

A Comparative Analysis of the Selected Profile Characteristics of Farmers in East Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh

P Revathi Nagamani, V Jyothi, P V Sathya Gopal and K Mosha
Department of Agricultural Extension, Agricultural Collage, Bapatla, A. P.

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted during 2019-20 using ex-post facto research design in East Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh sampling three groups of farmers namely 45 tenant farmers, 45 owner cum tenant farmers and 45 owner farmers. The profile characteristics namely extension contact, mass media exposure, scientific orientation, risk orientation and market orientation were studied and compared among the three groups. More than one-third of the tenant farmers had low (40.00%) extension contact, while 68.89 per cent of the owner cum tenant farmers had high extension contact and 68.89 per cent of the owner farmers had medium extension contact. More than half of the tenant (55.56%) farmers had high mass media exposure, while 75.56 per cent of the owner cum tenant farmers and 73.33 per cent of the owner farmers had medium mass media exposure. Great majority of the tenant (91.11%) farmers, 71.11 per cent of the owner cum tenant farmers and 64.44 per cent of the owner farmers had medium social participation. More than half of the tenant farmers had low (51.11%) scientific orientation, 53.33 per cent of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium scientific orientation and more than three-fourth of the owner farmers had high (77.78%) scientific orientation. More than two-third of the tenant (71.11%) farmers had high risk orientation, two-third of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium (66.66%) risk orientation and less than two-third of the owner farmers had low (64.45%) risk orientation. More than three-fourth of the tenant farmers had medium (75.56%) market orientation, 71.11 per cent of the owner cum tenant farmers had high market orientation and less than two-third of the owner (62.22%) farmers had medium market orientation.

Keywords: *Owner cum tenant farmers, Owner farmers, Tenant farming and Tenant farmers.*

The urge of landless to increase their income is the reason for tenancy. Uneconomic landholdings is one of the reason for owner cum tenant farming. In the recent times, it is observed in field situation that the real land owner is rarely in the fields. Small and marginal farmers, agricultural labour are taking up lands on rent basis for increasing their farm annual income. The form of cultivating crops on rented lands is termed as tenant farming. In field situation, it is observed that there are three types of people who are actually cultivating the land. They include the people who don't have any own land but practice cultivation on leased lands called as tenant farmers. The second group consist of the people practicing farming on own land as well as on leased land called as owner cum tenant farmers. The third group of farmers consists of the people practicing farming on own land called owner farmers. It is observed that there is an increase in the number of tenant farmers and owner cum tenant farmers in the recent past.

According to Cess Report 2014, there are about 13,48,035 tenant farmers in Andhra Pradesh. Among the 13 districts in Andhra Pradesh, East Godavari is having highest number of tenant farmers accounting to 2,50,000 (Revathi, 2014). Agriculture is

considered as the backbone of Indian economy. Every farmer is important to make this backbone strong and so the tenant farmers. To have a comprehensive analysis of tenant farming it is important to understand, compare and contrast tenant farmers with owner farmers. Hence the study was planned considering the three groups of farmers namely tenant farmers, owner cum tenant farmers and owner farmers in East Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted during 2019-20 using ex-post facto research design. Three mandals *viz.*, Kirlampudi, Peddapuram, Kajuluru were selected, from each of the selected mandal, three villages were selected using simple random sampling procedure. From each of the selected mandal, three villages were selected using simple random sampling procedure. Kirlampudi, Burugupudi and Jagapathinagaram villages from Kirlampudi mandal; Gorinta, J.Thimmapuram and Divili villages from Peddapuram mandal; Kajuluru, Gollapalem and Bandanapudi villages from Kajuluru were selected for the study. Thus a total of nine (09) villages were selected for the study. From each of the selected village, 5 respondents

each of tenant farmers, owner cum tenant farmers and owner farmers engaged in farming were selected using simple random sampling procedure. A sample of 45 tenant farmers, 45 owner cum tenant farmers and 45 owner farmers were selected, thus making a total sample of 135 respondents. The profile characteristics namely extension contact, mass media exposure, scientific orientation, risk orientation and market orientation were studied and compared among the three groups. The data was collected by administering the pretested interview schedule. It was made sure that the questions were correctly understood by the respondents. To convert the data into meaningful findings the statistical tools namely mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage and chi-square were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

More than one-third of the tenant farmers had low (40.00%) extension contact, followed by medium (37.78%) and high (22.22%) extension contact as presented in Table 1. More than two-third of the owner cum tenant farmers had high (68.89%) extension contact, followed by medium (24.44%) and low (6.67%) extension contact. More than two-third of the owner farmers had medium (68.89%) extension contact, followed by high (17.78%) and low (13.33%) extension contact. The results are in conformity with that reported by Bishnoi *et al.* (2017) and Mithun *et al.* (2020). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically no significant difference in extension contact levels between different groups, $\chi^2 = 4.577$, $p = 0.101$.

It could be inferred from the above results that there is clear cut difference in the proportion of the respondents observed in low, medium and high categories among the three groups of tenants, owner cum tenants and owner farmers. Greater proportion of the owner cum tenant farmers were observed in high extension contact which could be accounted as that the area cultivated by owner cum tenant farmers is more, hence now and then they might have contacted extension personnel for inputs and agro advisories. The farmers having own land can gain a few inputs at free of cost or on subsidy basis, hence greater proportion of the owner farmers were observed in medium extension contact category. Tenant farmers can't avail any inputs either free or on subsidy basis, hence they rarely contacted extension personnel hence greater proportion were observed in low extension contact category. Among the three groups based on frequency and percentage respondents differed in their extension contact. However there is no significant difference in extension contact among the three groups.

More than half of the tenant farmers had high (55.56%) mass media exposure, followed by medium (24.44%) and low (20.00%) mass media exposure. More than three-fourth of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium (75.56%) mass media exposure, followed by high (13.33%) and low (11.11%) mass media exposure. Less than three-fourth of the owner farmers had medium (73.33%) mass media exposure, followed by high (15.56%) and low (11.11%) mass media exposure. The results are in conformity with that reported by Mir *et al.* (2015), Sarada (2016), Sivaraj *et al.* (2017), Kumar (2019), Vihan and Jahanara (2019). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically significant difference in mass media exposure levels between different groups, $\chi^2 = 8.638$, $p = 0.013$.

It could be inferred from the above results that, greater proportion of the tenant farmers were observed in high category of mass media exposure to get agriculture related information. While greater proportion of the owner cum tenant farmers and owner farmers were observed in medium category of mass media exposure to get agriculture related information. Among the three groups based on frequency and percentage tenant farmers differed from owner cum tenants and owner farmers in mass media exposure. Hence there is significant difference in mass media exposure among the three groups.

Great majority of the tenant farmers had medium (91.11%) social participation, followed by high (8.89%) social participation. More than two-third of the of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium (71.11%) social participation, followed by high (28.89%) social participation. Less than two-third of the owner farmers had medium (64.44%) social participation, followed by high (35.56%) social participation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Meena *et al.* (2015) and Sumana *et al.* (2018). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically significant difference in social participation levels between different groups, $\chi^2 = 8.667$, $p = 0.013$.

It could be inferred from the above results that, greater proportion of the respondents in all the three categories were observed in medium category of social participation. None of the respondents had low social participation. It is further observed that the proportion of the owner farmers observed in the category of high social participation is more among the three groups followed by owner cum tenants and tenants. Social participation depends on the extent of extrovert and introvert behaviour. It further depends on the respondents free time, interest, etc. The above findings clearly indicates the difference in the social participation among the three groups. Hence there is

Table 1. Distribution of tenant farmers, owner cum tenant farmers and owner farmers according to their selected profile characteristics

S.No.	Profile characteristic	Category	Tenants		Owner cum tenants		Owners		χ^2 Test statistics
			(n=45)		(n=45)		(n=45)		
			F	%	F	%	F	%	
1	Extension Contact	Low	18	40	3	6.67	6	13.33	$\chi^2=4.577$ p=0.101
		Medium	17	37.78	11	24.44	31	68.89	
		High	10	22.22	31	68.89	8	17.78	
2	Mass Media Exposure	Low	9	20	5	11.11	5	11.11	$\chi^2=8.638^*$ p=0.013
		Medium	11	24.44	34	75.56	33	73.33	
		High	25	55.56	6	13.33	7	15.56	
3	Social Participation	Low	--	--	--	--	--	--	$\chi^2=8.667^*$ p=0.013
		Medium	41	91.11	32	71.11	29	64.44	
		High	4	8.89	13	28.89	16	35.56	
4	Scientific Orientation	Low	23	51.11	12	26.67	4	8.89	$\chi^2=14.338^*$ p=0.001
		Medium	12	26.67	24	53.33	6	13.33	
		High	10	22.22	9	20	35	77.78	
5	Risk Orientation	Low	4	8.89	7	15.56	29	64.45	$\chi^2=9.053^*$ p=0.011
		Medium	9	20	30	66.66	6	13.33	
		High	32	71.11	8	17.78	10	22.22	
6	Market Orientation	Low	--	--	4	8.89	10	22.22	$\chi^2=14.126^*$ p=0.001
		Medium	11	24.44	9	20	28	62.22	
		High	34	75.56	32	71.11	7	15.56	

significant difference in social participation among the three groups.

More than half of the tenant farmers had low (51.11%) scientific orientation, followed by medium (26.67%), high (22.22%) scientific orientation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Kumar (2017). More than half of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium(53.33%)scientific orientation, followed by low(26.67%) and high(20.00%) scientific orientation. More than two-third of the owner farmers had high (77.78%) scientific orientation, followed by medium (13.33%) and low (8.89%) scientific orientation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Reddy *et al.* (2014), Tiwari *et al.* (2015), Deepa *et al.* (2019) and Khan *et al.* (2020). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically significant difference in scientific orientation levels between different groups, $\chi^2=14.338$, p=0.001.

It could be inferred from the above results that, greater proportion of the tenants were observed in low category of scientific orientation accounting that they lack scientific knowledge and skill may be due to low

participation in training programmes and low extension contact. Greater proportion of the owner cum tenants were observed in medium category of scientific orientation accounting that they have some scientific knowledge. While greater proportion of the owner farmers were observed in high category of scientific orientation, this could be accounted for the reason that they had been practicing farming in their own field since long time adopting scientific practices to safe guard the good soil, land and natural resource properties. While, tenants and owner cum tenants are practicing farming on others land, hence they might have not felt the responsibility of safe guarding the natural resources. A clear cut different is observed in all the three groups in scientific orientation. Hence there is significant difference in scientific orientation among the three groups.

More than two-third of the tenant farmers had high (71.11%) risk orientation, followed by medium (20.00%) and low (8.89%) risk orientation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Chithra *et al.* (2019). Two-third of the owner cum tenant farmers had medium(66.66%) risk orientation, followed by high (17.78%) and low (15.56%) risk orientation. The results

are in conformity with that reported by Bagenia and Lakhera (2017), Kumar (2019) Singh *et al.* (2020), Bagenia and Lakhera. (2017) and Vijayabhinandana *et al.* (2018). Less than two-third of the owner farmers had low (64.45%) risk orientation, followed by high (22.22%) and medium (13.33%) risk orientation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Tiwari *et al.* (2016). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically significant difference in risk orientation between different groups, $\chi^2=9.053$, $p=0.011$.

It could be inferred from the above results that, greater proportion of the tenant farmers were observed in high risk orientation category, which could be accounted for their entrepreneurial behaviour in leasing-in the land. Greater proportion of the owner cum tenant farmers were observed in medium risk orientation category, as they are farming in both own and leased land. While greater proportion of the owner farmers were observed in low risk orientation category, as they are farming in their own land and has no lease-in land. Based on frequency and percentage there is a clear cut difference in the risk orientation of the respondents among the three groups. Hence there is significant difference in risk orientation among the three groups.

More than third-fourth of the tenant farmers had medium (75.56%) market orientation, while the remaining had medium (24.44%) market orientation. Less than three-fourth of the owner cum tenant farmers had high (71.11%) market orientation, followed by medium (20.00%) and low (8.89%) market orientation. Less than two-third of the owner farmers had medium (62.22%) market orientation, followed by low (22.22%) and high (15.56%) market orientation. The results are in conformity with that reported by Meena (2014), Maratha and Badodiya (2017) and Singh *et al.* (2018). Chi-square test showed that there is statistically significant difference in market orientation levels between different groups, $\chi^2=14.126$, $p=0.001$.

It could be inferred from the above results that, greater proportion of the tenant farmers had high market orientation, followed by medium and none of them had low market orientation. This clearly indicates that they are market and price oriented as they need to pay off the additional burden of land lease rents and others. While greater proportion of the owner cum tenant farmers had high market orientation indicating the same need as in case of tenant farmers but however a little proportion of the respondents were observed in low market orientation category unlike tenant farmers. It may be due to the reason that owner cum tenant farmers own some land for which land lease rents need not be paid. Greater proportion of the owner farmers were observed in medium market orientation category while this proportion is less when compared to owner cum tenant farmers as they are need not pay any land

lease rents and completely farming on own land. Hence there is significant difference in market orientation among the three groups.

CONCLUSION

Mass media exposure, scientific orientation, risk orientation and market orientation significantly differed among the three groups namely tenant farmers, owner cum tenant farmers and owner farmers. Extension contact did not significantly differ as the farmers contacted extension personnel for agro advisories to increase their income and extension personnel served them without any difference. However, these variables and their differences among the groups need to be considered while formulating programmes, schemes, etc. The findings also indicate the need for client specific programmes.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bagenia P S and Lakhera J P 2017** Correlation of Personal Attributes with Adoption Behavior of Legume Growers in Thar Desert, Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Extension Education & Rural Development*. 25: 126-131.
- Bishnoi M, Sisodia S S, Kumar Vikas and Kumar Vinod 2017** Association between Personal Attributes of Farmers and Adoption of Bt Cotton Production Technology in Bhilwara District of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*. 9 (31): 4446-4450.
- Chithra Y D, Meti S K, Harshitha D and Maraddi GN 2019** A Study of Socio – Economic Profile of Seed Growers in Raichur District of Karnataka. *International Journal of Development Research*. 8 (9) : 22901-22906.
- Deepa C, Sathya Gopal P V, Lakshmi T and Hemalatha S 2019** Profile Characteristics of Rice Farmers in Nellore District of Andhra Pradesh, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 8 (07): 629-635.
- Khan M I, Sharad Bisen and Gaurav Mahajan 2020** Socio-Economic Profile of Vegetable Growers under Horticulture based Module of Farmer FIRST Project in Balaghat (MP), India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 9 (3): 3252-3257.
- Kumar N K 2019** Impact of ANGRAU supported Reliance Foundation Information Services in Guntur district of Andhra Pradesh – A public private partnership initiative. *M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University. Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India.

- Maratha P and Badodiya S K 2017** Study on Marketing Behaviour and Other Attributes of Vegetable Growers at Kota block of Kota district of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Bioscience*. 5 (1): 329-337.
- Meena N R, Sharma F L and Kaushik R A 2015** Association Between Personal Traits and Adoption of Pea Production Technology in Kota Region of Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Extension Education & Rural Development*. 23: 69-75.
- Mithun Kumar Ghosh, Shaikh Shamim Hasan, Enamul Haque Md and Jamal Uddin Md 2020** Knowledge of Farmers to Sustainable Agriculture Practices: A Case Study in Southwestern Region of Bangladesh. *Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences*. 7 (1): 5-12.
- Mir M A, Baqual M F, Kamili A S, Mir S A, Sakiba Saleem and Verma G R 2015** Impact of Mass Media Exposure and Innovation Proneness on Cocoon Production. *Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences*. 3 (5): 453-457.
- Reddy N P, Lakshmi T and Prasad S V 2014** Profile Characteristics of Cotton Farmers in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Streams Research Journal*. 4 (4): 1-5.
- Revathi E 2014** Liberalizing lease market- The Andhra Pradesh land licensed cultivators act. Working paper no. 135. Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad.
- Sarada K 2016** A study on Innovative Farmers Network (IFN) for transfer of Cotton Production Technologies in Telangana state. *M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*. Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad. India.
- Sivaraj P and Philip H 2017** Role of Mass Media in Changing the Attitude Level of Farmers towards Organic Farming in the Western Zone of Tamil Nadu. *Journal of Extension Education*. 29 (2): 5880-5884.
- Singh C V, Ranjan R, Shekhar S, Singh A K, Jaiswal A K and Pan R S 2018** Socio-Economic Status and Attitude of Farmers of Santhal Pargana Division of Jharkhand, Eastern India - A Benchmark Analysis. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*. 22 (2): 1-6.
- Singh D, Prabhjot Kaur and Dalber Singh 2020** Comparative Analysis of Socio-Psychological Characters of Farmers Adoption Various Resource Conservation Technologies. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 20 (1) : 61-66.
- Sumana N A, Lakshminarayan M T, Nataraju M S and Dishant Jojit James 2018** Profile and Marketing Practices of Grape Growers. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*. 6 (5): 1-6.
- Tiwari R K and Jaiswal P K 2015** A Study on Tribal Farmer's Knowledge About Sugarcane Production Technology. *Indian Journal of Extension Education & Rural Development*. 23: 125-128.
- Tiwari Garima, Singh P, Lodhi Sarvesh, Kumar Manoj and Singh Brajendra P 2016** Socioeconomic Profile of the Farmers and their Correlation with Technological Adoption of Rice Wheat- Cropping System in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*. 8 (55): 2960-2965.
- Vihan V and Jahanara 2019** Adoption Behaviour of Improved Potato Production Technology Among the Farmers of Meerut District (UP). *International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology*. 6 (5): 8-14.
- Vijayabhinandana B, Jyothi V and Venkata Subbaiah P 2018** Enhancing the Role of Tenant Farmers in Achieving Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 18 (1): 15-21.