



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.03
TPI 2020; SP-9(4): 176-179
© 2020 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 27-02-2020

Accepted: 30-03-2020

Sonam Upadhyay
Department of Extension
Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Dr. NK Khare
Department of Extension
Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Dr. Kamini Bisht
Department of Extension
Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Profile of tribal farmers availing subsidies under different programmes

Sonam Upadhyay, Dr. NK Khare and Dr. Kamini Bisht

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Mandla district of Madhya Pradesh because of having highest tribal populated area. Total 161 beneficiaries were selected for the study. Data were collected by personal interview technique from selected beneficiaries. The findings of the study revealed that majority of tribal in Mandla district of Madhya Pradesh were poor farmers, illiterate, having small size of land holdings with annual income less than rupees five thousand. The tribal farmers were having nuclear size of family with 2 to 5 family members. The tribal farmers were migrating in nearby areas to earn their income by doing labor work in fields of other farmers. The tribal farmers are surviving in meager conditions with very limited resources in their households. The majority of tribal farmers were having low social participation (90.68%), medium material possession (49.06%), low farm power (86.95%) and medium farming experience (55.90%). The tribal farmers were very much dependent on solely farming. The tribal farmers in Mandla district of Madhya Pradesh were having medium level of knowledge of different schemes providing subsidy (54.05%) and have medium level of satisfaction (62.73%) of subsidy with low mass media exposure (68.32%).

Keywords: Socio-personal, psychological and communicational profile, subsidy

Introduction

India is a vast and diverse country, which is also a home for over one-fourth of world's absolute poor. Among the social groups in India, Scheduled tribes (ST) have the highest proportion of the poor. The population of Mandla district of Madhya Pradesh is notable. Tribal areas in Mandla district are in remote, hilly and forest area of Satpura, in mostly scattered habitation and tribal farmers are illiterate with less awareness about latest improved agricultural practices resulting in backwardness and very poor socio-economic status. The tribal farmers are surviving in meager conditions with very limited resources in their households. It seems that the development of India is not possible without sustainable development of the country.

Subsidies are provided both by Central and the State Government. These subsidies are aimed at popularizing cultivation of certain crops and adoption of new technologies available for the purpose (Deshpande 2002) [5]. The Central and State Governments are providing subsidies to farmers on fertilizers, irrigation (canal water), electricity and miscellaneous agricultural subsidies and to farmers' cooperative societies in the form of seeds, development of oil seeds, pulses, cotton, rice, maize and crop insurance schemes and price support schemes, etc. (Kaur and Sharma, 2012) [7]. Since, in-depth study of profile characteristics of the farmers gives a clear-cut picture about the farmer's background, living condition, surroundings and belongings which in turn will help to bring appropriate policy implications based on derived conclusions. The socio-economic profiling of the tribal farmers was carried out to get a precise understanding about the beneficiary towards subsidy. In present study, socio-personal, economic, psychological and communicational variables have been taken into consideration.

Material and Methods

The present investigation was carried out in Mandla district. The farmers were selected by the proportionate random sampling method to make sample size 161. An interview schedule was used for the data collection. The data was collected personally at the residence as well as the farm of the farmers. The collected data were coded, compiled, tabulated, and analyzed in line with the objectives of the study. Qualitative data were converted into quantitative data by means of suitable scoring, wherever necessary. Descriptive statistics such as mean and frequency were used for describing the variables of the study.

Corresponding Author:
Sonam Upadhyay
Department of Extension
Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Result and Discussion

Profile characteristics of the farmers gives a clear-cut picture about the farmer's background, living condition, surroundings and belongings which in turn will help to bring appropriate policy implications based on derived conclusions. In the

present study, socio-personal, economic, psychological and communicational profile have been taken into consideration. The relevant information was collected and findings are presented below.

Table 1: Socio-personal and economic profile of tribal farmers

Socio-personal and economic profile	Categories	f	%
Age	Young age (up to 35 yrs)	34	21.11
	Middle age (36-55 yrs)	91	56.52
	Old age (above 55 yrs)	36	22.37
Education	Illiterate	09	05.59
	Only can read	04	02.48
	Only read and write	10	06.21
	Primary school education	31	19.25
	Middle school education	31	19.25
	High school education	38	23.60
	Higher secondary education	24	14.90
	Graduate	10	06.24
	Post graduate	04	02.48
	Family type	Nuclear	86
Joint		75	46.58
Type of house	Kuchcha house	12	07.45
	Mixed house	39	24.22
	Pucca house	110	68.33
	Mansion	00	00.00
Land holding	Marginal (less than 1 ha)	70	43.47
	Small (1-2 ha)	59	36.64
	Medium (3-5 ha)	27	16.77
	Large (6-10 ha)	05	03.12
Occupation	Farming	142	88.19
	Farming + others	19	11.81
Annual income	Low (up to Rs. 100000 lakh)	59	36.64
	Medium (1- 200000 lakh)	92	57.14
	High (above 200000 lakh)	10	06.22
Social participation	Low (Up to 1)	146	90.68
	Medium (2-22)	12	07.45
	High (Above 22)	03	01.87
Material possession	Low	71	44.09
	Medium	79	49.06
	High	11	06.85
Farm power	Low (up to 4)	140	86.95
	Medium (5-8)	21	13.05
	High (above 8)	00	00.00
Farming experience	Low (Upto 10 yrs)	49	30.43
	Medium (11-20 yrs)	90	55.90
	High (Above 20 yrs)	22	13.67

It could be observed from Table 1, that 56.52 per cent of the selected beneficiaries were under middle age group and having age between 36 to 55 years, followed by old and young age. This leads to understand that majority of the tribal beneficiaries selected for this study belonged to middle aged. This finding is supported by Arifullah (2014) [2]. Whereas 23.60 per cent beneficiaries were having education level up to high school, followed by primary school, middle school, higher secondary, graduate, only read and write, illiterate, post graduate and only can read. The results are in line with the findings of Navdeep (2014). Highest percentage of beneficiaries (53.42%) belonged to nuclear family, followed by joint family. About half of the beneficiaries i.e. 43.47 per cent were observed in marginal land holding group, followed

by small, medium and large land holding group, 88.19 per cent of tribal farmers solely dependent on farming, belonged to medium income group (57.14%) followed by low and high annual income, had (90.68%) low social participation followed by medium and high social participation. In case of material possession, nearly half of the beneficiaries (44.09%) were having medium material possession, while 86.95 per cent of beneficiaries were having low farm power followed by medium farm power and most of the beneficiaries (55.90%) were having medium farming experience followed by low and high farming experience. Findings suggested that they were poor to fair in respect of these socio-personal and economic characteristics.

Table 2: Psychological profile of tribal farmers

Psychological profile	Categories	f	%
Risk orientation	Low (Up to 11)	21	13.04
	Medium (12-22)	115	71.42
	High (Above 18)	25	15.54
Innovativeness	Low (Up to 8)	15	09.31
	Medium (9-16)	92	57.14
	High (Above 16)	54	33.55
Subsidy orientation	Low (Up to 7)	27	16.77
	Medium (8-14)	106	65.84
	High (Above 14)	28	17.39
Knowledge towards subsidies	Low (Up to 21)	34	21.11
	Medium (22-42)	87	54.05
	High (Above 42)	40	24.84
Attitude towards subsidies	Low (Up to 16)	23	14.28
	Medium (17-36)	99	61.49
	High (Above 36)	39	24.23
Level of satisfaction	Low (Up to 7)	09	05.59
	Medium (8-14)	101	62.73
	High (Above 14)	51	31.68
Economic motivation	Low (Up to 10)	18	11.18
	Medium (11-20)	89	55.27
	High (Above 20)	54	33.55

It could be observed from Table 2, that 71.42 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium risk orientation followed by high and low risk orientation; this might be due to experiencing various degrees of risks to achieve their goals. Table 2 reveals that 57.14 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium innovativeness followed by high and low innovativeness due to their low level of education and mass media exposure. This finding is supported by Aiyasha and Shivamurthy (2014) [4]. Near about seventy (65.84%) of the beneficiaries having medium subsidy orientation, it might be due to the fact that they feel it act as a motivational factor for them (Mrutyunjay 2011) [8]. It could be observed that 54.05 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium knowledge regarding subsidies followed by high and low knowledge about subsidies; this might be due to having proper

information about different subsidy programme. About sixty per cent (61.49%) of the beneficiaries were having medium attitude toward subsidy followed by high and low attitude, due to the fact that tribal beneficiaries of subsidy are convinced about the benefit of subsidy. Whereas, 62.73 per cent of beneficiaries having medium level of satisfaction through subsidy followed by high and low satisfaction, it shows that they are more enthusiastic and have tendency to learn new things from the different sources. Result shows that 55.27 per cent of beneficiaries had medium economic motivation followed by high and low motivation. It is a fact that tribal farmers are skeptical about any innovations and they believe the innovations after they had received the importance about that innovation.

Table 3: Communicational profile of tribal farmers

Communicational profile	categories	f	Percentages
Extension contact	Low (Up to 9)	73	45.34
	Medium (10-18)	85	52.79
	High (Above 18)	03	01.87
Mass media exposure	Low (Up to 5)	110	68.32
	Medium (6-10)	31	19.25
	High (Above 10)	20	12.43
Source of information used	Low (Up to 14)	51	31.67
	Medium (15-28)	103	63.97
	High (Above 28)	07	04.36

Table 3 shows that about half of the beneficiaries (52.79%) were having medium extension contact followed by low and high extension contact. This might be due to less extent of participation and utilization of extension services and about 68.32 per cent of beneficiaries were having low mass media exposure followed by medium and high exposure, this might be due to the level of education and remoteness of the village. In case of source of information used by beneficiaries, 63.97 per cent were using medium sources of information followed by low and high source of information used by them.

Conclusion

It can be concluded from the study that the tribal farmers of

Mandla district of Madhya Pradesh have medium literacy, having small land holdings, medium income, and small family size with low social participation, medium innovativeness, subsidy orientation and level of satisfaction. It can be said that they were falling under the category of low to medium level of socio-economic standard, so appropriate policy has to be developed to enhance their standard of living. Large scale awareness campaign and mass media should be utilized in a big way to promote the subsidy provided by central and state government. Findings suggested that they were poor to fair in respect of these characteristics. Such conditions were responsible for making them very poor and consequently the poor tribal farmers were migrating into nearby areas for labor

work in the fields of big farmers to earn their livelihood. The tribal farmers were also very much dependent on solely farming. It is also concluded that the tribal farmers were facing lack of knowledge about subsidies provided to them by different schemes. The extension workers should consider all these facts while planning and executing the programmes for agricultural development of the tribal of Madhya Pradesh.

Reference

1. Anonymus. Census report. Government of India, 2011, 2011a.
2. Anonymus. Report of district planning and statistical office, Mandla district, Madhya Pradesh, 2011b.
3. Arifullah M, Zahan A, Rana MM, Adil M, Shamsunnaher. Attitude of the rural elite farmers towards extension activities performed by personnel of department of agricultural extension, 2014; 12(1):96-102.
4. Aiyasha GF, Shivamurthy M. Knowledge of farmers regarding use of *Trichoderma viride*. Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2014; 48 (2):257-263.
5. Deshpande RS, Bhende MJ, Raveendra T, Naika. Volume and composition of subsidies in food and agriculture: In ISEC, subsidies for agriculture in Karnataka, Bangalore: Institute for Social and Economic Change. 2002; 4:71-93.
6. Kalamkar SS, Swain M, Bhaiya SR. Impact Evaluation of Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) in Gujarat, agro-economic research centre, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Anand, Gujarat & Agricultural Development & Rural Transformation Centre, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, 2015.
7. Kaur R, Sharma M. Agricultural subsidies in India: Case study of electricity subsidy in Punjab state: An analysis. Int. J Sci. Res. Pub. 2012; 2:1-7.
8. Mrutyunajay S, Ramesh H, Patel, Manish K. Impact of the National Horticulture Mission Scheme in Rajasthan. AERC Sardar Patel University, Gujarat, Agriculture situation in India, 2011, 153-164.
9. Kakkar N, Kaur P, Dhaliwal RK. Satisfaction of farmers regarding subsidies provided under National Food Security Mission. Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development. 2014; 9(2):107-109.
10. Pareek U, Trivedi G. Factor analysis of socio-economic status of farmers in India. Rural Sociology. 1963; 30:311-321.
11. Pauline AA, Karthikeyan C. Farmer to farmer extension through farmer friend. Indian Res. J Ext. Edu. 2015; 15(2); 95-99.