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ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic status is measurement of economic and social position of an individual in the society. It influences the accessibility to the resources, livelihood pattern, food and nutritional security. The research investigation was conducted in Zahirabad, Narayanakhed and Sanga Reddy. Revenue divisions purposively based on the highest number of agripreneurs. Nine blocks were selected from each revenue division purposively, thus making up a total of 27 blocks with the objective to know the profile of agri-input based Agripreneurs. Sample size constituted 200 Agripreneurs. The respondents were interviewed with the help of a schedule designed for the study. The exploratory survey design was used for the present study. The analysis of data revealed that majority of the respondents were ‘middle age’ with ‘Graduation level’ education (40.05%), majority of the Farm based agripreneurs with ‘medium’ Socioeconomic status (80.00%), Source of information utilization(53.50%) and Extension agency contact (69.00%), had ‘medium’ value orientation(49.00%) and had ‘high coordinate ability (64.50%) and medium achievement motivation (71.00%) and medium risk taking behavior (74.00%) and medium innovativeness(57.50%) were observed. Hence these independent variables should be taken care of by the implementing agencies while selecting the beneficiaries for entrepreneurship development programmes and farmer-friendly policies.
1. INTRODUCTION

Modern India is in need of realistic growth of the agricultural sectors to meet the social problems such as poverty alleviation and unemployment and improving the standard of living of the people [1-3]. Increasing population growth in the country places pressure on agricultural production. The miss uses of agrochemicals, pesticides increasing rapidly, the harmful effects of the pesticides are now established worldwide. Farmers are the direct users of pesticides and more like to get acute toxicity of pesticides. The chronic toxicity effect whole population. Farmers were unaware of correct usage of such agro chemicals, they are guided by agri input dealers and retail outlets of agri inputs [4-7]. Today the average age of the farmer increasing globally and encouraging new generation of farmer, farm-based enterprises are crucial because the quality supply of agricultural inputs like seeds, fertilizers, pesticides etc. ensure the quality production and productivity of agricultural products [8-10]. This naturally draws our interest to investigate as how the Agripreneur running farm-based enterprises his awareness about the legal procedures like laws related to agricultural inputs seed act and seed rules, fertilizer control order and insecticide act and rules, essential commodities act, consumer protection act etc. regarding purchasing and selling of agricultural inputs seeds fertilizers pesticides agro chemicals etc.

To improve the economic condition in rural areas, it is necessary to increase the supply of Agripreneurs. Farm based enterprises are important vehicle for imparting sustainability in farmer’s income, In a situation when farmer’s suicide and distress sell still remain the key issues in India’s Agricultural scenario, we are dreaming of achieving a double income for the farming community [11,12]. This gap in the income levels of farmers can only be bridged by adopting newer income generating opportunities like establishment of Farm based enterprises. Agriculture and industry both are miles apart from each other but there are definite enterprises which are dependent on agriculture and these types of enterprises are known as farm-based enterprises. Balaganoormth Laxmi [13] in her study revealed that factors influencing successful agripreneurs in dairy were high level of risk orientation (45.00%), followed by medium level of herd size and income level.

A farm-based enterprise is one which produces the finished goods by using agricultural raw materials or producing required inputs for farm or producing economic agricultural produce or rendering services for the farm. Ex; Biofertilizers, Livestock, Agro-processing, Agri clinic etc. (Source: vikaspedia.in/agriculture/farm-based enterprises). The farm based enterprises depends upon agriculture for raw materials. Farm based enterprises are the major market of agricultural commodities [14,15]. Main farm-based enterprises in India are the sugar industry, the cotton textile industry, jute industry, food processing, paper industry and agricultural inputs like seed fertilizer pesticides industries. Employment opportunities in the rural region of the country are increasing due to the establishment of more and more farm-based enterprises. Farm based enterprises playing a significant role in agricultural development. Farm based enterprises are the future of Indian agriculture.

Farmers get reasonable cost of the farm-based product by interlinking of farm-based enterprise and farmers. So in view of the importance of entrepreneurship development in agricultural sector and business planning for agricultural firms-from input traders to producers to processors an attempt has been made to find out socioeconomic profile of farm based agripreneurs. Being an agrarian economy, it is the need of the hour for promoting farm-based enterprises and stabilizing Agripreneurship as one of the most emphasized sectors of governmental policies which are being seen as an answer to low production, unemployment, poverty reduction in agricultural sector. For one, to become a successful Agripreneur, access to capital, technical and managerial know-how and at the same time aware of legal procedure for establishment of farm-based enterprises, documents required for sanctioning of licenses and knowing of different central and state acts, laws, schemes regarding the enterprise gives strength to the Agripreneur.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Ex-Post Facto research design was adopted for the study as the event was already occurred and the researcher has no opportunity to influence the independent variables. To place it in Kerlinger (1968) words, ex-post facto research is an
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orderly experimental enquiry wherein the researchers don’t have direct control of impacting (independent) factors. Since their appearances have just happened or on the grounds that they are characteristically not manipulatable.

The research investigation was conducted in Zahirabad, Narayanakhed and Sanga reddy Revenue divisions purposively based on the highest number of agripreneurs, nine blocks were selected from each revenue division, thus making up a total of 27 blocks with the objective, to know the role performance of Farm based Agripreneurs. Sample size constituted 200 Agripreneurs involved in agri input services drawn from three revenue division randomly as shown in Table 1. The collected data was processed and tabulated manually. Simple frequency and percentage were calculated to analyze the data.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Socioeconomic, Psychological and Communication Profile of Respondents

##### 3.1.1 Education

From Table 2, it can be understood that, majority of the respondents were graduated (40.5%), followed by matriculation (28%), higher secondary (21.5%), post-graduation (6%) and primary education (4%). It might be due to the fact that increased awareness on the education and free education motivates respondents to learn. Simultaneously, education made them to accept the science and innovation which resulted in quality service to farming community because of their expertise. Similar findings were reported by Gondkar et. al., [16], Mainroodi [17] and Sravan and Sivanarayana (2015).

| S.NO | Revenue divisions       | Mandals       | No of FBEs |
|------|-------------------------|---------------|------------|
| 1    | Narayankhed revenue     | 1. Kalher     | 08         |
|      |                         | 2. Kangti     | 18         |
|      |                         | 3. Manor      | 10         |
|      |                         | 4. Nagiligida  | 06         |
|      |                         | 5. Narayankhed | 32         |
|      |                         | 6. Sirgapoor  | 05         |
| 2    | Sangareddy revenue      | 7. Ameenpur   | 03         |
|      |                         | 8. Andole     | 11         |
|      |                         | 9. Gummadidala| 09         |
|      |                         | 10. Hathnoora | 09         |
|      |                         | 11. Jinnaram  | 06         |
|      |                         | 12. Kandi     | 0          |
|      |                         | 13. Kondapur  | 02         |
|      |                         | 14. Munipally | 13         |
|      |                         | 15. Patancheru| 06         |
|      |                         | 16. Pulkal    | 09         |
|      |                         | 17. Ramchandrapuram | 03         |
|      |                         | 18. Sadasivapet | 35         |
|      |                         | 19. Sangareddy | 10         |
|      |                         | 20. Vatpally  | 14         |
| 3    | Zaheerabab revenue      | 21. Jharasangam | 11        |
|      |                         | 22. Kohir     | 14         |
|      |                         | 23. Mogudampally | 03         |
|      |                         | 24. Nyalkal   | 14         |
|      |                         | 25. Raikode   | 24         |
|      |                         | 26. Zahirabad | 22         |
Table 2. Distribution of respondents based on their education level (n= 200)

| S. No. | Educational level | Frequency | Response |
|--------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1      | Primary          | 8         | 4        |
| 2      | Matriculation    | 56        | 28       |
| 3      | Higher secondary | 43        | 21.5     |
| 4      | Graduation       | 81        | 40.5     |
| 5      | Post-graduation  | 12        | 6        |

Table 3. Distribution of respondents based on their socioeconomic status (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Response |
|--------|----------|-----------|----------|
| 1      | Low      | 13        | 6.5      |
| 2      | Medium   | 160       | 80       |
| 3      | High     | 27        | 13.5     |

3.1.1.2 Socioeconomic status

From Table 3, it can be seen that majority of the respondents had medium level of socioeconomic status (80%), followed by high (13.5%) and low (6.5%) of socioeconomic status. It was because of the reason that increased land holding and a greater number of family members resulted in medium and high level of socioeconomic status. Similar findings were reported by Ram et. al., (2013).

3.1.1.3 Training received

From Table 4, it can be evident that more than half of the respondents (59%) not received any training and some of them (41%) received training. It was due to the fact that unaware of the benefits of the training, unaware of the purpose and place of training resulted in many of the respondents not received training. The results were in contrast with the studies of Gondkar et al., [16].

3.1.1.4 Experience

From Table 5, it revealed that equal percentage of respondents had experience of 4-8 years (35%) and more than 8 years (35%), followed by experience less than four years (30%). The probable reason might be the fact that the only some of the respondents were freshly employed. The work is contrast to the findings of Gondkar et al., (2012).

3.1.1.5 Source of Information Utilization

From Table 6, it indicated that more than half of the respondents (53.5%) had medium level of source of information utilization, followed by high level (46.5%) and low (22.5%) level of source of information utilization. It might be because of the reason that better education and experience results in increased source of information by attending various extension programmes like training, awareness campaigns, exhibitions, etc. Consequently, good source of communication leads to better decision-making. The findings were in line with studies of Sharma et al., (2011), Patel et al., (2014) and Sanjeev and Saroj (2014).

3.1.1.6 Ability to co-ordinate the farming activities

From Table 7 it can be seen that nearly two-third of the respondents (64.5%) had high level of ability to co-ordinate the farming activities, followed by medium (35.5%) and low (24%) level of ability to co-ordinate the farming activities. The possible reason might be that expertise and experience in their job, increased their ability to co-ordinate and manage their success on the enterprise. The results were in confirmatory with the findings of Sonawane (2012), Patel et al., (2014) and Boruah et al., (2015).

3.1.1.7 Value Orientation

From Table 8, it can be understood that nearly half of the respondents (45%) had medium level, followed by high level (42%) of value orientation, followed by low level of value orientation (13%). It might be due to the fact that respondent's education, experience, expertise and changing scenario may affect the value and resulted in low value orientation.
Table 4. Distribution of respondents based on their trainings received (n=200)

| S. No. | Category              | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Trainings not received| 118       | 59         |
| 2      | Trainings received    | 82        | 41         |

Table 5. Distribution of respondents based on their experience (n=200)

| S. No. | Category   | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|------------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | < 4 years  | 60        | 30         |
| 2      | 4-8 years  | 70        | 35         |
| 3      | >8 years   | 70        | 35         |

Table 6. Distribution of respondents based on their source of information utilization (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage | \( \bar{x} = 21.81 \) | \( \sigma = 2.84 \) |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1      | Low      | 45        | 22.5       |                        |                     |
| 2      | Medium   | 107       | 53.5       |                        |                     |
| 3      | High     | 48        | 46.5       |                        |                     |

Table 7. Distribution of respondents based on their ability to co-ordinate the farming activities (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage | \( \bar{x} = 13.59 \) | \( \sigma = 1.72 \) |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1      | Low      | 48        | 24         |                        |                     |
| 2      | Medium   | 71        | 35.5       |                        |                     |
| 3      | High     | 81        | 64.5       |                        |                     |

Table 8. Distribution of respondents based on their Value Orientation (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage | \( \bar{x} = 6.46 \) | \( \sigma = 0.92 \) |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1      | Low      | 26        | 13         |                        |                     |
| 2      | Medium   | 90        | 45         |                        |                     |
| 3      | High     | 84        | 42         |                        |                     |

Table 9. Distribution of respondents based on their Extension Agency Contact (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage | \( \bar{x} = 13.83 \) | \( \sigma = 2.88 \) |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1      | Low      | 37        | 18.5       |                        |                     |
| 2      | Medium   | 138       | 69         |                        |                     |
| 3      | High     | 25        | 12.5       |                        |                     |

3.1.1.8 Extension agency contact

From Table 9, it revealed that two-third of the respondents (69%) had medium level of extension agency contact, followed by low (18.5%) and high (12.5%) level of extension agency contact. The findings were inconsistent with the results reported by Tochhawng and Rewani (2013).

3.1.1.9 Mass media exposure

From Table 10, it indicated that nearly two-third of the respondents had medium level of mass media exposure (69%), followed by low (17%) and high level (14%) of mass media exposure. It
might be due to the fact that, good extension agency contact, better information sources and cyber media, need of information according to the modern scenario made the respondents to had medium level of mass media exposure. Studies by Gondkar et al., (2012) indicated inconsistent results.

3.1.1.10 Risk taking behaviour

From Table 11, it can be understood that nearly three-fourth (74.5%) of the respondents had medium level of risk-taking behavior, followed by low level (19%) of risk-taking behavior. Only few of them (6.5%) had high level of risk-taking behavior. It was because of the reason that well-qualified professionals with more experience had medium level of risk orientation as it involves high investment, more maintenance and uncertain climatic conditions in farm-based enterprises prevents high risk-taking behavior. Similar findings were reported by Sharma and Singh (2011), Borhan et al., (2015) and Gautam et al., (2015).

3.1.1.11 Innovativeness

From Table 12, it can be seen that more than half of the respondents had medium (57.5%) level of innovativeness, followed by high (22%) and low (20.5%) level of innovativeness.

The probable reason might be that, increased level of education and good extension agency contact made them to learn new technologies and adopt them. The findings were in accordance with the studies by Hajong and Sharma (2010) and Singh et al., (2011)

3.1.1.12 Achievement motivation

From Table 13, it can be evident that most of the entrepreneurs had (71%) medium level of achievement motivation, followed by 18 per cent and 11 per cent of low and high level of achievement motivation respectively. It might be because of the reason that, the inner drive of the respondents to achieve success in their enterprise, good extension agency contacts and increased mass media exposure made them to had medium level of achievement motivation.

Table 10. Distribution of respondents based on their Mass Media Exposure (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Low      | 34        | 17         |
| 2      | Medium   | 138       | 69         |
| 3      | High     | 28        | 14         |

\[ \bar{x} = 42.99, \sigma = 4.20 \]

Table 11. Distribution of respondents based on their Risk-Taking Behaviour (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Low      | 38        | 19         |
| 2      | Medium   | 149       | 74.5       |
| 3      | High     | 13        | 6.5        |

\[ \bar{x} = 12.62, \sigma = 1.39 \]

Table 12. Distribution of respondents based on their Innovativeness (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Low      | 41        | 20.5       |
| 2      | Medium   | 115       | 57.5       |
| 3      | High     | 44        | 22         |

\[ \bar{x} = 16.02, \sigma = 1.59 \]

Table 13. Distribution of respondents based on their Achievement Motivation (n=200)

| S. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 1      | Low      | 36        | 18         |
| 2      | Medium   | 142       | 71         |
| 3      | High     | 22        | 11         |

\[ \bar{x} = 20.83, \sigma = 2.71 \]
4. CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that majority of the respondents had bachelor degree of education, medium socioeconomic status, 4-8 years of experience with no training received and medium level of source of information utilization, value orientation, extension agency contact, mass media exposure, risk-taking behaviour, achievement motivation, innovativeness and high level of ability to co-ordinate the farming activities. By seeing the results of the study the socioeconomic variables are significantly effecting the behaviour and performance, ability of the farm based agripreneurs. Hence these independent variables should be taken care of by the implementing agencies while selecting the beneficiaries for entrepreneurship development programmes and farmer-friendly policies.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Creating awareness on the usage of insecticides, fungicides and fertilizers used through entrepreneurial programmes, trainings and awareness campaigns.
2. Increased level of education, good extension agency contacts and better exposure to mass media helps them to be aware of the new technologies and practices.
3. Support by family members and government, innovativeness, self-identity, need for additional family income motivates them to initiate their business.
4. Most of the respondents were unaware of the purpose and place of training since participation of respondents in various extension programmes like exhibitions, awareness campaigns, training, etc. becomes necessary.
5. Most of the respondents were aware on the various legal procedures related to documents applying for licenses, seed related, fungicides, insecticides, pesticides and fertilizers used, market related.
6. Awareness level on various schemes and technologies seems to be increased through the efforts of Government promotional activities.
7. Most of the respondents had medium level of role performance and they were aware of their role in their enterprise.
8. Socio-economic status of respondents does not have any association with the factors that motivate them to start their enterprise, their role performance, the difficulties experienced by the respondents and the awareness level on the legal procedures for the establishment of the enterprise.
9. Providing vocational training programme, managerial and technical assistance, financial assistance, space and infrastructure facility, increased awareness about government schemes and institutional support, providing good education, credible sources of information which in turns promote the farm-based enterprises.
10. Eliminating the middle men, creating new market opportunities, regulating price of inputs, provision of bank loans with low interest rate also motivated them to do their job efficiently and effectively.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Though, all possible efforts were made to make the study objective and precise, certain limitations did remain. The present study, being part of the Master's programme, has the normal limitations of time, funds and other facilities commonly faced by single student researcher. These limitations led to the purposive selection of only one district as the locale of the study. Generalizations made based on the findings of the study may not be directly applicable to other areas and need to be substantiated with other studies.

7. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE LINE OF WORK

1. The present study was conducted at only one district of the state. So, it needs to be replicated on larger samples covering all the individuals who has taken licenses from department of agriculture government of Telangana, so that the inferences drawn can be generalized to a greater extent.
2. Agripreneurship has enormous opportunity in various sectors. The entrepreneurial behaviour, role performance, dual duties and the importance of entrepreneurship in those sectors should be studied.
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