



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2022; SP-11(9): 04-07  
© 2022 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 08-06-2022  
Accepted: 13-07-2022

**Guneshori Lairenjam,**  
M.Sc. (Ag), Department of  
Extension Education, JNKVV,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

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

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

## Socio-economic attributes of MOVCDNER beneficiaries of Imphal east district of Manipur

**Guneshori Lairenjam, NK Khare and Kamini Bisht**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.22271/tpi.2022.v11.i9Sa.15215>

### Abstract

A study entitled “Impact of Mission Organic Value Chain Development for North Eastern Region (MOVCDNER) on livelihood of beneficiary farmers in Manipur” was conducted by employing ex-post-facto research design during 2020. A total of 100 respondents covering 4 villages from 3 blocks of Imphal east district were selected as sample respondents. The data regarding socio-economic attributes were collected by personal interview using a well-structured interview schedule. The findings of the study include the higher percentage of beneficiaries (61.00%) belonged to middle age groups, 83.00 percent of the total respondents were of male had education up-to middle school level (37.00%). 54.00 percent were having 5-7 family members possessed small land holdings, majority were 84.00 percent engaged to farming as their primary occupations, 40.00 percent were having low annual income. More than sixty percent were having medium market orientation (66.00%) and low social participation (62.00%).

**Keywords:** MOVCDNER, socio-economic, beneficiary

### Introduction

In recent times, organic farming has increasingly gained attention as a way to manage natural resources in a more sustainable way and to raise incomes especially of smallholder farm (Nazeer, 2014) <sup>[1]</sup>. Organic farming systems have attracted increasing attention world over due to wide adverse effects of conventional agricultural practices on human diet, environment and sustainability of agricultural production. The Organic farming is not new to the farming community of the North-East India. The North-Eastern (NE) Region of India has tremendous potential for development of organic farming (Ramesh, 2008) <sup>[2]</sup>. Initially, the North-Eastern States were identified for promoting organic farming, because, the use of inorganic fertilizers and chemicals is meagre in the region and secondly, the system of production in the hills remained low and the average yield of most of the crop remained far behind national average (Bhagat and Gaurav 2004) <sup>[3]</sup>. Realizing these potential of organic farming in the region of the country Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare has launched a Central Sector Scheme entitled “Mission Organic Value Chain Development for North Eastern Region” for implementation in the states of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura, during the 12th plan period. The scheme aims at development of certified organic production in a value chain mode to link growers with consumers and to support the development of entire value chain starting from inputs, seeds, certification, to the creation of facilities for collection, aggregation, processing marketing and brand building initiative (Reddy, 2017) <sup>[4]</sup>.

Manipur is one of the north-eastern states in India with an area of 22,327 sq.km. Agriculture is the dominant occupation of the people of Manipur. It is not only the main source of livelihood of the overwhelming majority, but also a tradition and a way of life that moulds the socio-economic status of the people. More than half (52.19 percent) of the total working population of the state are directly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. Of the total working population of 11, 59, 053 persons; 2, 66,486 persons or 23 percent in the valley and 3, 02, 466 persons or 26.1 percent in the hills are agricultural workers (Lairenjam, 2020) <sup>[5]</sup>.

### Material and Methods

The investigation was conducted in the Imphal East district of Manipur. The district comprises of 3 blocks namely Sawombung, Jiribam and Keirao. Out of which Sawombung block was selected purposively having maximum number of MOVCDNER beneficiaries. The selected block comprises of 67 villages, out of which 4 villages were selected.

**Corresponding Author**  
**Guneshori Lairenjam,**  
M.Sc. (Ag), Department of  
Extension Education, JNKVV,  
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

From these villages a list of 100 MOVCDNER beneficiaries was selected as respondents for investigation. Data were collected through personal interviews using the pretested structured schedule to elicit the socio-economic attributes of MOVCDNER beneficiaries. The data were tabulated and analyzed by using statistical tools viz. frequency, percentage, mean and Standard Deviation.

**Results and Discussion**

The socio-economic profile provides a complete picture of their existing situation and gives an idea of their basic socioeconomic characteristic at a glance. The major criteria or variables used for presenting the profile were: age, Gender, Level of education, Family size, Land holdings, Occupations, Annual income, Market orientation and Social participation.

**Age**

Age is an important social factor that influences individuals working ability. Age is significant in terms of experience, the maturity of judgment, decision making, and the power of understanding. The respondent farmers of the study were categorized into 3 groups as reflected in the table below.

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to their age

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Young age (Up to 35 years)	13	13.00
2.	Middle age (36-55 years)	61	61.00
3.	Old age (above 55 years)	26	26.00
	Total	100	100.00

Perusal of data in the table 1 explicates that out of the total farmers 61.00 percent of the respondent were found in middle age category followed by 26.00 percent in old age category and 13.00 percent in young age category. These findings are in line with the results of Roy *et al.* (2013) [6], Rathore (2016) [7], and Pradhan *et al.* (2021) [8].

**Gender**

Gender was operationally defined as the set of characteristics that distinguish between male and female. The respondents were grouped into male and female based on gender. The gender was expressed in terms of frequency and percentage.

**Table 2:** Distribution of respondents according to their age

S.No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Male	83	83.00
2.	Female	17	17.00
	Total	100	100.00

The data of the table 2 reveals that the out of total respondents, 83.00 percent were male and 17.00 percent were female. These findings are similar to the results of previously research work done by Neelu (2013) [9] and Hanumantha (2016) [10].

**Education**

Education has been identified as a major component for the development of an individual, the process of bringing desirable changes in the behavior of human beings, particularly in the development of knowledge, skill and positive attitude. In this study, the respondents were categorized into 5 groups as per their level of education.

**Table 3:** Distribution of respondents according to their education

S. No	Education level	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Illiterate	7	7.00
2.	Primary school	14	14.00
3.	Middle school	37	37.00
4.	High school and Higher secondary	29	29.00
5.	Graduate	13	13.00
	Total	100	100.00

The data in table 3 clearly depicts that out of the total respondents, 37.00 percent of the respondents received education up to middle school level, followed by high school and higher secondary (29.00%), primary school (14.00%), graduate (13.33%) and 7.00 percent were illiterate. These findings are in line with the results of Roy *et al.* (2013) [6] and Pradhan *et al.* (2021) [8].

**Family size**

Family size indicates no of members in respondent's family. Respondents in this study were categorized into 3 groups as per family size.

**Table 4:** Distribution of respondents according to their family size

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Less than 5 members	22	22.00
2.	5-7 members	54	54.00
3.	More than 7 members	24	24.00
	Total	100	100.00

Above table 4 reveals that out of the total respondents, 54.00 percent were having 5 to 7 members in a family, followed by 24.00 percent having more than 7 members and 22.00 percent of the respondents having less than 5 members in a family. The results of the present study are in line with the results of work done Lal (2014) [11] and Pradhan *et al.* (2021) [8].

**Land holding size**

It is referred to the number of acres of land possessed by a family of the respondent. In this study, the respondents were categorized into 3 groups as per their landholding size.

**Table 5:** Distribution of respondents according to their land holding

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Marginal (up to 1 ha)	55	55.00
2.	Small (1.01 – 2 ha)	33	33.00
3.	Medium (2.01- 4 ha)	12	12.00
	Total	100	100.00

The data in table 5 clearly shows that out of the total respondents 55.00 percent of respondents were observed in marginal land holding category followed by 33.00 percent under small land holding category and only 12.00 percent were observed under medium land holding category. These findings are similar with the results of research work done by Neelu (2013) [9] and Meshram *et al.* (2020) [12].

**Occupation**

It is referred to the various sources from where the respondents derived income. In this study, the respondents were categorized into two categories as per their source of income.

**Table 6:** Distribution of respondents according to their occupation

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Primary (Farming )	84	84.00
2.	Subsidiary (Others)	16	16.00
	Total	100	100.00

The data of the table 6 reveals that out of the total respondents, 84.00 percent were having farming as their primary occupation and 16.00 percent of respondents were having subsidiary occupations (i.e beekeeping, labour, dairy farming). These findings are similar with the results of research work done by Choudhury (2010) [13] and Meshram *et al.* (2020) [12].

**Annual Income**

Annual income is the sign of social status and level of maintenance of life, which is directly related to the knowledge and adoption level of the farmers. In this study, the respondents were categorized into 4 groups as per their annual income.

**Table 7:** Distribution of respondents according to their annual income

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Very Low (up to Rs.50,000)	36	36.00
2.	Low (Rs.50,001-1 lakh)	40	40.00
3.	Medium (Rs.1 lakh-1.5 lakh)	16	16.00
4.	High (above 1.5 lakh)	8	8.00
	Total	100	100.00

The data in table 7 clearly shows that out of the total respondents, 40.00 percent were having low income, followed by very low income (36.00%), medium income (16.00%) and high income (8.00%). These findings are similar with the results of research work done by Datta and Singh (2011) [14] and Pradhan *et al.* (2021) [8].

**Market Orientation**

Market orientation was operationalized as the judgements taken by the individual respondent to sell the produce for better price by analysing the various prevailing infrastructure and market intelligence facilities.

**Table 8:** Distribution of respondents according to their market orientation

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (Up to 11.36score)	25	25.00
2.	Medium (11.37-15.28 score)	66	66.00
3.	High (Above 15.28 score)	9	9.00
	Total	100	100.00

Mean=13.32 SD=1.96

The data in table 8 indicates that out of the total respondents, (66.00) percent farmers had medium market orientation, followed by low market orientation (25.00%) and high market orientation (9.00%). These findings are similar with the results of research work done by Rai (2015) [15].

**Social Participation**

The extent of involvement of respondents in activities of different organizations determines the progressiveness and social position of a person in the society. A person having more social contact is supposed to be exposed to up to date information, due to his involvement in different organizations,

which in turn aid to motivation for use of changed practice. Attempt was also made to assess the involvement of the respondents in different social activities in their situation.

**Table 9:** Distribution of respondents according to their social participation

S. No	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low	62	62.00
2.	Medium	23	23.00
3.	High	15	15.00
	Total	100	100.00

Table 9 shows that out of the total respondents, (62.00) percent farmers had low social participation, followed by medium social participation (23.00%) and high social participation (15.00%). These findings are similar with the results of research work done by Lal (2014) [11] and Pradhan *et al.* (2021) [8].

**Conclusion**

It was concluded from the study that higher percentage of beneficiaries (61.00%) belonged to middle age groups, 83.00 percent of the total respondents were of male had education up-to middle school level (37.00%). 54.00 percent were having 5-7 family members possessed small land holdings, majority were 84.00 percent engaged to farming as their primary occupations, 40.00 percent were having low annual income. More than sixty percent were having medium market orientation (66.00%) and low social participation (62.00%). With understanding the socioeconomic attributes of farmers the direction can be provided and policies can be developed to provide necessary technologies and information to the targeted regions with the most effective impact.

**References**

1. Nazeer U. Organic Farming Impact on Sustainable Livelihoods of Marginal Farmers in Shimoga District of Karnataka, 2014;2(4):81.
2. Ramesh P, Panwar NR, Singh AB, Ramana S, Yadav SK, Shrivastava R, *et al.* Status of Organic Farming in India. *Current Science*; c2010. p. 1190-1194.
3. Bhagat B, Gaurav. Organic by default: The Irony of organic farming in India; c2004.
4. Reddy AA. Impact Study of Mission Organic Value Chain Development for North-eastern Region (MOVCDNER). MANAGE, Hyderabad; c2017.
5. Lairenjam G. Impact of Mission Organic Value Chain Development for North Eastern Region (MOVCDNER) on livelihood of beneficiary farmers in Manipur. M.Sc. (Thesis), JNKVV, Jabalpur; c2020.
6. Roy ML, Chandra N, Kharbikar HL, Joshi P, Jethi R. Socio-economic Status of Hill Farmers: An Exploration from Almora District in Uttarakhand. *International Journals of Agriculture and Food Science Technology*, 2013;4(4):353-358.
7. Rathore P. Impact of Integrated Watershed Management programme on sustainable livelihoods of beneficiary farmers in district Sidhi (M.P.). M.Sc Thesis, JNKVV, Jabalpur; c2016.
8. Pradhan S, Naberia S, Harikrishna YV, Jallarp V. Socio-Economic Correlates of Livelihood Security of Small Farmers in Jabalpur District of Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2021;57(3):57-59.
9. Neelu T. A Study on Impact of Integrated Tribal

- Development Programme with Reference to Income Generation among the Tribal of Mandla District Madhya Pradesh. M.Sc. Thesis, JNKVV, Jabalpur; c2013.
10. Hanumantha K. Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MNREGS) In Ananthapuramu District of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc. Thesis, Acharya N.G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad; c2016.
  11. Lal SP. Assessment of Livelihood Security and Resilience among Farmers affected by Natural Calamity in Bihar Ph.D. Thesis, NDRI, Karnal; c2014.
  12. Meshram M, Khare NK, Singh SRK. Socio-Economic Profile of Integrated Farming System Practicing Farmers in Madhya Pradesh State. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2020;9(4):155-159.
  13. Choudhury MA, Ali MDH. Income employment and consumption patterns of the tribal people in Manipur. Journal of interacademic. 2010;14(4):569-582.
  14. Datta SK, Singh K. Livelihood Diversification: Case study of some backward regions in India. International Journal of Current Research. 2011;3(2):139-151.
  15. Rai SK. Agricultural diversification for livelihood security of rural people of south Gujarat. Ph.D. Thesis, NAU, Navsari; c2015.