



Research Article

A study on personal, socio-economic, psychological and situational characteristics of agro-service providers and beneficiaries in Gujarat state

■ S.R. SALUNKHE, R.D. PANDYA AND S.K. RAI

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :

Received:

28.05.2012;

Revised :

26.09.2012;

Accepted:

22.10.2012

SUMMARY : Present study was conducted in year of 2008-09 to study the personal characteristics, socio-economic, psychological and situational characteristics of agro-service providers and Beneficiaries in Gujarat State. The study concluded that, by and large, majority of the agro-service providers and beneficiaries were in the middle age group, secondary level of education, medium size family, farming + animal husbandry + business as their major occupations, medium level of annual income, medium land holding, membership in one organization, medium level of farming experience, medium level of innovativeness, medium level of overall modernity, medium level of economic orientation, medium level of scientific orientation medium level of risk orientation, medium level of management orientation, medium level of progressivism, favourable attitude towards their enterprise, medium level of knowledge of their enterprise, medium level of information input and processing behaviour, medium level of sales and purchasing behaviour.

How to cite this article : Salunkhe, S.R., Pandya, R.D. and Rai, S.K. (2012). A study on personal, socio-economic, psychological and situational characteristics of agro-service providers and beneficiaries in Gujarat state. *Agric. Update*, 7(3&4): 389-393.

KEY WORDS:

Personal characteristics, Socio-economic, Psychological, Situational characteristics, Agro-service providers, Beneficiaries

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Agriculture is a backbone of Indian economy. It has a critical role to play in the country's economic development. With ever increasing human population, there is an increasing demand to raise the production. There are two basic way of augmenting the production, first enlarging the area cultivated by expanding agriculture operation to virgin areas and secondly to increase the productivity of land already under cultivation.

As there is almost no scope to expand the cultivated area because the average size of operational holding is decreasing day by day due to pressure of population, therefore, the ultimate way of increasing production is to raise the productivity level. Among the all measures to raise the productivity level, plant protection is in central position. Plant protection is a basic exercise in any crop for control of insect-pest and disease,

etc. to avoid economic losses especially in this field as well as for overall agricultural development, the agro-service providers are playing an important role with their marketing environment and limitation were the main points of interest.

Keeping in view of this importance, the present study was undertaken with following specific objective to study the personal, socio-economic, psychological and situational characteristics of agro-service providers and beneficiaries.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present investigation was purposely conducted in all five talukas viz., Chikhli, Gandevi, Jalalpore, Navsari and Vansda of Navsari district. An ex-post facto research design was adopted to conduct the study. A proportionate random sampling method was used to obtain the ASPs from respective talukas. As a result, 32 of Chikhli

Author for correspondence :

S.R. SALUNKHE

Department of
Extension Education,
N.M. College of
Agriculture, Navsari
Agricultural University,
NAVSARI (GUJARAT)
INDIA

Email: sumitsalunkhe45@
rediffmail.com

See end of the article for
authors' affiliations

from 151, 10 of Gandevi from 47, 8 of Jalalpore from 42, 32 of Navsari from 151 and 18 of Vansda from 83 ASPs were obtained. In all, 100 ASPs were obtained for the present study. According to the proportionate numbers of each taluka, a simple random sampling method was used to get the name of ASPs. These were approached personally and name of five villages as well as farmers who came to purchase critical inputs for their agriculture during last six months. Once again, the list of suggested villages and farmers was prepared and from it one village and two farmers selected randomly. Thus, the sample for the study composed of total 200 beneficiary respondents. Eighteen independent and three dependent variables were identified for the study. The collected data were analyzed by using appropriate methods of analysis *viz.*, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and correlation co-efficient(*r*).

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The observations of the present study as well as relevant analysis have been summarized under the following heads:

Personal profile of the agro-service providers and beneficiaries:

Age:

It is evident from Table 1 that the majority of agro-service providers (53.00 %) and beneficiaries (50.00 %) were in the middle age group followed by, 29.00 and 31.00 per cent were belonged to old and 18.00 and 19.00 per cent belonged to young age groups of agro service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Education:

It is apparent from the Table 1 that more than two fifth of agro-service providers (45.00 %) and majority of beneficiaries (53.00 %) had secondary level of education followed by 34.00 and 22.50 per cent belonged to college and above level of education and 21.00 and 24.50 per cent belonged to primary education groups of agro service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Size of family:

The data of the Table-1 indicated that about half of agro-service providers (48.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (54.50 %) belonged to medium family followed by 38.00 and 30.00 per cent belonged to small and 14.00 and 15.50 per cent belonged to big family groups of agro service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Occupations:

The Table 1 shows that about two fifth of agro-service providers (37.00 %) and nearly half of beneficiaries (48.00 %)

had farming + animal husbandry + business as their major occupations followed by 34.00 and 16.00 per cent were having farming + animal husbandry + service and 29.00 and 36.00 per cent were having farming only by agro service provider and beneficiaries, respectively.

Annual incomes:

The information presented that in Table 1 revealed that the majority of agro-service providers (52.00 %) and beneficiaries (60.00 %) had medium level of annual income followed by 25.00 per cent each had higher level of annual income and 23.00 and 15.00 per cent of them had lower level of annual income, respectively.

Land holding:

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that nearly half of the agro-service providers (44.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (51.50 %) had medium land holding followed by 30.00 and 35.00 per cent had small and 26.00 and 13.50 per cent of agro-service providers and beneficiaries had big land holding, respectively.

Social participation:

The information presented in Table 1 revealed that the nearly half of agro-service providers (45.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (55.00 %) had membership in one organization followed by 30.00 and 28.00 per cent of them had membership in more than one organization with position and 25.00 and 17.00 per cent of agro-service providers and beneficiaries hadn't any membership, respectively.

Farming experience:

The data presented in Table 1 reveal that the nearly half of the agro-service providers and beneficiaries (45.00 %) had medium level of farming experience followed by 35.00 and 20.00 per cent of them had lower level of farming experience and 20.00 and 35.00 per cent had higher level of farming experiences by agro-service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Innovativeness:

It is evident from Table 1 that about half of agro-service providers (45.00 %) and beneficiaries (44.50 %) had medium level of innovativeness followed by 30.00 and 35.50 per cent had higher level of innovativeness and 25.00 and 20.00 per cent of them had lower level of innovativeness, respectively.

Overall modernity:

It is observed from Table 1 that the majority of agro-service providers (51.00 %) and beneficiaries (62.50 %) had medium level of overall modernity followed by 25.00 and 22.50 per cent of agro-service providers and beneficiaries, respectively had lower level of overall modernity and 24.00

Table 1 : Personal profile of the agro-service providers and beneficiaries (n=100/200)

Sr. No.	Independent variables	Agro-service providers	Beneficiaries
1.	Age	Nos.	Nos.
	Young age	18	38
	Middle age	53	100
	Old age	29	62
	Total	100	200
2.	Education	Nos.	Nos.
	Primary education	21	49
	Secondary education	45	106
	Collage & above education	34	45
	Total	100	200
3.	Family size	Nos.	Nos.
	Big family	14	31
	Medium family	48	109
	Small family	38	60
	Total	100	200
4.	Occupation	Nos.	Nos.
	Farming alone	29	72
	Farming + animal husbandry + business	37	96
	Farming + animal husbandry + service	34	32
	Total	100	200
5.	Level of annual income	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of income	23	30
	Medium level of income	52	120
	Higher level of income	25	50
	Total	100	200
6.	Level of land holding	Nos.	Nos.
	Small land holding	30	70
	Medium land holding	44	103
	Big land holding	26	27
	Total	100	200
7.	Social participation	Nos.	Nos.
	No membership	25	34
	Membership in one organization	45	110
	Membership in more than one organization with position	30	56
	Total	100	200
8.	Farming experience	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of farming experience	35	40
	Medium level of farming experience	45	90
	Higher level of farming experience	20	70
	Total	100	200
9.	Level of innovativeness	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of innovativeness	25	40
	Medium level of innovativeness	45	89
	Higher level of innovativeness	30	71
	Total	100	200

Table 1 contd...

Contd..... Table 1

10.	Level of overall modernity	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of overall modernity	25	45
	Medium level of overall modernity	51	125
	Higher level of overall modernity	24	30
	Total	100	200
11.	Level of economic orientation	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of economic orientation	28	40
	Medium level of economic orientation	45	114
	Higher level of economic orientation	27	46
	Total	100	200
12.	Level of scientific orientation	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of scientific orientation	35	45
	Medium level of scientific orientation	40	115
	Higher level of scientific orientation	25	40
	Total	100	200
13.	Level of risk orientation	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of risk orientation	32	42
	Medium level of risk orientation	44	107
	Higher level of risk orientation	24	51
	Total	100	200
14.	Level of management orientation	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of management orientation	32	35
	Medium level of management orientation	45	127
	Higher level of management orientation	23	38
	Total	100	200
15.	Level of progressivism	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of progressivism	21	30
	Medium level of progressivism	51	120
	Higher level of progressivism	28	50
	Total	100	200
16.	Level of attitude	Nos.	Nos.
	Some what favourable attitude	22	30
	Favourable attitude	50	98
	Highly favourable attitude	28	72
	Total	100	200
17.	Level of knowledge	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of knowledge	15	43
	Medium level of knowledge	50	87
	Higher level of knowledge	35	70
	Total	100	200
18.	Level of information input and processing behaviour	Nos.	Nos.
	Lower level of IIAPB	22	45
	Medium level of IIAPB	52	108
	Higher level of IIAPB	26	47
	Total	100	200

and 15.00 per cent had higher level of overall modernity.

Economic orientation:

It can be seen from Table-1 that nearly half of agro-service providers (45.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (57.00 %) had medium level of economic orientation followed by 28.00 and 20.00 per cent had lower level of economic orientation and 27.00 and 23.00 per cent of them had higher level of economic orientation, respectively.

Scientific orientation:

It is observed from Table 1 that exactly two fifth of the agro-service providers (40.00 %) and most of the beneficiaries (57.50 %) had medium level of scientific orientation followed by 35.00 and 22.50 per cent had lower level of scientific orientation and 25.00 and 20.00 per cent of them had higher level of scientific orientation, respectively.

Risk orientation:

It is evident from Table 1 that more than two fifth of agro-service providers (44.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (53.50 %) had medium level of risk orientation followed by 32.00 and 21.00 per cent had lower level of risk orientation and 24.00 and 25.50 per cent of them had higher level of risk orientation, respectively.

Management orientation:

It was revealed from Table 1 that more than two fifth of the agro-service providers (45.00 %) and the majority of beneficiaries (63.50 %) possessed medium level of management orientation followed by 32.00 and 17.50 per cent had lower level of management orientation and 23.00 and 19.00 per cent of them had higher level of management orientation, respectively.

Progressivism:

It is observed from Table 1 that the majority of agro-service providers (51.00 %) and beneficiaries (60.00 %) had medium level of progressivism followed by 28.00 and 25.00 per cent had higher level of progressivism and 21.00 and 15.00 per cent had lower level of progressivism by agro-service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Attitude towards agriculture:

The data of Table 1 revealed that half of the agro-service providers (50.00 %) and almost half of beneficiaries (49.00 %) possessed favourable attitude towards their enterprise followed by 28.00 and 36.00 per cent had highly favourable attitude and 22.00 and 15.00 per cent had somewhat favourable attitude by agro-service providers and beneficiaries towards

agriculture, respectively.

Level of knowledge:

Table 1 clearly indicated that the half of agro-service providers (50.00 %) and more than two fifth of the beneficiaries (43.50 %) had medium level of knowledge of their enterprise followed by 35.00 each had higher level of knowledge and 15.00 and 21.50 per cent of them had lower level of knowledge of their enterprise, respectively.

Information input and processing behavior:

It is clear from Table 1 that the majority of agro-service providers (52.00 per cent) and beneficiaries (54.00 per cent) possessed medium level of information input and processing behaviour followed by 26.00 and 23.50 per cent had higher level of information input and processing behaviour and 22.00 and 22.50 per cent had lower level of information input and processing behaviour by agro-service providers and beneficiaries, respectively.

Conclusion:

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that, majority of the agro-service providers and beneficiaries were in the middle age group, secondary level of education, medium size family, farming + animal husbandry + business as their major occupations, medium level of annual income, medium land holding, membership in one organization, medium level of farming experience, medium level of innovativeness, medium level of overall modernity, medium level of economic orientation, medium level of scientific orientation medium level of risk orientation, medium level of management orientation, medium level of progressivism, favourable attitude towards their enterprise, medium level of knowledge of their enterprise, medium level of information input and processing behaviour, medium level of sales and purchasing behaviour. Similar findings have been reported by Bairathi and Sharma (1999) and Ahire *et al.* (2004).

Authors' affiliations :

R.D. PANDYA AND S.K. RAI, Department of Extension Education, N.M. College of Agriculture (N.A.U.), NAVSARI (GUJARAT) INDIA

REFERENCES

- Ahire, M.C., Phadatare, V.R. and Kalche, P.G.** (2004). A status of green house adopters. *Rural India*. 242-243.
- Bairathi, R. and Sharma, B.N.** (1999). Determinant of working environment in Agriculture University. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **18**: 27-32.