

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 9; Issue 6; June 2026; Page No. 1005-1007

Received: 14-03-2026
Accepted: 18-04-2026

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Socio-economic, communication and psychological profile by the farmers in Satna, District of M.P.

¹Jay Prakash Bishi, ²Yogendra Kumar Singh and ³Beena Singh

¹Research Scholar (Agriculture Extension), MGCGVV, Chitrakoot, Madhya Pradesh, Satna

²Professor (Agriculture Extension), MGCGVV, Chitrakoot, Satna, Madhya Pradesh, Satna

³Assistant Professor, Atarra P.G. College, Atarra, Uttar Pradesh, India

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2026.v9.i6m.3806>

Corresponding Author: Jay Prakash Bishi

Abstract

The present study has been conducted to study the socio-economic status of tomato growers in the Satna, District of Madhya Pradesh. The multi-stage sampling technique and pre-tested interview schedule were used for data collection for the study. A sample was collected from eight villages in Satna district to make a total sample size of 240 tomato growers in the study area for the agricultural year 2025. Mean, percentage, frequency, and standard deviation were used to find out the socio-economic status of tomato growers. The result stated that majority of interviewee highest middle age group, Middle school level, OBC category, Largest percentage had small family, involved in Agriculture, medium annual income group, marginal farmer, land holdings. tube well use for irrigation, medium farm power, medium extension contact, medium mass media exposure, medium social participation, medium risk orientation, medium low market orientation and medium economic motivation.

Keywords: Socio, economic, communicational and Tomato Growers

Introduction

Agriculture, is the science, art, and practice of producing food, fiber, fuel, and other products. It includes everything from planting and irrigation to harvesting and sophisticated farming methods like advanced farm preparation. By supplying food, raw materials, and economic stability, agriculture serves as the foundation for humankind. Vegetables are the edible parts of plants—like stems, roots, leaves, flowers, or even savory fruits—consumed for nutrition, providing essential vitamins, minerals, fiber, and antioxidants, crucial for a healthy diet and disease prevention, often divided by largely water content and low calories, and enjoyed raw or cooked in various culinary traditions. Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) plays an important role by providing economic and nutritional security to producers. It is one of the most important cash crops ranked second after potato.

The seeds can be sown direct in the land or raised in nursery & then transplanted. For nursery sowing, seeds are sowing in seed trays or beds covered with a thin layer of soil. Sowing season – May – June and November – December. The plants are usually transplanted after 4-6 weeks when they are about 15-20 cm tall. The distance between rows should ideally be 60-90, cm & between plants 30-45 cm. Regular irrigation is very important, especially during dry season. Tomatoes are usually harvested when they reach the mature pink stage, depending on the variety. Harvesting begins 60-90 days after transplanting. Fruits are harvesting at the mature green or ripening stage depending on the

distance to the market. The fruits should be graded and packed properly. Stored in cool and ventilated conditions. Tomatoes are in high demand in local and processing markets.

Increasing demand from hotels, restaurants, and fast food chains. Can be grown in different climates and agro-climatic zones. Suitable for crop rotation, intercropping, and multiple cropping systems. Efficient use of land and resources. Easily available & affordable vegetable. Plays a major role in improve. nutritional security of population. Important component of daily diets in urban or rural location. A large proportion of produce is lost after harvest due to improper handling, storage, and transportation. Adoption of PHT like grading, proper packaging, cold storage, and efficient transport can significantly reduce these losses and improve marketable surplus. Value addition through processing (sauce, ketchup, puree) further enhances income opportunities. Adoption of recommended plant protection measures and post-harvest handling techniques helps in producing safe, residue-free, and high-quality tomatoes, which are increasingly demanded by consumers and processing industries.

Methodology

This Chapter discusses the materials or method used for gathering the data needed in the research as well as the variables and how they were measured. Out of these, M.P. were selected for the research. The Baghelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh consists of 55 districts for the study, Satna

district has been selected because this district is close to the university area. District Satna is comprised of eight blocks. Further, out of two blocks, Maihar or Amrapattan blocks were selected. Using a random sample technique, from each block, four communities were selected. Eight communities in all have been chosen from two blocks maihar block village namely- Berma, Barhi, Itama, Ghunwara and Amarpattan - Gora, Lalpur, Magraj, Majhgawaon. Thus, A

240 respondents selected for the research. 30 respondents selected in each village. The first hand data collection method used. The analysis techniques used in the were tabulation, percent, SD, Mean, Percentage.

Results and Discussion

Social - Financial, communication and psychological profile

Social - Financial, communication and psychological profile		F	%
Age	Up to Thirty Five years	68	28.33
	Thirty six – fifty five years	158	65.83
	Above fifty five years	14	5.84
Education	Unschool	6	2.50
	Can read only	22	9.16
	Can read and, write	35	14.58
	Primary	54	22.50
	Middle	64	26.26
	High school	45	18.75
	Graduate	14	5.83
Caste	ST	34	14.17
	SC	51	21.25
	OBC	103	42.92
	GENERAL	52	21.67
Family size	Little (< 5 members)	100	41.67
	Medium (6 to 8 members)	69	28.75
	Big (>8 members)	71	29.58
Farming experience	Up to Fifteen years	50	20.83
	Fifteen to thirty years	154	64.17
	Above thirty years	36	15.00
Occupation	Agriculture	103	42.92
	Agriculture + labour	68	28.33
	Agriculture + Service	59	24.92
	Agriculture + Business	10	4.17
Annual Income	Less (up to 124000)	46	19.17
	Medium (Rs. 124000 –248000)	143	59.58
	High (Above Rs. 248000)	51	21.25
Land holding	“one hectare”	116	48.33
	“one hectare to two hectare”	79	32.92
	“two hectare to four hectare”	26	10.83
	“Four hectare to ten hac.”	14	5.83
	“Above ten hectare”	5	2.08
Irrigation facility	Tube Well	129	49.58
	Submersible+ Well	78	32.50
	Canal	00	00
	Well+Pond	43	17.92
Farm power	Low (up to 1.61)	74	30.83
	Medium (1.62-6.67)	142	59.17
	High (Above 6.67)	24	10.00
Extension contact	Low (Up to 7.03)	69	28.75
	Medium (7.03-18.84)	116	48.33
	High (Above 18.84)	55	22.92
Mass Media Exposure	Low (Up to 6.09)	64	26.67
	Medium (6.09-16.91)	122	50.83
	High (Above 16.91)	54	22.50
Social Participation	Less	60	25.00
	Moderate	115	47.92
	Big	65	27.08
Risk Orientation	Low (Up to 10.62)	51	21.25
	Medium (10.62-24.34)	132	55.00
	High (Above 24.34)	57	23.75
Marketing Orientation	Low (Up to 7.09)	43	17.92
	Medium (7.09-11.7)	149	62.08
	High (Above 11.7)	48	20.00
Economic Motivation	Low (Up to 14.02)	51	21.25
	Medium (14.02-24.79)	111	46.25
	High (Above 24.79)	78	32.50

The table indicate that the interviewee “65.83%” “middle age, “young age category 28.33%” or “old age group 5.84%” respectively. largest farmers 26.26 per cent “Middle school level, 22.50 per cent respondents Primary, 18.75 percent respondents High school, 14.58 percent respondents had Can read & write, 9.16 per cent “Can read only”, 5.83% Graduate & 2.50% Illiterate. Highest (42.92%) “Other backward castes’, 21.67% general, 21.25 percent SC and 14.17% were from ST. largest per cent (41.67%) had “small family, followed by 29.58% “large” and 28.75% “medium family”. Big per cent (64.17%) had medium, ‘followed by 20.83% less and 15% high Farming Experience. (42.92%), per cent “involved in Agriculture, followed by “Agriculture + labour (28.22%)”, whereas Agriculture + service (24.92%), and only (4.17%) Agriculture + business. 59.58% “medium income category’, 21.25 per cent into high income category’, and 19.17% the less earning category. 48.33% “marginal farmer, 32.92% had small land holdings, 10.83% Semi-medium, 5.83% Medium and only 2.08% had large land holdings. largest farmers, 49.58% had tube well, 32.50% had submersible + well, and 17.92% had well + pond. largest interviewee, 59.17% “medium Farm Power, 30.83% “less Farm Power”, and 10.00% “high farm power”. 48.33% “medium Extension Contact, 28.75 percent low, or 22.92 per cent high Extension Contact. largest 50.83% “medium Mass Media Exposure’, 26.67 percent low, and 22.50 per cent high MME. largely interviewee, 47.92% “medium SP, 27.08 percent high, and 25.00 percent into the low. (47.92%) “medium Social Participation category”. 55.00% “medium RO, 23.75 percent high, and 21.25 percent into the low. 62.08% medium MO, 20.00 percent high, and 17.92 percent into the low. 46.25% medium Economic Motivation, 32.50 percent high, and 21.25 percent into the low.

Conclusion

Majority of the interviewee is middle age category, related to up to middle age group, middle school level, other backward castes, small family, medium farming experience. Occupation agriculture, medium annual income category, marginal farmer, use for tube well, medium farm power, medium extension contact, medium Mass Media Exposure, Social Participation, medium low Risk Orientation, medium low market orientation and medium and economic motivation.

References

1. Amar AK, Padhy C, Prusty AK, Reddy C, Kumari A. A study on socio-economic and personal characteristics of tomato growers in South. *International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development*. 2024;7(6):118-121.
2. Singh B, Singh YK, Singh L. Socio-economic profile of the KVK trainees in Barwani District. *Advance Research in Agriculture and Veterinary Science*. 2019;5(2):18-20.
3. Mansuree M, Kumar V, Singh YK. To the study on socio-economic status of sesame growers of Satna District of M.P. *International Journal of Food and Nutritional Sciences*. 2023;12(1):4892-4895.
4. Sharma PK, Choudhary MK, Shekhawat BS, Prajapati KA. Socio-economic status and constraints faced by tomato growers in Kheda District. *J Krishi Vigyan*. 2016;5(1):114-116.
5. Sangavi M, Janaki Rani A, Pushpa J, Prabakaran K. Socio-economic status of tomato growers in Madurai District of Tamil Nadu. *Ind J Pure App Biosci*. 2020;8(6):511-514.
6. Sahu D, Sahu T, Pyasi VK, Agrawal SK. To study the profile and entrepreneurial behaviour of tomato growers in the Panagar Block of Jabalpur District (MP). *J Pharmacogn Phytochem*. 2020;9(2S):154-159.
7. Solanki VS, Singh YK, Singh B. The impact of socio-economic status of the respondents, Khandwa District of M.P. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*. 2025;13(9):A865-A869.
8. Bansal V, Joshi V. Socio-economic profile characteristics of farmers regarding use of ICT tools. *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci*. 2019;8(7):164-170. doi:10.20546/ijcmas.2019.807.020.
9. Yadav KN, Sharma ML. Socio-economic status of sericulture of Chhattisgarh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education and Rural Development*. 2016;24:156-161. <https://www.rseeudaipur.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2016.pdf#page=168>