https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A01726

UTILIZATION PATTERN OF INFRASTRUCTURAL FACILITIES BY RICE FARMERS

R. ANNAMALAI and V. SEKAR

Dept. of Agrl. Extension and Rural Sociology, Agricultural College and Research Institute., Madurai.

ABSTRACT

The extent of utilization of all the infrastructural facilities was not uniform among the different categories of farmers. Hence extension methods like meetings and campaigns are to be arranged to convince the farmers about the advantages of utilising various facilities. It was found that the regulated market and storage and ware housing facilities were not completely utilized by the rice farmers. Hence the extension functionaries should take necessary steps to popularise these facilities. The important constraint was non-availability of organisations to obtain the credit, input and implements. Hence they are to be established by observing scientific procedures.

KEY WORDS : Intra structural facilities, utilization level, Rice farmers.

Availability of infrastructural facilities induces to go in for widespread use of new agricultural technologies leading to higher level of productivity. Joshi (1987) reported that it is universally recognised that infrastructure development plays a critical role in initiating and accelerating the process of economic development. Thus realising the importance of the infrastructural facilities in increasing the productivity of crop, this study was formulated with the following objectives taking into account the rice farmers.

1. to assess the utilization level of infrastructural facilities among different categories of rice farmers and

2. to study the problems encountered by the rice farmers in utilising the infrastructural facilities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in thirteen villages of Tiruchendur block in Chidambaranar district of Tamil Nadu. By employing probability proportionate random sampling procedure, a fixed sample of 40 marginal farmers, 40 small farmers and 40 big farmers among the contact farmers were selected for study. A well structured interview schedule was constructed, pretested, modified and the data were collected through personal interview. Suitable statistical tools were used in analysing the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Majority of marginal farmers (50.00 per cent) were found to have low level utilisation of the infrastructural facilities followed by small farmers (25.00 per cent). It is a good

Table 1. Distribution of rice farmers according to their utilization level

Utilisation level	Farmers								Chi-square value
	Marginal (n = 40)		Small (n = 40)		Big (n = 40)		Total (n = 120)		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Low	20	50.00	10	25.00	..	..	30	25.00	
Medium	17	42.50	20	50.00	34	85.00	71	59.17	30.853**
High	3	7.50	10	25.00	6	15.00	19	15.83	
Total	40	100.00	40	100.00	40	100.00	120	100.00	

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

Table 2. Coefficient of correlation between the characteristics of farmers and their infrsture utilizatior level of farmers and their infrastructure utilization level.

S.No	Characteristics	Correlation coefficient value 'r'		
		Marginal farmers (n = 40)	Small farmers (n = 40)	Big farmers (n = 40)
1.	Education	0.3459*	0.3187*	0 3556*
2.	Mass media exposure	0.4697**	0.3555*	0.4547**
3.	Extension agency contact	0.3265*	0.5545**	0.1002 NS
4.	Socio-economic status	0.3134*	0.3416*	0.3278*
5.	Scientific orientation	0.3857*	0.3485*	0.3762*
6.	Risk orientation	0.0047 NS	0.3153*	0.3739*

* * Significant at 0.05 level of probability   * Significant at 0.01 level of probability
N S - Non-significant

sign to note that no one big farmer is under low category level. The chi-square value confirmed that the rice farmers differed significantly from one category to other with respect to their utilisation of infrastructural facilities (Table 1).

The factors such as education, mass media exposure, socio-economic status and scientific orientation had brought out a significant relationship among all the categories of farmers with their utilisation level (Table 2).

Table 3. Problems encountered by the rice farmers in utilising the infrastructural facilities

S.No	Problems	Marginal farmers (n = 40)			Small farmers (n = 40)			Big farmers (n = 40)		
		No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank
1.	Lack of credit institutional facilities and non-availability of credit in time	36	90.00	I	34	85.00	I	17	42.50	VI
2.	Lack of facilities for marketing and non-availability of credit in regulated market	33	82.50	II	29	72.50	II	20	50.00	II
3.	Lack of facilities for purchase and repair of agricultural implements	31	77.50	III	24	60.00	V	19	47.50	III
4.	Lack of facilities for purchase of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides	28	70.00	IV	21	52.50	VII	23	57.50	I
5.	Lack of transport facility	26	65.00	V	23	57.50	VI	16	40.00	VIII
6.	Inadequate storage facility	25	62.50	VI	19	47.50	VIII	17	42.50	VII
7.	Lack of facility for co-operative milk society	23	57.50	VII	25	62.50	IV	19	47.50	IV
8.	Complete lack of cooperative agro-service centre facility	19	47.50	VIII	27	67.50	III	18	45.00	V
9.	Lack of village extension worker residing at the village	18	45.00	IX	15	37.50	IX	13	32.50	IX

It is a fact that the farmers with high level of education and scientific orientation and having exposure to various mass media like radio, newspapers, leaflet and booklet etc., might have naturally gained better knowledge to utilise various infrastructural facilities existing over a space than other farmers. It is also fact that the farmers who are economically sound could have respect in the area and utilise the facilities with some command.

With regard to facility-wise utilisation of infrastructural facilities, cent per cent of the three categories of farmers had utilized the fertilizer shop facilities. It was also found that majority of all the categories of farmers had utilised seed shop, pesticide shop, services of Assistant Agricultural Officers, Agricultural Officers and Veterinary Sub-Centre. It was discouraging to note that none of the rice farmers had utilized the facilities storage and ware housing and regulated market. The utilisation of primary agricultural cooperative society was comparatively very low among all the three categories of farmers. It was also found that no one marginal farmer had utilized the nationalised bank facility.

Lack of credit facilities and non-availability credit in time were the major problems for poor utilization among the marginal and small farmers, since finance was not a constraint to them (Table 3). Lack of marketing and non-availability of credit in regulated market was the second major problem as this got the second rank in all the categories of farmers. Lack of facilities for the purchase and repair of agricultural implements was the third major problem expessed by marginal and big farmers whereas it was ranked as fifth by small farmers.

REFERENCES

JOSHI, B.M. 1987. Planning for infrastructure development: some policy issues. **The Ind. Journal of Public Administration, 33(4):** 918-928.

ECONOMICS OF MILK PRODUCTION IN HOMESTEADS - A CASE STUDY IN TRIVANDRUM DISTRICT

ELSAMMA JOB[1], E.K. THOMAS[2] and K.S. KARAYALAR[3]
Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture,
Vellayani - 695 522, Trivandrum Dist, Kerala.

ABSTRACT

Average milk yield per animal per annum was observed to be 1217 litres and 1989 litres respectively for buffaloes and cows. On the basis of a comparative study of feed, fodder and other costs on buffaloes and cows, it was observed that the expenditure on feed and labour was productive in both cases to such an extent that the income increased by 144 and and 135 per cent respectively of the additional expenditure on feed and labour in the former and 228 and 194 per cent in the case of latter. On the contarary, expenditure on other costs was productive in the case of buffaloes and a source of loss in the case of cows to such an extent that income from buffaloes increased by 8.62 per cent and in the case of cows it decreased by 7.21 per cent of the additional expenditure on other coats.

KEY WORDS : Milk Production, Economics.

In our rural economy, livestock raising provides an important means of livelihood to the agriculturists. Livesotck plays a complementary role in crop production, since fodder provides food for animals and farm yard manure is a valuable source of organic manure. Milk and milk products besides providing valuable food for the rural population also serve as an important source of income. India occupies 191