



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2022; SP-11(3): 1123-1125  
© 2022 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 06-01-2022  
Accepted: 13-02-2022

**Nedhi Rani Sharma**  
Ph.D., Scholar, Department of  
Extension Education, JNKVV,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**NK Khare**  
Professor and Head, Department  
of Extension Education JNKVV,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**PK Singh**  
Principal Scientist, ICAR-DWR,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**Kamini Bisht**  
Assistant professor, Department  
of Extension Education,  
JNKVV, Jabalpur, Madhya  
Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author**  
**Nedhi Rani Sharma**  
Ph.D., Scholar, Department of  
Extension Education, JNKVV,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

## Socio personal and economic traits of tribal FIGs of farmer producer company

**Nedhi Rani Sharma, NK Khare, PK Singh and Kamini Bisht**

### Abstract

Farmer producer organizations are essential institutions for the empowerment, poverty alleviation, and advancement of farmers and rural poor. The present study was carried out in Adilabad and KB Asifabad district of Telangana. Out of these two districts four FPCs were purposively selected with the sample size of 191. The well structured interview schedule was developed for data collection and the study found that more than half of the members were in the middle age group, majority were male, had small size of landholding, medium level of farming experience, joint family type, medium annual income, medium mass media exposure, medium information seeking behaviour, decision making ability, medium achievement motivation. The correlation between socio economic traits and perception showed that gender, education, landholding was significant with perception.

**Keywords:** Personal, economic, tribal, farmer, company

### Introduction

Agriculture has been an important sector for the Indian economy as nearly 70 percent of the rural population depends on agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood. On the recommendations of an expert panel led by Y.K. Alagh, Centre had amended the Indian Companies Act, 1956, in 2002-03 to provide for "producer companies". A Farmer Producer Company is a hybrid between cooperative societies and private limited companies. A producer organization is an association, a society, a cooperative, a union, a federation, or even a firm that has been established to promote the interests of farmers (SFAC guidelines). Farmer producer organizations are essential institutions for the empowerment, poverty alleviation, and advancement of farmers and rural poor (FAO, 2006).

Tribal are indigenous people who has have very little social contact and for them the major source of livelihood is agriculture and allied activities. Being dominant the majority of them lack awareness and access to the latest technology and as a result they are still lagging behind. For this purpose the present paper was carried out to determine the socio economic condition of tribal FIGs of FPC.

### Material and Methods

The present research was carried out in the Adilabad and KB Asifababd district of Telangana state. Of these two districts, FPOs named Indravelly Farmer Producer Company Limited (IFPCL) and Daditanda Neeredigonda Takiguda Farmer Producer Company Limited(DNT FPCL) located at Adilabad district and Baganpalli Balaji Watershed Farmer Producer Company Limited (BBWSFPCL) Thiryani Farmer Producer Company Limited (TRNFPCL) located at Kumaram Bheem (KB) Asifabad were selected purposively based on their performance. The data was collected from sample size of 191 by taking 1/10<sup>th</sup> proportion of each FPCs total shareholders. Structured interview schedule was developed to collect data from the respondents. To determine the relationship between socio economic traits and perception correlation test was run using SPSS 16.

### Result

The tribe FIGs were distributed into different categories based on their selected profile characteristics

#### 1. Age

The data given in table 1 illustrated that more than half of the members were in the middle age group followed by old age group (25.10%). The possible reason can be as the younger generation are lesser attracted towards farming compared to other groups and there are not willing to take farming as an occupation.

The findings are supported by Babu *et al.* (2021) and Elizabeth and Meena (2019) <sup>[12]</sup>.

**2. Gender**

The data given table 1 depicts that majority (75.39%) of the respondent were male followed by female (24.61%). The reason for this can be the irregular share of land among women and it is expected that women looks after the family and not work. The findings are supported by Soni and Veerakumaran (2020) <sup>[8]</sup>.

**3. Landholding**

The data given table 1 shows that nearly half (49.22%) of the respondents had small size of landholding followed by semi medium (32.98%). The possible reason for this result can be as the target group of FPCs was mainly small and marginal farmers as their have lesser size of land and are economically resource poor. The share amount of 1100 rs or 1500 rs can also felt more for them. Findings are in line with Chopade *et al.* (2019) <sup>[2]</sup>, Babu *et al.* (2021) and Ahire *et al.* (2015) <sup>[14]</sup>

**4. Farming Experience**

The data given table 1 shows that about fourty per cent (40.83%) of the respondents had medium level of farming experience followed by 30.36 per cent had high farming experience. The reason for this can be as most of the farmers were under the category of middle age, medium farming experience is natural. The findings are supported by Amitha *et al.* (2021) <sup>[1]</sup>

**5. Family type**

The data given table 1 shows that more than half (52.87%) of the respondents had joint family type followed by nuclear type (47.1%). The possible reason for this can be that the rural families are less being driven to take a nuclear family when compared to urban. The findings are in accordance with Tejashwini and Panigrahi (2012) <sup>[9]</sup>

**6. Annual income**

The data from the table1 reveals that 48.69 per cent of farmers had medium annual income followed by high (37.18%). The FPOs primarily focuses on ways to increase the income of the farmers, so various activities were carried out to bring changes in the income of the member farmers. The findings were supported by Msuta and Urassa (2015) <sup>[7]</sup> and Gayathri *et al.* (2016).

**7. Farm power possession**

The data from the table1 reveals that nearly 60 per cent of the farmers had possessed pair of bullocks followed by irrigation pumps. The reason for this can be as the purchase of higher farm machinery requires large amount of investment and it is difficult for the farmers to share the large amount. The findings were in accordance with Darshan (2019) <sup>[3]</sup>.

**8. Mass Media exposure**

The data from the table1 reveals that more than half (51.30%) of the respondents had mass media exposure followed by high (40.83%). This could be because Members were made to explore more mass media to understand more about latest technologies and get new information timely. Findings are in accordance with Chauhan *et al.* (2016) <sup>[5]</sup> and Singh *et al.* (2019) <sup>[13]</sup>.

**9. Information seeking behaviour**

The data from the table1 reveals that nearly half of the

respondents had medium information seeking behaviour followed by high i.e 38.74 per cent. This could be because the members had regular contact with extension personnel to solve their queries and tries to provide information from authentic sources like Department of Agriculture and others. Study is in accordance with Gupta *et al.* (2020) <sup>[6]</sup>.

**10. Decision making ability**

The data from the table1 showed that members of FPO had medium decision making ability (46.59%) followed by high (46.59%). The intervention of FPO, the decision making ability of the members was enhanced at farm as well as home management by considering opinion of others and pledging to fulfil decisions by completing actions which could help them in giving better result for having a quality life. Findings are in line with Dechamma *et al.* (2020) <sup>[4]</sup>.

**11. Achievement motivation**

The data from the table1 reveals that nearly half (17.80%) of the respondents had medium level of achievement motivation followed by high (33.51%). The FPO not only just focused on increasing the yield and income but also provided various business activity which help the farmers in changing their view towards farming as mere occupation and encouraged them to take up new challenges and achieve a better standard of living. Results are in accordance with Subrahmanyam (2012).

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to variables

s.no	Variables	Categories	Frequency (Percentage)
1	Age	Young	37(22.99)
		Middle	124(51.91)
		Old	30(25.10)
2	Gender	Male	144(75.39)
		Female	47(24.61)
3	Land holding	Marginal	8(4.18)
		Small	94(49.22)
		Semi medium	63(32.98)
		Medium	15(7.85)
4	Farming Experience	Low	11(5.77)
		Medium	55(28.79)
		High	78 (40.83)
5	Family type	Nuclear	58(30.36)
		Joint	90(47.13)
6	Annual income	Joint	101 (52.87)
		Low	27(14.13)
		Medium	93(48.69)
7	Farm power possession	High	71(37.18)
		No farm power	6 (3.14)
		Pair of bullocks	102(53.40)
		Tractor	35(18.32)
		Irrigation pumps	38(19.89)
8	Mass Media exposure	Thresher	10(5.25)
		Low	21(10.99)
		Medium	98(51.30)
9	Information seeking behaviour	High	78(40.83)
		Low	25(13.08)
		Medium	92(48.16)
10	Decision making ability	High	74(38.74)
		Low	34(17.80)
		Medium	89(46.59)
11	achievement motivation	High	68(35.61)
		Low	34(17.80)
		Medium	93(48.69)
		High	64(33.51)

## 2. Determine the relationship between socio economic traits and perception of tribal FIGs

The relationship between socio economic traits with perception was determined to understand which variable which has a significant relationship and it showed that Gender (0.488\*), education (0.237\*\*), landholding (0.279\*\*), farming experience (0.171\*), housing type (0.191\*\*), social participation (0.154\*), farm power possession (0.570\*\*), source of credit (0.405\*), capacity building (0.002\*\*), risk preference (0.46\*\*) and satisfaction (0.16\*) was found to be significant at 0.01 and 0.05 per cent level of significance respectively.

\*\*0.01 Level of significance \*0.05 level of significance

### Conclusion

The results revealed that more than half of the members were in the middle age group, majority male, small size of landholding, medium level of farming experience, joint family type, medium annual income, medium mass media exposure, medium information seeking behaviour, medium decision making ability, medium achievement motivation. The FPCs can help the farmers in improving their socio economic condition so the FPCs ideology should be covered among more farmers and bring them up to take newer initiatives to improve their condition. FPCs need to focus more on bringing the income generating activities and importance of the farmers bringing more exposure to training programmes, success stories and exposure visits.

### References

1. Amitha CD, Savitha B, Sudha rani V, Laxminarayan P. farmer producer organization(FPOs)- analysis of profile of FPOs and its members in Medak district of telangana. *Current journal of applied science and technology*. 2020;8(10):223-228.
2. Chopade SL, Kapse PS, Dhulgand VG. Constraints faced by the members of farmer producer company. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2019;8(08):2358-2361
3. Darshan NP. A study on functioning and impact of farmer producer organizations in Karnataka. Phd Thesis. Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad, 2019.
4. Dechamma S, Krishnamurthy B, Shasidhar BM, Vasantha Kumari R. Profile characteristics of members of Farmer producer organizations (FPO). *International journal of agriculture sciences*. 2020;12(23):10422-10429.
5. Chauhan JK, Adhikary A, Pradhan K. Identification of constraints associated with Farmer Producers Organisation (FPOs). *international journal of current microbiology and applied science*. 2021;10(1):1859-1864.
6. Gupta R, Dana SS, Maity A, UK bandyopadhyay. A study on the socio economic status of the fishery based self help groups in India, WB. *Journal of crop and weed*. 2020;16(3):238-243.
7. Msuta PB, Urassa KJ. The contribution of farmers organisations to small farmers well being: a case study of Kasulu district, Tanzania. *African Journal of agriculture research*. 2015;10(23):2343-2349.
8. Soni S, Veerakumaran G. Problems and constraints faced by farmer producer company in India with special reference to poultry sector of Kerala, *International Journal of Innovative science and research technology* 2020;5(10):2456-2165
9. Tejashwini M, Panigrahi RS. Socio Economic Profile of Self Help Group (SHG) members – A Study in Anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*. 2019;(1):495-500.
10. Gopi R, Narmatha N, Sakthivel KM, Uma V, Jothilakshmi M. Socio-economic characteristics and its relationship with information seeking pattern of dairy farmers in Tamilnadu, India. *Asian Journal of Dairy and Food Research*. 2017;36(1):16-20.
11. Gayatri S, Mahajanshetti SB, Sowmya AN, Parvati Shreedevi C. Socio-economic characteristics of members of fisheries cooperatives and benefits derived from cooperatives. *International Journal of Science and Nature*. 2016;7(2):400-404.
12. Elizabeth J, Meena, HR. Profile of Farmer Producer Company (Dairy based) members in Kerala. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2019;55(2):47-51.
13. Singh D, Singh BP, Rita B, Pordhiya KI. A socio - economic and socio-psychological appraisal of Farmer Producer Organizations. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2019;8(4):686-689.
14. Ahire RD, Kapse PS, Deshmukh PR. Socio-economic impact of Commodity Interest Group among pomegranate growers. *International Journal of Extension Education*. 2015;11:40-45