



***The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library***

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*



# **A Study on Socio-economic Status of Tomato Growers in Solan District of Himachal Pradesh**

**Tenzing Palmu Sherpa <sup>a\*</sup>, Pratima Rana <sup>b++</sup>,  
Parvani Sharma <sup>c#</sup> and Samriti <sup>d++</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Department of Agricultural Extension, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India.

<sup>b</sup> Directorate of Extension Education, Dr. Y S Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India.

<sup>c</sup> Government College for Women, Parade, Jammu, India.

<sup>d</sup> Department of Social Sciences, Dr. Y S Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India.

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author TPS designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author PR guidance throughout the research study, read and approved the final manuscript. Author PS helped in the selection of research title and designed the sampling plan for the study. Author Samriti assisted in statistical analysis and proofreading. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2023/v41i31855

## **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/96530>

**Received: 14/12/2022**

**Accepted: 20/02/2023**

**Published: 28/02/2023**

**Original Research Article**

## **ABSTRACT**

Tomato is one of the most consumed and produced horticulture crops in the world. It is more economical than food grains due to their higher production per unit area in less time as they provide a good source of income to farmers. The present study has been conducted to study the

<sup>++</sup> Assistant Professor;

<sup>#</sup> Lecturer;

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: tezingp@gmail.com;

socio-economic status of tomato growers in the Solan district of Himachal 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 Solan district to make a total sample size of 80 tomato growers in the study area for the agricultural year 2021-2022. Mean, percentage, frequency, and standard deviation were used to find out the socio-economic status of tomato growers. The result revealed that majority i.e., 80 per cent of tomato growers belonged to middle aged group and 33.75 per cent had primary school education. About 76.25 per cent of tomato growers had joint family with 3 to 7 family members. 77.5 per cent of tomato growers had 0.5 to 3.17 bigha under tomato cultivation with 11 to 42 years of farming experience. The gross income of tomato growers was Rs. 60,000 per bigha and net income was Rs. 38,353 per bigha. The output input ratio worked out to be 1.77. The majority i.e., 55 per cent of tomato growers had medium level of socio-economic class. This study suggests the appointment of more extension personnel at grass root level. This study will be helpful in developing suitable and effective extension programmes to increase tomato production.

**Keywords:** Gross income; net income; production; socio-economic status; tomato growers.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

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. It is one of the most consumed and cultivated solanaceous plant species. Tomato belongs to the nightshade family, Solanaceae with other crops like eggplants, tobacco, potato, chilies, etc. Today whole world uses tomatoes as king ingredients in their dish. Tomato is the most popular vegetable in the world with an annual production of approximately 180 million tonnes on a global scale. India is a resource-rich country where agriculture and its allied sectors provide the majority of people's income. Agriculture employs more than 70% of India's total workforce. Agriculture is vital to the country's economy. The agricultural sector contributed 20.2 per cent in 2020-21. The total geographical area of the country is 328.7 million hectares, with a net sown area of 139.5 million hectares. The gross cropped area is 197.05 million hectares, with a net irrigated area of 68.65 million hectares [1]. In Himachal Pradesh, total area under vegetable cultivation was 88.61 thousand hectares with a total production of 1776.02 thousand tons during 2019-20 [2]. In Himachal Pradesh among different vegetables like cabbage, garlic, capsicum, carrot, and chilies, tomato is one of the most commercially grown vegetables mainly in district Solan. Tomato growers require sufficient access to affordable yield-enhancing inputs and modern methods in order to boost their production, profitability, and sustainability [3,4]. Access to appropriate education, health care, and other resources is determined by an individual's or

group's social standing and economic situation [5,6]. There are several studies [7,8] on Indian farmers, but the socioeconomic status of our tomato growers is only mentioned in a few study journals, despite the fact that farmers in the Solan district have been farming tomatoes for many years. Very less information about their socio-economic status is known. Understanding how these study's findings will serve contribute immense importance for future references and will also help researchers acquire insight into the socioeconomic status of tomato growers in the coming days.

In this study, an attempt had been made to understand the ground reality of tomato growers' social and economic status which will further help the policymakers to decide on suitable policies and strategies, for the well-being of the tomato growers. The finding of the study will also contribute to design appropriate extension programmes to boost tomato growers in the study area and other areas with similar situation. With this as a background, the present study was conducted to understand the various effect of social and economic factors on tomato production in the Solan district of Himachal Pradesh.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA/UNIVERSE

Himachal Pradesh is a hilly state in northern India. It is the 16<sup>th</sup> largest state in India covering a total geographical area of 55,673 sq. km. The total population in the state is 68.5 lakh with a population density of 123 people per sq. km. The

literacy rate of the state is 82.8 per cent. There are twelve districts in Himachal Pradesh which includes Bilaspur, Chamba, Hamirpur, Kangra, Kinnaur, Kullu, Lahaul and Spiti, Mandi, Shimla, Sirmaur, Solan and Una. There are three divisions namely Kangra, Mandi and Shimla and 73 sub-divisions in the state.

The present study was carried out in the Solan district of Himachal Pradesh. Among all the twelve districts of Himachal Pradesh, the leading district in the area under tomato cultivation is Solan district. The total area under tomato cultivation in Himachal Pradesh was 11,064 hectares out of which Solan has 4,640 hectares. Besides the Solan district also has the highest tomato production out of all other districts in the state.

## 2.2 Sampling and Sampling Procedure

### 2.2.1 Selection of the district

Out of twelve districts of Himachal Pradesh state, Solan district was selected purposively for the present study as it has the highest area (4,640 ha) and production (2,32,000 tonne) of tomato compared to other districts.

### 2.2.2 Selection of block

District Solan is comprised of five blocks viz, Nalagarh, Kunihar, Solan, Dharampur, and Kandaghat. Further, out of five blocks, Solan and Dharampur blocks were selected purposively on the basis of maximum production among all blocks.

### 2.2.3 Selection of villages

From the two selected blocks i.e. Solan and Dharampur, the further selection of the villages was done randomly using a simple random sampling method. A list of villages was collected from the block and from the list of villages four villages were selected randomly from each selected block without replacement (SRSWOR) i.e. Simple random sampling without replacement was used for the present study. The villages were selected using Random Number Generator.

### 2.2.4 Selection of farmers/respondents

From each selected villages, ten tomato growers were selected randomly to make the total sample of 80 tomato growers. The multi-stage sampling technique was used for the study.

### 2.2.5 Statistical data analysis

For the study, data were collected in accordance with the study's predetermined objectives, which had been coded or scored, classified, and tabulated using appropriate statistical tools, such as IBM Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20, to make inferences pertaining to the research study and draw conclusions, it was calculated using formula as mean, percentage, frequency, and standard deviation. The respondents were categorized in three categories using the Singh cube root method and also based on mean and standard deviation.

## 2.3 Cost Concepts

In this study, the cost of cultivation included was classified as recommended by the "Special expert committee on cost estimates, GOI, New Delhi." The cost concepts considered in this study are as follow:

**Cost A<sub>1</sub>:** It includes

1. Values of hired/owned human labour
2. Value of seed
3. Value of manure and fertilizer
4. Value of insecticides and pesticides and chemical fertilizers
5. Value of bullock and machinery labour
6. Depreciation on implements and farm buildings
7. Land revenue
8. Interest on working capital

**Cost A<sub>2</sub>:** Cost A<sub>1</sub> + Rent paid for leased in land

**Cost B<sub>1</sub>:** Cost A<sub>2</sub> + Interest on value of owned fixed capital assets (Excluding land)

**Cost B<sub>2</sub>:** Cost B<sub>1</sub> + Rental value of owned land (net land revenue) + rent paid for leased in land

**Cost C<sub>1</sub>:** Cost B<sub>1</sub> + Imputed value of family labour

**Cost C<sub>2</sub>:** Cost B<sub>2</sub> + Imputed value of family labour

**Cost C<sub>3</sub>:** Cost C<sub>2</sub> + 10 % of C<sub>2</sub> (managerial cost)

**Gross Income:** Yield of main product (in Qtl) x their price (in Rs)

**Net Income:** Gross income – Cost of cultivation

**Farm Business Income:** Gross Income – Cost A<sub>2</sub>

**Farm Labour Income:** Gross Income -Cost B<sub>2</sub>

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The socio-economic characteristics of tomato growers included age, education, family type, family size, occupation, farming experience, social participation, farm power and implements, land holding of tomato growers. Communication characteristics included extension contact, mass media exposure, and information-seeking behavior along with the area under tomato cultivation, cost and returns of tomato growers are discussed under the following headings:

#### 3.1 Socio-economic Factors of Tomato Growers

The result shows different parameter of social and economic profile of tomato growers in the study area. Table 1 shows that majority 80 per cent of tomato growers were middle aged (34 to 56 years) while 10 per cent of respondents were young and 10 per cent belonged to old aged category. The possible reason could be that they had primary level of education and in order to sustain a livelihood they were engaged in farming which was passed on to them from their forefather. A similar finding was reported by Suman [9]. According to data, 3.75 per cent of respondents were illiterate, 13.75 per cent had middle education, 25 per cent had secondary level of education, 7.5 per cent had completed diploma, 10 per cent graduate and 5 per cent completed post graduation and majority of respondents i.e., 33.75 per cent had completed primary level of education as majority of respondents in the research area were middle aged who could not afford private schools back then and were mostly dependent on government educational institutes located far from the village. The result of study is in accordance with the finding of Parvin [10].

In case of family size, majority i.e., 90 per cent of tomato growers had medium family size with three to seven family members. This is because in the study area majority had joint family type followed by nuclear family type. The results are in agreement with the findings of Parvin [10], Singh et al. [11] and Verma et al. [12]. The fact that only 20 per cent of tomato growers were

purely dependent on agriculture and the majority i.e., 80 per cent of tomato growers have diversified their sources of income to expand their livelihood options to support their livelihood as risk and uncertainties are associated in the farm sector. Table 1 disclosed that majority of tomato growers had medium i.e., 11 to 42 years of experience in cultivation of tomato in the study area. They had been helping their parents and started working in tomato's fields. Majority of respondents had no social participation because that about 80 per cent of tomato growers were occupied in other source of income alongside farming.

The majority had medium level of farm power and machinery due to farmers' small land holdings, which limit their capacity to invest. In terms of landholding majority i.e., 81.25 per cent had 1-5 bigha land followed by 11.25 per cent with six to ten bigha 3.75 per cent with eleven to fifteen bigha and 3.75 per cent with sixteen to twenty bigha. This indicates that majority of respondents were small and marginal farmers. Table 1 clearly elucidates that maximum 77.50 per cent of tomato growers has one to three bigha under tomato cultivation followed by 20 per cent of tomato growers with three to six bigha and 2.5 per cent of tomato growers had six to ten bigha area for tomato cultivation. This is due to the division of land with each generation as it goes from parent to children.

Table 1 shows the communication characteristics of tomato growers. It is revealed that majority 56.25 per cent of tomato growers had medium level of extension contact followed by low level 30 per cent high level 13.75 per cent of extension contacts. Table 1 delineate that 48.75 per cent respondents had medium level of mass media exposure and 33.75 per cent respondents had low level of mass media exposure. 17.50 per cent had high level of mass media exposure in the study area. Reason might be due to their medium level of education, extension contacts and economic conditions. It is inferred from the table that majority 42.50 per cent of tomato growers had medium level of information seeking behavior followed by high level (38.75 per cent) and low level (18.75 per cent) of information seeking behavior. The possible reason for gathering more information could be to make decision on farm related activities that help them grow more crops.

**Table 1. Socio-economic factors of tomato growers**

<b>Socio-economic factors</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages (%)</b>
<b>Age of tomato growers (years)</b>		
Less than 34	08	10.00
34 to 56	64	80.00
More than 56	08	10.00
<b>Education</b>		
Illiterate	03	3.75
Primary	27	33.75
Middle Education	11	13.75
High school	20	25.00
Diploma	06	7.50
Graduate	08	10.00
Post Graduate	04	5.00
<b>Family Type</b>		
Single	18	22.50
Nuclear	01	1.25
Joint	61	76.25
<b>Family Size (in numbers)</b>		
Below 3	03	3.75
3-7	72	90.00
Above 7	05	6.25
<b>Occupation</b>		
Farming (Tomato production)	16	20.00
Farming + Laborer	08	10.00
Farming +Shopkeeper	30	37.50
Farming + Driver	09	11.25
Farming + Business	01	1.25
Farming + Service	16	20.00
<b>Farming Experience (in years)</b>		
Below 11	12	15.00
11-42	67	83.75
Above 42	01	1.25
<b>Social Participation</b>		
No participation	77	96.25
Member of one organization	03	3.75
<b>Farm power and implements</b>		
1-9	20	25.00
9-17	47	58.75
17-26	13	16.25
<b>Land Holding (bigha)</b>		
1- 5	65	81.25
6-10	09	11.25
11-15	03	3.75
16-20	03	3.75
<b>Area under tomato cultivation (bigha)</b>		
1-3	62	77.50
3-6	16	20.00
6-10	02	2.50
<b>Extension contacts</b>		
Low	24	30.00
Medium	45	56.25
High	11	13.75
<b>Mass Media Exposure</b>		
Low	27	33.75
Medium	39	48.75
High	14	17.50
<b>Information Seeking Behavior</b>		
Low	15	18.75
Medium	34	42.50
High	31	38.75

\*1 bigha is equal to 0.0809 ha

**Table 2. Cost and returns analysis of tomato growers in the study area per Bigha**

<b>Particulars</b>		<b>Values (in Rupee)</b>
<b>Cost</b>	Human hired labour	4,600
	Seed/plants	1,500
	FYM cost	1,500
	Fertilizer cost	1,537
	Machinery labour	1,000
	Plant protection	2,600
	Interest on working capital	114.21
	Depreciation	110
	Land Revenue	31.25
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>12,992.46</b>
<b>Cost A<sub>2</sub></b>	Cost A <sub>1</sub>	12,992.46
	Rental value of leased in land	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>12,992.46</b>
<b>Cost B<sub>1</sub></b>	Cost A <sub>1</sub>	12,992.46
	Interest of owned fixed capital	14.12
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>13,006.58</b>
<b>Cost B<sub>2</sub></b>	Cost B <sub>1</sub>	13,006.58
	Rental value of land	1,872.5
	Rental value of leased in land	0
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>14,879.08</b>
<b>Cost C<sub>1</sub></b>	Cost B <sub>1</sub>	13,006.58
	Imputed value of family labour	4,800
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>17,806.58</b>
<b>Cost C<sub>2</sub></b>	Cost B <sub>2</sub>	14,879.08
	Imputed value of family labour	4,800
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>19,679.08</b>
<b>Cost C<sub>3</sub></b>	Cost C <sub>2</sub>	19,679.08
	Value of management input (10% of cost C <sub>2</sub> )	1,967.90
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>21,646.99</b>
	Cost A <sub>1</sub>	12,992.46
	Cost B <sub>2</sub>	14,879.08
	Cost C <sub>3</sub>	21,646.99
	Yield (Qtl.)	30
	Gross income (Rs.)	60,000
	Farm business income (Rs.)	47,007.53
	Farm labour income (Rs.)	45,120.91
	Net Income (Rs.)	38,353.03
<b>Output Input Ratio</b>		<b>1.77</b>

\*1 bigha is equal to 0.0809 ha

### **3.2 Cost and Returns Analysis of Tomato Growers in the Study Area per Bigha**

The cost and returns from production of tomato crop per bigha is presented in Table 2. It delineates that per bigha cost A<sub>1</sub>, cost A<sub>2</sub>, cost B<sub>1</sub>, cost B<sub>2</sub>, cost C<sub>1</sub>, cost C<sub>2</sub>, and cost C<sub>3</sub> of tomato growers was Rs.12,992.46, Rs. 12,992.46, Rs. 13,006.58, Rs. 14879.08, Rs. 17,806.58, Rs. 19,679.08 and Rs. 21,646.99, respectively. The cost of production per bigha and yield per bigha was Rs. 21,646 per bigha and 30 quintals respectively. The gross income of tomato growers came to Rs. 60,000 and net income was observed to Rs. 38,353 per bigha.

The output input ratio was worked out to be 1.77 that means the cultivation of tomato was profitable in the study area.

### **4. CONCLUSIONS**

The inference regarding socioeconomic and communication characteristic of tomato growers clearly depicts that tomato growers are quite aware about the programme and training benefits but lack a deep understanding which is linked with their living standard. Therefore, other mass media source should be utilized to provide more information. The government should appoint more extension personnel to interact with the target groups to understand

their needs and problems in order to fulfill the purpose of the development programme. To educate tomato growers about enhanced crop production, extension agents must visit villages and educate them about enhanced tomato production.

There is a need to encourage and support farming professionals by diversifying the agricultural practices as farming was main occupation only for some percentage of tomato growers. They had already switched over to the non-farm sector to diversify their source of income. Therefore, a welfare program for small and marginal farmer should be implemented in true spirit in all blocks.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful to Department of Agricultural Extension, Shoolini University of Biotechnology and Management Sciences and Department of Agriculture, Solan, Himachal Pradesh for providing me the list of farmers which helped me in the sampling plan of study.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Land use Statistics; 2018. Available:[https://eands.dacnet.nic.in/LUS\\_2017-18](https://eands.dacnet.nic.in/LUS_2017-18). Access on 08/ 10/2021.
2. National Horticulture Board; 2019-2020. Available:<http://nhb.gov.in/StatisticsViewer.aspx> Access on 10/18/2020.
3. Khan MI, Bisen S, Mahajan G. Socio-economic profile of vegetable growers under horticulture based module of farmer first project in Balaghat (Madhya Pradesh), India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020;9(3):3252-3257.
4. Murry N, Lalruatsangi K. Socio economic status and constraints faced by organic vegetable growers in Wokha District of Nagaland, India. Editor Message. 2020;266.
5. Agarwal P, Banerjee A. Economic analysis of tomato cultivation in kandi block of West-Bengal, India. Economic Affairs. 2019;64(3):643-647.
6. Basyal K, Khanal K, Dhakal S. Socio-economic study of tomato producing farmers in Lamahi, Dang. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research. 2019;20(5):15441-15443.
7. Rahman MS, Manjira S, Majumder MK, Rahman S. Socio-economic determinants of off-season summer tomato cultivation. International Journal of Vegetable Science. 2021;27(3): 252-259.
8. Sonkar SP, Shalini. Socioeconomic factors affecting vegetable production in Western Uttar Pradesh. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2020;8(5):244-248.
9. Suman. Socio-economic and psychological characteristics of vegetable growers. International Journal of Scientific Research. 2019;10(01):30544-30547
10. Parvin MM. Farmer's profitability of tomato cultivation in the socio-economic context of Bangladesh: A study at Rangpur district. International Journal of Applied Research. 2017;3(6):09-15.
11. Singh BP, Dohare RK, Singh SN, Kumar S, Verma A. Socio economic status of vegetable growers in Bareilly district. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2018;7(6):632-635.
12. Verma AK, Singh D, Singh DK, Singh MK, Singh G. Socio-economic profile of vegetable growers in Western Uttar Pradesh, India. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2019;8(1):1508-1511.

© 2023 Sherpa 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/96530>