | 26.66 |
| 3 | Participation in two organization | 32 | 26.66 |
| 4 | Participation in more than two organization | 44 | 36.66 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, S.D. = 1.01, Mean = 1.9, Max. = 3, Min. = 0.

It is apparent from the Table 10 that 66.66per penny respondents were having Pumping set/Diesel motor, 50per penny respondents were having Tractor, 25per penny respondents have

electric engine, 15per penny of the respondents were having power turner, and 8.33 percent respondents were have Bullocks.

Table 10. Distribution of the respondents as per their farm power: (n=120)

| S. N. | Category | f | % |
|-------|----------------------------|-----|-------|
| 1 | Bullock | 10 | 08.33 |
| 2 | Electric motor | 30 | 25.00 |
| 3 | Pumping set/ Diesel engine | 80 | 66.66 |
| 4 | Power tiller | 18 | 15.00 |
| 5 | Tractor | 60 | 50.00 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Table 11. Distribution of the respondents as per their household materials: (n=120)

| S. No | Particulars | f | % |
|-------|------------------|-----|--------|
| 1. | Double bed | 54 | 45.00 |
| 2. | Sofa set | 28 | 23.33 |
| 3. | Dressing Table | 40 | 33.33 |
| 4. | Gas cylinder | 98 | 81.66 |
| 5. | Electric press | 70 | 58.33 |
| 6. | Pressure cooker | 120 | 01.00 |
| 7. | Crockery | 60 | 50.00 |
| 8. | Fan | 140 | 116.66 |
| 9. | Cooler | 60 | 50.00 |
| 10. | Solar light | 40 | 33.33 |
| 11. | Heater | 80 | 66.66 |
| 12. | Cots | 100 | 83.33 |
| 13. | Sewing machine | 90 | 75.00 |
| 14. | Chair | 160 | 133.33 |
| 15. | Wall watch | 140 | 116.66 |
| 16. | Induction cooker | 56 | 46.66 |
| 17. | Washing machine | 40 | 33.33 |
| 18. | Dining Table | 45 | 37.50 |

Denotes the different household material posses by the respondents.

medium (28.33 percent) and significant level (28.33 percent) of monetary inspiration.

It is apparent from the Table 12 that penny percent of the respondents have cell phone. PC is moved by 66.66 percent of the respondents, 50% respondents have PC, 35 per cent respondents have subscribed to the newspaper, Radio is possessed by 73.33 per cent, TV is possessed by 79.16 per cent and DTH is possessed by 48.33 per cent.

It is obvious from the Table 14 that the majority of the respondents were found with medium (60%) level of logical direction followed by High (28.33 percent) degree and afterward in conclusion Low (11.66 percent) level of logical direction.

Table 15 denotes the extension contacts by the respondents.

It is clear from the Table 13 that greater part of the respondents (43.33 percent) was having Low degree of financial inspiration followed by

It is evident from the Table 15 that is out of 3 variables studied. The variable of formal source

is average mean of 3.86. Found the Ranks of Formal Sources is Kisan sahayak (I), Followed by Agril. Scientist is (II), Mandy Samiti (III), and Agril. College/University (IV), Fertilizers/Seed Stores (v), Co-operatives (VI), Gram- Pradhan (VII), B.D.O.(VIII), V.D.O.(IX), and A.D.O.(X). Variable of Informal Sources Average Mean is 4.59. In this table result is available in Ranks Local Leaders (I), Followed by Relatives (II), Progressive Farmers (III), Friends (IV), Neighbour's (V), and Family Members (VI).

In third variable Mass Media Exposure result found in Ranks. In this table ranks followed one by one. Average Mean of Mass Media Exposures is 3.86. T.V (I), Relatives (II), Radio (III),Posters (IV), Social Media (V), Others (VI), Folders (VII), Agri. Books (VIII), Circular Letters (IX), Farm Magazines (X), Farmers Fair (XI), Folders (XII), and Demonstration (XIII).

Table 12. Distribution of the respondents as per their communication media possession (n=120)

| S.N. | Particulars | f | % |
|------|--------------|-----|-------|
| 1. | Radio | 88 | 73.33 |
| 2. | T.V. | 95 | 79.16 |
| 3. | D.T.H. | 58 | 48.33 |
| 4. | Mobile phone | 120 | 100 |
| 5. | Computer | 80 | 66.66 |
| 6. | Laptop | 60 | 50.00 |
| 7. | News Paper | 42 | 35.00 |

Table 13. Distribution of the respondents as per their economic motivation level (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|----------------|-----|-------|
| 1. | Low (up to 25) | 52 | 43.33 |
| 2. | Medium (25-30) | 34 | 28.33 |
| 3. | High (30-40) | 34 | 28.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f=frequency, Mean=26.60, S.D. = 5.61, Range- Min. =15, Max. =39.2.

Table 14. Distribution of the respondents as per their scientific orientation (n=120)

| S.N. | Category | f | % |
|------|----------------|-----|-------|
| 1. | Low (29-40) | 14 | 11.66 |
| 2. | Medium (41-60) | 72 | 60.00 |
| 3. | High (78) | 34 | 28.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

f= frequency, Mean=52.16, S.D. =11.20, Range- Min. =29, Max. = 77.4.

Table 15. Distribution of respondents on the basis of extension contact

| S. No. | Source of information | Respondents | |
|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|------|
| | | Mean per score | Rank |
| A. | Formal Sources | | |
| 1. | B.D.O. | 3.13 | VIII |
| 2. | A.D.O. | 2.26 | X |
| 3. | V.D.O. | 2.70 | IX |
| 4. | Kisan Sahayak | 5.70 | I |
| 5. | Gram Pradhan | 3.33 | VII |
| 6. | Co-operatives | 3.53 | VI |
| 7. | Agril. College/University | 3.70 | IV |
| 8. | Mandi Samiti | 3.83 | III |
| 9. | Fertilizer/Seed Stores | 3.63 | V |

| S. No. | Source of information | Respondents | |
|-----------|----------------------------|----------------|------|
| | | Mean per score | Rank |
| 10. | Agril. Scientists | 3.90 | II |
| | Mean | 3.57 | |
| B. | Informal Sources | | |
| 1. | Family Members | 4.23 | VI |
| 2. | Neighbour | 4.50 | V |
| 3. | Friends | 4.60 | IV |
| 4. | Relatives | 4.70 | II |
| 5. | Local Leaders | 4.90 | I |
| 6. | Progressive farmer | 4.63 | III |
| | Mean | 4.59 | |
| C. | Mass Media Exposure | | |
| 1. | Radio | 5.16 | III |
| 2. | T.V. | 6.79 | I |
| 3. | News paper | 6.14 | II |
| 4. | News bulletins | 3.76 | VII |
| 5. | Farm magazines | 3.54 | X |
| 6. | Circular letters | 3.55 | IX |
| 7. | Agri. Books | 3.72 | VIII |
| 8. | Posters | 4.92 | IV |
| 9. | Farmers fair | 1.66 | XI |
| 10. | Demonstration | 1.50 | XIII |
| 11. | Folders | 1.57 | XII |
| 12. | Social Media | 4.03 | V |
| 13. | Others | 3.94 | VI |
| | Mean | 3.86 | |

4. CONCLUSION

The greater part of respondents (46.66 per cent) was observed in the middle age category of up to 40-60 years. The greater part of the both respondents was educated up to High school and Intermediate (21.66 per cent). The greater part of respondents found under the married Category (80.33 per cent). The maximum number of the respondents was found in scheduled caste (50 per cent). The majority of 95.83 per cent respondent's belonged to joint family system. The 46.66 per cent respondent's families were observed such as who had Up to 0-4 members. The best part of the respondents was existed in small size farmer category (40 per cent). The most extreme (60%) of the respondents were found in the pay classes of Rs. 100,000-400,000. The larger piece of the respondents (36.66 percent) was having interest in multiple associations. The 66.66 per penny respondents were having Pumping set/Diesel motor, 50% respondents were having Tractor, 25% respondents have electric engine, 15% of the respondents were having power turner, and 8.33 percent respondents were have Bullocks. The penny percent of the respondents have cell phone. PC is moved by 66.66 percent of the

respondents, 50% respondents have PC, 35% respondents have preferred the paper, Radio is moved by 73.33 percent, TV is moved by 79.16 percent and DTH is moved by 48.33 percent. The mass of the respondents (43.33 percent) were having Low degree of financial inspiration. The greater part of the respondents were found with medium (60%) level of logical direction.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Ganeshamurthy AN, Rupa TR, Shivananda TN. Enhancing Mango Productivity through Sustainable Resource Management, Published in Journal of Hortl. Sci. 2018;13(1):1-31.
2. Aski SG, Hirevenkanagoudar LV. Extent of adoption of improved mango cultivation practices by the KVK trained farmers. Published in Asian Sciences. 2010;5(2): 98-101.

3. Balaji J, Manjunath L. Knowledge level of farmers regarding recommended cultivation practices of mango. *Journal of Agriculture Update*. 2011;6(2):73-76.
4. Bhole RS, Thakur KK, Atrey AH. Sources of information, knowledge and adoption of dry land horticulture technology by farmers, Published in national level seminar on changing scenario of rainfed horticulture in rural areas, MAU, Parbhani (M.S.). 1990; 14-200.
5. Chatterjee D, Jha SK, Maiti S. Effect of multimedia on preparation of traditional dairy products at the household level. Published in *Journal of Agriculture*. 2019;4(2): 212-235.
6. Chaudhari SK, Singh A. NRM Interventions for Enhanced Mango Productivity and Quality, Published in *Advanced Agricultural Research & Technology Journal*. 2019;3(1): 9-29.
7. Chauhan NB, Siddhartha DSD, Patel JG. Entrepreneurial distinctive features of poultry entrepreneur. Published in *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.* 2003;14:42-45.
8. Chinchmalatpure UR. Sardar Sarovar Project affected farmers' attitude towards rehabilitated place and their adoption of agricultural technology. Published in Ph.D Thesis, G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar; 2001.
9. Dana SS, Kanbid BR. Impact of knowledge on attitude of livestock owners towards artificial insemination in cattle. Published in *Indian Vet. J.* 1998;75(6):572-573.
10. Dibaba R, Hagos A, Bekele A, Alemu D. Challenges and Opportunities of Mango Production and Marketing in Assosa Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Region: Evidence from Ethiopia. Published in *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*. 2019; 53(1):2422-8451.
11. Diwan YB. Study on role performance of Tribal farm women in Adoption of maize production technology in Dahod dist. of Guj. State. Published in M.Sc. thesis, GAU, S. K. Nagar; 2000.
12. Dodia LB. Assessment of Training Needs of Tobacco Growers with Regard to Tobacco Nursery Management in Kheda District of Gujarat State. Published in M.Sc. (Agri). Thesis, G.A.U., Anand Campus, Anand; 1997.
13. Dongardive VT. A study on adoption of recommended technology of chilly crop by chilly Growers of Anand district of Gujarat state. Published in M.Sc (Agri.) thesis G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar; 2002.
14. Gouda KC. Extent of adoption of banana cultivation technology by the farmers of Anand Taluka of Gujarat State. Published in M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis, GAU, S.K. Nagar; 1995.
15. Jawale PS, Nachane MN. Socio-personal characteristics and adoption of recommended practices of mango and citrus crops. Published in *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edn.* 1994;13:139.
16. Joshi PI. Extent of knowledge and adoption of farmers about modern practices of cotton in Bhal area of Gujarat state. Published in M.Sc (Agri.) thesis. G.A.U, Sardar Krushinagar; 2004.

© 2022 Kumar et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/73692>