



ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; SP-12(8): 367-372
© 2023 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 21-06-2023
Accepted: 30-07-2023

Sruti Manjari Padhiary
Department of Agricultural
Extension Education, M.S.
Swaminathan School of
Agriculture, Centurion
University of Technology and
Management, Odisha, India

Ajay Kumar Prusty
Department of Agricultural
Extension Education, M.S.
Swaminathan School of
Agriculture, Centurion
University of Technology and
Management, Odisha, India

Chitrasena Padhy
Department of Agricultural
Extension Education, M.S.
Swaminathan School of
Agriculture, Centurion
University of Technology and
Management, Odisha, India

Soumik Ray
Department of Agricultural
Economics and Statistics, M.S.
Swaminathan School of
Agriculture, Centurion
University of Technology and
Management, Odisha, India

Corresponding Author:
Ajay Kumar Prusty
Department of Agricultural
Extension Education, M.S.
Swaminathan School of
Agriculture, Centurion
University of Technology and
Management, Odisha, India

Socio-economic profile of SHG and non-SHG members in value addition of finger millet in Koraput district of Odisha

Sruti Manjari Padhiary, Ajay Kumar Prusty, Chitrasena Padhy and Soumik Ray

Abstract

Finger millet has a significant role in the food economy of the people who grow and consume it; increasing production will have to be achieved to ensure regional food security. The amount of food gained from own production, household size, educational level of household head, and household income were found to be factors in determining the food security status of farming families in the research region. This study was conducted in four selected blocks of the Koraput district of Odisha. A total of 120 respondents were randomly selected from each selected block for the study. The present study assessed the socio-economic status of SHG and Non-SHG members in the value addition of finger millet. The data collection was done by the use of ex post facto design and through pre-tested structured personal interview schedule. The study showed that the majority (85%) of the respondents belonged to the middle age group (30 to 50 years), went to High school (66.66%) and lived in a nuclear family (31%) with membership in one organization. The majority (74%) of the respondents were medium farmers (<1ha) and the surviving with their low annual income) Up to Rs 10,000). The majority (63.33%) of the selected respondents had acquired credit for finger millet production. The study's findings may be used in other research or referred by Government for policy implications.

Keywords: Finger millet, SHG, Socio-economic, Value addition

Introduction

India is the world's second largest food producer next to China and has the potential to be the biggest food and agricultural sector. During 2012-2013 there were all time increases in food production to the tune of 257.44 million tonnes, with a buffer stock of 76 million tonnes of food grains. There is an urgent need to prepare and market value-added products utilizing surplus production to fetch better prices without spoilage. The value-added food products provide better nutritive value, good keeping quality and increase the demand for processed food. The single advantage that ragi enjoys is that it is a cheap source of nutrients which is affordable by even the economically suppressed workforce. It serves as an ideal food for the working class as it is digested slowly (due to high fibre content) and thereby supplies energy throughout the day. A single meal eaten in the morning can sustain the worker throughout the day. Finger millet is a profitable crop in the hilly regions of India, but to maximize returns, there is a need to provide efficient infrastructure support and tap the vast potential to grow this crop commercially (Pant and Srivastava, 2015) [6].

Despite constraints in production, finger millet will continue to have a significant role in the food economy of the people who grow and consume it; increasing production will have to be achieved to ensure regional food security. Finger millet can be used as healthy food material and natural antioxidant resource (Xiang *et al.*, 2019) [14]. Overall, finger millet has the potential to serve as an alternative crop for the production of forage and possibly grain in the SGP (Baath *et al.*, 2019) [1]. Finger millet is one of the potential cereal crops that can contribute to realising food security (Wafula *et al.*, 2016) [13]. Some traditional food preparations are made out of Ragi grain in rural India. Finger millet for a meal is consumed mainly in the form of Aarisha Pitha, finger millet cake, finger millet cookies, and finger millet chakli. In addition to the above, there are at least 80 recipes made out of finger millet by rural and urban commodities. Most popular among them is nadi, mixture of several snack preparations made out of popped grain, and many other bakery products, including Ragi bread, bun and biscuits.

Composite flour can also be prepared by mixing Ragi flour with wheat flour/rice flour/ sorghum flour. It is possible to obtain different blends to meet the needs taking into account economic, nutritional and organoleptic considerations. Processing the finger millet using traditional as well as modern techniques for the development of value added and convenient food products would be the possible solution for its promotion and enhancement of consumption, nutritional status and thereby increasing profitability and better livelihood to the tribal community (Patel and Verma, 2015) [7].

The Koraput district of Odisha, India, has a warm and humid climate, with the south-west monsoon bringing 80% of the region's annual rainfall from June to mid-October. The yearly average precipitation ranges from 1320 to 1520 mm. Around 40 °C is the average daily high temperature, while 14 °C is the average daily low temperature. Matured red lateritic soil (Alfisols), mixed grey soil (Inceptisols), and unmodified soils with coarse parent materials (Entisols) are the main soil types in the area. Most of the soil in the area has a sandy loam texture. The major agricultural season, known as kharif, lasts from June to September. Agriculture is predominantly rainfed. across subsistence farming households across the world, finger millet ranks second only to rice as a key staple food crop (Pradhan *et al.*, 2019) [8]. The area under finger millet accounts for 16% of the total gross cropped area and 28% of the total area under cereal crop cultivation in the district (Fernandez *et al.*, 2003) [3]. The tribal communities predominantly cultivate local landraces of finger millet, *viz.* Telugu Mandia, Dasara Mandia, San Mandia and Bada Mandia, using traditional agronomic practices.

Materials and Methods

The finger millet value chain in Koraput district has been selected for the study, as the crop is considered pro-poor, pro-nutrition in nature. An ex-post facto methodology was used for the study's research design since the phenomena had already happened and were still happening. The data were collected using a planned and standardised personal interview schedule from four blocks of Koraput district which were selected purposively as they are the district's major producers of finger millet. The blocks selected were Koraput, Nandapur, Semiliguda, and Sunabeda. For the study, two villages were arbitrarily chosen from each sampled block. 120 SHGs and non-SHGs in total were therefore chosen for the investigation. The data were tabulated and analysed using relevant statistical methods like frequency, percentage, mean, and rank order.

Results and Discussion

Data in Table 1 showed that, of the 60 SHG respondents in

the age category, 85% were in the medium age range (30-55 years) of SHGs, followed by 5% in the young age group (up to 30 years) and only 10% in the elderly age group (above 55 years). Out of 60 non-SHG respondents, the majority (78.33%) belonged to the SHGs' 30-55-year-old age category, while 8.33 percent were under 30 years old and just 13.33 percent were over 55, which is in agreement with Tijjani (2019) [11] in age group basically 85% is highest due to the medium age range which is 30-55 years old.

A maximum proportion of 66.66% of farmers were in high school, 0% of respondents were illiterate, 13.33% were in elementary school, up to 16.66% were in middle school, and just 2% were in college. Out of 60 non-SHG farmers, 13.33% are in high school, 20% are illiterate, 26.66% are in elementary school, up to 3.33% are in middle school, and only 36.66% are in college or above. Among the selected respondent, 66.6% is the highest in high school.

Among the selected respondent maximum of 76.66% of SHGs were in the nuclear family type, 23.33% in the joint type and 81.66% of non-SHGs in the nuclear type and 18.33% were of the joint type. Nuclear family type respondent is highest in both SHGs and non-SHGs. Both SHGs and non-SHG maximum people will likely stay in a nuclear family.

And 81.66% of SHGs were in small family sizes, 18.33% in large family sizes and, 88.33% in small family sizes in non-SHGs, 11.66% in large family sizes, which is in agreement with Babatunde (2017) [12].

Among the selected respondents in SHGs, 71.66% lived in semi-pucca houses, 0% were in kaccha houses, and 17% were in pucca. 65% of non-SHGs lived in semi-pucca, 0% in kaccha and 35% in pucca. Maximum people live in pucca houses among all the respondents.

In land holding, 11.66% SHGs were landless, 51.66% were marginal, 25% were small, 8.33% were medium, and 3.33% were large.

Out of 60 SHG respondents, 63.33% of respondents had chosen farming as their primary occupation, 5% were in service, 10% were in business, 21.66% were in wage-earning, and 0% were considered other. Out of 60 non-SHG respondents, 11.66% of respondents had chosen farming as their primary occupation, 51% were in service, 25% were in business, 8.33% were in wage-earning, and 3.33% were considered any other. Maximum people working in farming as primary occupation agreement with Sahana *et al.* (2018) [10].

And 56% of SHG members annual income was up to 10,000, 31.66% in 10,000-50,000, 11.66% had up to 50,000- 1 lakh and 0% above 1.0 lakh. 50% of non-SHG annual income was up to 10,000, 38.33% in 10,000-50,000, up to 50,000- 1 lakh was 11.66% and 0% above 1.0 lakh.

Table 1: Social characteristics of SHG and Non-SHG members

Sr. No	Characteristics	Participants			
		SHG Members		Non-SHG Members	
		F	%	F	%
Age					
A.	Young	3	5	5	8.33
B.	Middle	51	85	47	78.33
C.	Old	6	10	8	13.33
Education					
A.	Illiterate	0	0	12	20
B.	Primary	8	13.33	16	26.66
C.	Middle	10	16.66	8	13.33
D.	High School	40	66.66	2	3.33
E.	College And Above	2	3.33	22	36.66

Family Type					
A.	Nuclear	46	76.33	49	81.66
B.	Joint	14	23.33	11	18.33
Family Size					
A.	Small	49	81.66	53	88.33
B.	Large	11	18.33	7	11.66
Housing Pattern					
A.	Kaccha	0	0	0	0
B.	Semi Pucca	43	71.66	39	65
C.	Pucca	17	28.33	21	35
Land Holding					
A.	Landless	7	11.66	0	0
B.	<1.0.(Marginal)	31	51.66	0	0
C.	1.0-2.5(Small)	15	25	46	76.66
D.	2.5-5.0(Medium)	5	8.33	14	23.33
E.	5.0-10.0 And Above(Large)	2	3.33	0	0
Primary Occupation					
A.	Farming	38	63.33	7	11.66
B.	Service	3	5	31	51.66
C.	Business	6	10	15	25
D.	Wage Earning	13	21.66	5	8.33
E.	Any Other	0	0	2	3.33
Annual Income					
A.	Upto 10,000	34	56.66	30	50
B.	10,000-50,000	19	31.66	23	38.33
C.	50,000- 1 Lakh	7	11.66	7	11.66
D.	Above 1.0 Lakh	0	0	0	0

Data in Table 2 revealed that in activities, out of 60 SHG respondents in training, 20% in often training, 41.44% in sometimes, and 38.33% in never. In demonstrations, 45% in often training, 38.33% in sometimes, 16.66% in never. In Kisan Mela, 11.66% in often training, 26.66% in sometimes, 61.66% in never. In field visits, 13.33% in often training, 31.66% in sometimes, 55% in never. In discussion meetings, 53.33% in often training, 35% in sometimes, 11.66% in never. In farmers' tours, 18.33% in often training, 26.66% in

sometimes, 55% in never. In the exhibition, 11.66% in often training, 48.33% in sometimes, 40% in never. The training program was important for SHG members, whose percentage is 2.85%. The government provides many training programmes for SHG members, which will help them learn about finger millet's value addition. Maximum respondents often attend many kinds of activities like training, demonstration, Kisan Mela and meetings.

Table 2: Extension participation of SHG members

Sr. No	Activities	Often		Sometimes		Never		Mean score	Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
a.	Training	12	20	25	41.66	23	38.33	1.8	2.41
b.	Demonstration	27	45	23	38.33	10	16.66	2.3	2.3
c.	Kisan Mela	7	11.66	16	26.66	37	61.66	1.46	1.8
d.	Field visit	8	13.33	19	31.66	33	55	1.6	1.71
e.	Discussions meetings	32	53.33	21	35	7	11.66	2.41	1.6
f.	Farmers tours	11	18.33	16	26.66	33	55	1.6	1.6
g.	Exhibition	7	11.66	29	48.33	24	40	1.71	1.46

Data in Table 3 revealed that in activities, out of 60 non-SHG respondents in training, 0% in often training, 100% in sometimes, and 0% in never. In demonstrations, 3.33% in often training, 40% in sometimes, 56.66% in never. In Kisan Mela, 0% in often training, 68.33% in sometimes, and 31.66% in never. In field visits, 0% in often training, 76.66% in sometimes, 23.33% in never. In discussion meetings, 0% in

often training, 100% in sometimes, 0% in never. In farmers' tours, 56.66% in often training, 0% in sometimes, and 43.33% in never. In the exhibition, 0% in often training, 100% in sometimes, 0% in never. Non-SHG members like farmers or businessmen. Maximum respondents often attend many kinds of activities like training, demonstration, Kisan Mela and meetings.

Table 3: Extension participation of non-SHG members

Sl. No	Activities	Often		Sometimes		Never		Mean score	Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
a.	Training	0	0	60	100	0	0	2	2.13
b.	Demonstration	2	3.33	24	40	34	56.66	1.46	2.13
c.	Kisan Mela	0	0	41	68.33	19	31.66	1.68	2
d.	Field visit	0	0	46	76.66	14	23.33	1.76	2
e.	Discussions meetings	0	0	60	100	0	0	2	1.68
f.	Farmers tours	34	56.66	0	0	26	43.33	2.13	1.76
g.	Exhibition	0	0	60	100	0	0	2	1.46

Data in Table 4 revealed that, out of 60 SHGs in the panchayat, 3.33% was office bearer, 8.33% were ordinary member, and 88.33% had no membership. In the youth club, 6.66% was office bearer, 15% were ordinary member, and 78.33% had no membership. In FPO, 11.66% was office bearer, 78.33% were ordinary member, and 10% had no membership. In cultural organizations, 1.66% were office bearers, 21.66% were ordinary members, and 75% were not members. In religious organization, 0% was office bearer,

25% were ordinary member, and 76.66% had no membership. In financial organization, 0% was office bearer, 38.33% were ordinary member, and 61.66% had no membership. In SHGs, 23.33% were office bearers, 76.66% were ordinary members, and 0% had no membership. Regarding social participation, maximum members of SHGs were not interested in any kind of youth club or financial organization, and some people showed interest in panchayat, cultural organizations, or religious organizations.

Table 4: Social participation of SHG members

Sl. No	Activities	Daily		Weekly		Fortnightly		rarely		Mean score	Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%		
1.	Panchayat	2	3.33	7	11.6	12	20	39	65	1.53	3.71
2.	LAMPS	4	6.66	6	10	10	16.66	40	66.6	1.56	3.71
3.	Block office	4	6.66	7	11.6	17	28.33	32	53.33	1.71	2.85
4.	District headquarter	4	6.66	6	10	12	20	38	63.33	1.6	2.75
5.	Credit Institution	8	13.33	35	58.33	11	18.3	6	10	2.75	1.71
6.	Nearest towns	5	8.33	43	71.66	10	16.6	2	3.33	2.85	1.6
7.	PHC	43	71.66	17	28.33	0	0	0	0	3.71	1.56
8.	KVK/OUAT/ICAR/Agril. office	47	78.33	0	0	2	3.33	1	1.6	3.71	1.53

Data in Table 5 revealed that out of 60 non-SHG members in the panchayat, 8.33% was office bearer, 8.33% were ordinary members, and 83.33% had no membership. In the youth club, 10% was office bearer, 23.33% were ordinary member, and 76.66% had no membership. In FPO, 15% was office bearer, 78.33% were ordinary member, and 76.66% had no membership. In cultural organization, 6.66% was office bearer, 16.66% were ordinary member, and 76.66% had no membership. In religious organization, 0% was office bearer, 33.33% were ordinary member, and 66.66% had no

membership. In financial organization, 16.66% was office bearer, 33.33% were ordinary member, and 2.38% had no membership. In non-SHG members, 25% were office bearers, 75% were ordinary members, and 0% had no membership. The findings were in line with study conducted by Prusty *et al.* (2020) [9]. Among all non-SHG members like farmers and businessmen, some farmers are likely to participate in the panchayat, cultural organizations, and religious organizations, and maximum businessmen are interested in youth clubs, cultural organizations and print media.

Table 5: Social participation of Non-SHG members

Sr. No	Activities	Daily		Weekly		Fortnightly		rarely		Mean score	Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%		
1.	Panchayat	5	8.33	8	13.33	16	26.66	30	50	1.78	3.71
2.	LAMPS	47	78.33	10	16.66	2	3.33	1	1.66	3.71	3.71
3.	Block office	43	71.66	17	28.33	0	0	0	0	3.71	2.85
4.	District headquarter	5	8.33	43	71.66	10	16.66	2	3.33	2.85	2.75
5.	Credit Institution	8	13.33	35	58.33	11	18.33	6	10	2.75	1.78
6.	Nearest towns	4	6.66	7	11.66	17	28.33	32	53.33	1.71	1.71
7.	PHC	4	6.66	6	10	12	20	38	63.33	1.6	1.6
8.	KVK/OUAT/ICAR/Agril. office	4	6.66	6	10	10	16.66	40	66.66	1.5	1.5

Table 6 revealed that out of 60 SHGs in the panchayat, 3.33% were daily, 11.6% weekly, 20% fortnightly and 65% rarely. In lamps, 6.66% was daily, 10% weekly, 16.66% fortnightly and 66.6% rarely. In the block office, 6.66% were daily, 11.6% weekly, 28.33% fortnightly and 53.33% rarely. In district headquarters, 6.66% was daily, 10% weekly, 20% fortnightly and 63.33% rarely. In credit institutions, 13.33% were daily, 58.33% weekly, 18.3% fortnightly and 10% rarely. In the

nearest towns, 8.33% were daily, 71.66% weekly, 16.6% fortnightly and 3.33% rarely. In PHC, 71.66% was daily, 28.33% weekly, 0% fortnightly and 0% rarely. In KVK, 78.33% was daily, 0% weekly, 3.33% fortnightly and 1.6% rarely. Regarding cosmopolitanism in SHGs, most SHG members were likely to coordinate weekly in the nearest towns, district headquarters, and credit institutions.

Table 6: Cosmopolitanism of SHG member

Sr. No	Sources	Office bearer		Ordinary member		No membership		Mean Score	rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Panchayat	2	3.33	5	8.33	53	88.33	1.15	2.23
2.	Youth club	4	6.66	9	15	47	78.33	1.15	2.01
3.	FPO	7	11.66	47	78.33	6	10	2.016	1.36
4.	Cultural Organization	1	1.66	13	21.66	46	76.66	1.23	1.23
5.	Religious organization	0	0	15	25	45	75	1.23	1.23
6.	Financial organization	0	0	23	38.33	37	61.66	1.36	1.15
7.	SHG	14	23.33	46	76.66	0	0	2.23	1.15

Table 7 revealed that out of 60 non-SHG in the panchayat, 8.33% were daily, 13.33% weekly, 26.66% fortnightly and 50% rarely. In lamps, 78.33% was daily, 16.66% weekly, 3.33% fortnightly and 1.66% rarely. In the block office, 71.66% was daily, 28.33% weekly, 0% fortnightly and 0% rarely. In district headquarters, 8.33% was daily, 71.66% weekly, 16.66% fortnightly and 3.33% rarely. In credit institutions, 13.33% were daily, 58.33% weekly, 18.3%

fortnightly and 10% rarely. In the nearest towns, 6.66% were daily, 11.66% weekly, 53.33% fortnightly and 3.33% rarely. In PHC, 6.66% was daily, 10% weekly, 20% fortnightly and 63.33% rarely. In KVK, 6.66% was daily, 10% weekly, 3.33% fortnightly and 16.66% rarely. Regarding cosmopolitanism in SHGs, most SHG members were likely to coordinate weekly in the nearest towns, district headquarters, and credit institutions.

Table 7: Cosmopolitanism of Non-SHG members

Sr. No	Sources	Office bearer		Ordinary member		No membership		Mean Score	rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Panchayat	5	8.33	5	8.33	50	83.33	1.28	2.25
2.	Youth club	6	10	14	23.33	40	66.66	1.43	1.96
3.	FPO	9	15	47	78.33	11	18.33	1.96	1.5
4.	Cultural Organization	4	6.66	10	16.66	46	76.66	1.3	1.43
5.	Religious organization	0	0	20	33.33	40	66.66	1.3	1.3
6.	Financial organization	10	16.66	20	33.33	30	50	1.5	1.3
7.	SHG	15	25	45	75	0	0	2.25	1.28

Table 8 revealed that, for personal sources, out of 60 Non SHGs, 11.66% were in regular contact, 75% were in occasional contact, and 13.33% had no contact. In formal resources, 80% were in regular contact, 15% occasional, and 5% no contact. In the demonstration, 26.66% were in regular contact, 70% were in occasional contact, and 3.33% had no contact. In social media, 76.6% were in regular contact, 15% were in occasional contact, and 8.33% were in no contact. In exposure visit, 15% was in regular contact, 80% had occasional contact, and 5% had no contact. In farm fairs, 6.66% were in regular contact, 86.66% had occasional

contact, and 6.66% had no contact. In meetings, 90% were in regular contact, 5% had occasional contact, and 5% had no contact. In print media, 13.33% were in regular contact, 3.33% had occasional contact, and 83.33% had no contact. Through these sources of information, both SHGs and non-SHG get much information through social media, demonstrations, exhibitions, meetings, newspapers etc. Sources of information play an important role in our day-to-day life. SHG members contact in exposure visits, exhibitions, meetings or training on an occasional basis.

Table 8: Sources of information of SHG members

Sl. No	Sources	Regular contact		Occasional contact		No contact		Mean Score	rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Personal sources (Friends/relatives/ Progressive farmer)	7	11.66	45	75	8	13.33	1.96	2.85
2.	Formal sources (Krishak Mitra, VLW/BTM/ATM, Agriculture officer, Input dealers, OUAT/ KVK)	48	80	9	15	3	5	2.75	2.75
3.	Demonstration/trial	16	26.66	42	70	2	3.33	2.21	2.68
4.	Social Media (Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.)	46	76.6	9	15	5	8.33	2.68	2.21
5.	Exposure visit	9	15	48	80	3	5	2	2
6.	Farm fair/exhibition	4	6.66	52	86.66	4	6.66	1.98	1.98
7.	Meetings/Trainings	54	90	3	5	3	5	2.85	1.96
8.	Print media (Newspapers, Farm literature)	8	13.33	2	3.33	50	83.33	1.26	1.26

Table 9 revealed that, for personal sources, out of 60 non-SHG, 13.33% were in regular contact, 3.33% were in occasional contact, and 83.33% had no contact. In formal resources, 90% were in regular contact, 5% were in occasional contact, and 5% were in no contact. In the demonstration, 6.66% were in regular contact, 86.66% had occasional contact, and 6.66% had no contact. In social media, 15% were in regular contact, 80% had occasional contact, and 13.33% had no contact. In exposure visit, 11.66% was in regular contact, 75% had occasional contact, and 13.33% had no contact. In the farm fair, 80% were in regular

contact, 15% had occasional contact, and 5% had no contact. In meetings, 26.66% were in regular contact, 70% were in occasional contact, and 3.33% had no contact. In print media, 15% were in regular contact, 80% had occasional contact, and 5% had no contact. Through these sources of information, both SHGs and non-SHG were getting much information through social media, demonstrations, exhibitions, meetings, newspapers etc., regarding non-SHG members, contact in exposure visits, exhibitions, meetings or training and demonstration on an occasional basis.

Table 9: Sources of information of Non SHG members

Sr. no.	Sources	Regular contact		Occasional contact		No contact		Mean Score	rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Personal sources (Friends/relatives/ Progressive farmer)	8	13.33	2	3.33	50	83.33	1.26	2.85
2.	Formal sources (Krishak Mitra, VLW/BTM/ATM, Agriculture officer, Input dealers, OUAT/ KVK)	54	90	3	5	3	5	2.85	2.75
3.	Demonstration/trial	4	6.66	52	86.66	4	6.66	1.98	2.21
4.	Social Media (Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.)	9	15	48	80	3	13.33	2	2

5.	Exposure visit	7	11.66	45	75	8	13.33	1.96	2
6.	Farm fair/exhibition	48	80	9	15	3	5	2.75	1.98
7.	Meetings/Trainings	16	26.66	42	70	2	3.33	2.21	1.96
8.	Print media (Newspapers, Farm literature)	9	15	48	80	3	5	2	1.26

Conclusion

From the study, it can be concluded that the majority (85%) of the respondents were found in the middle age group (30 to 50 year), maximum (66.66%) number of the respondents were found to be high school and live in a nuclear family, maximum 31% number of the respondents had a medium size of land holding (<1.0 ha.), maximum (43) percent number respondents had semi pucca house, maximum (56.66%) number of the respondents were having annual income up to Rs.10,000. The majority (63.33%) of respondents' primary occupation was farming. The study's findings may be used in other research or referred by Government for policy implications.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper

References

- Baath G, Northup B, Gowda P, Rocateli A, Turner K. Adaptability and Forage Characterization of Finger Millet Accessions in U.S. Southern Great Plains. *Agronomy*; c2018. <https://doi.org/10.3390/AGRONOMY8090177>.
- Babatunde RO, Omotesho OA, Sholotan OS. Socio-economic characteristics and food security status of farming households in Kwara State, North-Central Nigeria. *Pakistan journal of nutrition*. 2007;6(1):49-58.
- Fernandez DR, Vanderjagt DJ, Millson M, Huang YS, Chuang LT, Pastuszyn A, Glew RH. Fatty acid, amino acid and trace mineral composition of Eleusine coracana (Pwana) seeds from northern Nigeria. *Plant Foods for Human Nutrition*. 2003;58:1-10.
- Government of Odisha. Odisha agriculture statistics. Director of agriculture and food production, Bhubaneswar; c2015.
- Gull A, Jan R, Nayik GA, Prasad K, Kumar P. Significance of finger millet in nutrition, health and value added products: a review. *Magnesium (mg)*, 2014;130(32):120.
- Pant M, Srivastava S. Economics of finger millet cultivation in hills of Kumaon region of Uttarakhand. *Journal of Hill Agriculture*. 2014;5:13-18. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2230-7338.2014.00831.3>.
- Patel S, Verma V. Ways for Better Utilization of Finger Millet through Processing and Value Addition and Enhance Nutritional Security among Tribals. *The Journal of medical research*; c2015. p.15.
- Pradhan A, Panda AK, Bhavani RV. Finger millet in tribal farming systems contributes to increased availability of nutritious food at household level: Insights from India. *Agricultural Research*. 2019;8(4):540-547.
- Prusty AK, Senapati R, Badajena T, Rout S. Socio-economic attributes of farmers adopting System of Rice Intensification (SRI) method-An overview. *Mukt Shabd Journal*. 2020;9(6):2477-2486.
- Sahana S, Nanjappa D, Arunkumar P. Constraints Faced by the Stakeholders and Contract Sponsors of their

Suggestions for Improvement in Contract Farming. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci*. 2018;7(10):3559-3572.

- Tijjani H, Umar BF, Abubakar BZ, Aliyu U. Socio-economic determinants of adoption of improved millet production practices by farmers in Borno State, Nigeria. *Agrosearch*. 2018;18(2):86-100.
- Vijaya Bhaskar AV, Nithya DJ, Raju S, Bhavani RV. Establishing integrated agriculture-nutrition programmes to diversify household food and diets in rural India. *Food Security*. 2017;9:981-999.
- Wafula W, Nicholas K, Henry O, Siambi M, Gweyi-Onyango J. Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* L.) grain yield and yield components as influenced by phosphorus application and variety in Western Kenya. *Town Planning Review*. 2016;3:673-680. <https://doi.org/10.22271/TPR.2016.V3.I3.088>.
- Xiang J, Apea-Bah F, Ndolo V, Katundu M, Beta T. Profile of phenolic compounds and antioxidant activity of finger millet varieties. *Food chemistry*. 2019;275:361-368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.09.120>.