

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 7; Issue 9; September 2024; Page No. 06-10

Received: 05-05-2024
Accepted: 09-06-2024

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Attitude of agri and non agri professionals towards agripreneurship: A comparative study

¹Kondle Sushma, ²P Vijaya Lakshmi, ³B Savitha and ⁴I Shakuntala Devi

¹P.G. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

²Professor, Extension Education Institute, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

³Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

⁴Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2024.v7.i9a.1001>

Corresponding Author: Kondle Sushma

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Hyderabad, Karimnagar and Warangal districts of Telangana state to study the Attitude of Agripreneurs towards Agripreneurship: Profile Characteristics of Agri and non agri professionals. A total of 120 respondents (60 agri professionals and 60 non agri professionals) were randomly selected for the study. Ex-post-facto research design was used for the present study. It was found that among agri professionals majority of the agri professionals fell under middle age category (56.67%), male (73.33%), with nuclear family type (85.00%) had undergraduation education (68.34%), with medium annual income (58.33%), financial support from banks and self-investment (85.00%), received technical support from government institutions (71.66%), moderately favourable entrepreneurial motivation (63.33%), medium innovativeness (68.34%), medium risk taking ability (73.33%), medium mass media contact (61.66%), medium achievement motivation (65.00%), medium decision making ability (55.00%), medium self-confidence (51.67%), undergone 1-2 trainings (48.33%). Majority of the non agri professionals fell under middle age category (75.00%), male (78.33%), with nuclear family type (81.33%), with under graduation (80.00%), medium annual income (48.33%), invested their own funds/self-investment (90.00%), received technical support from private institutions (43.33%), with moderately favourable entrepreneurial motivation (50.00%), medium innovativeness (51.67%), medium risk taking ability (58.33%), medium mass media contact (45.00%), medium level achievement motivation (48.33%), medium decision making ability (46.67%), medium self-confidence (53.33%), and undergone 1-2 trainings (56.67%).

Keywords: Attitude, agripreneurship, agri professionals, non agri professionals and profile characteristics

1. Introduction

India's economy is mostly based on agriculture, which provides 40% of employment and 20% of the country's GDP. Our population is mostly rural, relying on agriculture and related industries for their subsistence. The foundation of the Indian economy is agriculture and related businesses, which provide essential raw materials for other industries and fuel demand for a wide range of industrial goods, such as pesticides, fertilizers, agricultural tools, and consumer goods (Bairwa *et al.*, 2014) [3].

Agripreneurship is characterized by a number of mechanisms, such as forward and backward connections with the secondary and tertiary sectors, like manufacturing and services. There are opportunities in agriculture and related sectors at many different points along the agricultural process, such as input, farming, value chain, output processing and marketing, and related services (Misra & Puri, 2005) [11].

An agripreneur is a committed person who makes things for the market, regardless of gender, age, occupation, or

retirement status. This individual is a driven and innovative leader that is always looking for ways to grow and enhance their company. Entrepreneurs that are ready to take measured risks and take ownership of their wins and losses are known as agripreneurs.

2. Materials and Methods

The study was carried out in the year 2024 in Telangana state. Ex-post facto research design was adopted for the study. From each zone, one district was selected based on the highest number of agri and non agri professionals as per the data provided by MANAGE ACABC centre. Accordingly, Karimnagar from Northern Telangana zone, Warangal from Central Telangana zone and Hyderabad from Southern Telangana zone were selected. Twenty agri professionals and non agri professionals were selected randomly from each district, thus constituting 60 agri professionals and 60 non agri professionals for the study. Data was collected from the respondents using pre-tested interview schedule by personal interview method by the

researcher. The collected data were coded and tabulated for statistical analysis by using statistical tools such as frequency and percentage.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Age: From the Table 1 it was found that most (56.67%) of agri professionals belonged to middle age, followed by old (23.33%) and young age (20.00%). Among non agri professionals most (75.00%) of them belonged to middle age group, followed by old (15.00%) and young age (10.00%). Hence from the results, it could be concluded that majority of agri professionals and non agri professionals belonged to middle age group. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Dumpala and Thomas (2019)^[8].

3.2 Gender: It could be observed from Table 1 that the majority (73.33%) of the agri professionals were male and (26.67%) were female. Where as among non agri professionals majority (78.33%) were male and (21.67%) were female. The probable reason for this result might be because men are more likely to take risks than women, there is a greater percentage of male agripreneurs. It's also possible that the high levels of physical labor associated with agribusiness—such as rice mills, poultry farm, agriclincs, etc. and further Women are discouraged from participating in these kinds of activities due to a number of social and cultural barriers might be the contributing factors. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Dumpala (2019)^[8] and Thomas (2019), Santos *et al.* (2021)^[19].

3.3 Family type: It could be observed from Table 1 that the majority (52.22%) of the agri professionals had nuclear families and only (15.00%) had joint families. Among non agri professionals most (81.33%) had nuclear families and (18.67%) were joint families. The probable reasons for these results can be shifting family dynamics, growing living costs, and more significant socioeconomic status factors and maybe as a result of the development in individualism, the need for more financial stability or more living space for children, as well as the more frequent prevalence of divorce and the migration to urban areas in search of employment opportunities. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that urbanization has made the joint family arrangement unsustainable in modern times. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Pandi and Prabha (2016)^[16], Pranoy *et al.* (2020)^[17].

3.4 Education: The result shown in Table 1 revealed that majority (68.34%) of agri professionals belonged to undergraduation followed by post-graduation (18.33%) and doctoral degree level of education (13.33%). Where as (80.00%) of non agri professionals belonged to under graduation, followed by post graduation (13.33%) and doctoral degree level of education (6.67%) respectively which indicates that the respondents who had graduation and above level of education were more inclined towards engaging in activities of Agripreneurship. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Gayathri (2021)^[10] and Srishailam *et al.* (2021)^[20].

3.5 Annual income: It could be observed from the Table 1 that, among the agri respondents surveyed, (20.00%) had low annual income, and followed by (58.33%) medium income and additionally, (21.67%) belong to high annual income category. Whereas in case of non agri professionals surveyed, 16.66 per cent grouped under low income. Majority (61.66%) fell into medium income category, followed by (21.67%) high annual income category. The probable reason may be the shifting opportunities for agriculture businesses. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Barau and Adesiji (2018)^[5].

3.6 Financial support: It could be indicated from the Table 1 that most (86.66%) of the agri respondents invested their own funds in their enterprise investment, while for (31.66%) of respondents took financial support from friends and relatives, followed by (68.33%) banks and from money lenders (8.33%). Whereas (90.00%) of non agri professionals utilized their own funds, while (33.33%) borrowed from friends and relatives, and equal per cent i.e., (15.00%) of the respondents borrowed from money lenders and banks. This is due to the fact that they might have availed MANAGE AC&ABC Scheme, which provides credit-lined back-ended subsidies on bank loans, the majority of agri professionals who apply for bank loans do so after receiving financial help in the form of loans and subsidies. Whereas non agri professionals are receiving less support than agri professionals. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Munyori and Ngugi (2014)^[14].

3.7 Technical support: It was found from the Table 1 that most (90.00%) of agri professionals received technical support from government institutions followed by private institutions (48.00%) and friends and relatives (11.66%). Whereas in case of non agri-professionals received technical support from government agencies (41.66%), followed by (43.33%) from private institutions and friends and relatives (38.33%). The probable reason might be that, as agri professionals were fully aware of technical support providing institutions as they have undergone more number of trainings which might have improved their knowledge related to agri business compared to that of non agri professionals. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Baljeeth (2014)^[4].

3.8 Entrepreneurial motivation: It was observed from the Table 1 that majority the agri professionals (63.33%) had moderately favourable entrepreneurial motivation, followed by highly (23.34%) and less favourable (18.33%) level of entrepreneurial motivation. Whereas, exactly half (50.00%) of the non agri professionals had moderately favourable entrepreneurial motivation, followed by highly (26.67%) and less favourable (23.33) level of entrepreneurial motivation. The probable reason for majority of respondents being categorized under moderately favourable entrepreneurial motivation is that as the respondents had technical support, attended trainings, own experiences and interest, self-motivation to become agripreneur, government initiatives to provide support through agripreneurship and personal grooming would be the positive factors towards

entrepreneurial motivation. These findings were in conformity with findings of Elakkiya and Asokhan (2021) [9].

3.9 Innovativeness: The result shown in Table 1 indicated that majority (68.34%) of the agri professionals had medium innovativeness, followed by high (20.00%) and low (11.67%) innovativeness. Whereas most of the (51.67%) of the non agri professionals also had medium level of innovativeness, followed by high (25.00%) and low (23.33%) innovativeness. The reason for majority of respondents medium level of innovativeness might be their education, increased mass media exposure, responsiveness, and growth-oriented mindset. Furthermore, the distribution might be due to the fact that innovation helps to generate fresh ideas that make the firm stand out from the competition and can increase income. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Mubeena *et. al* (2020) [13], Sangeetha (2022) [18].

3.10 Risk taking ability: It could be observed from the Table 1 that most (73.33%) of the agri professionals had medium level of risk taking ability followed by high (18.34%) and low level (8.33%) of risk taking ability. Whereas 58.33 percent of the non agri professionals had medium level of risk taking ability, followed by high (31.67%) and low (10.00%) level of risk taking ability. The reason behind such trend might be that, as the respondents had attributes like developmental awareness, change proneness and innovativeness and they were ready to take risk during uncertain situations as agripreneurship involves high investment and more competition. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Boye *et al.* (2022) [6] and Ahmed *et al.* (2011) [1].

3.11 Mass media contact: It could be observed from Table 1 that, the majority of the agri professionals had medium level of mass media contact (61.66%) followed by high (23.34%) and low level (15.00%) of Mass media contact. Whereas (45.00%) in case of non agri professionals had medium level of mass media contact followed by low (35.00%) and high (20.00%) level of mass media contact. The majority of respondents had a medium level of mass media contact may be they approached relevant institutions and other sources for relevant information and found that technical support by institutions, might be useful for updating their business. The agripreneur also need to update themselves about current trends in marketing, technological breakthroughs, demand forecasts, customer expectations, and innovative advertising to generate creative concepts. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Deepthi *et al* (2018) [7], Mubeena *et. al* (2020) [13], and Srishailam *et. al* (2021) [20].

3.12 Achievement motivation: It could be observed from the Table 1 that, most of the agri professionals had medium level of achievement motivation (65.00%) followed by high (20.00%) and low level (15.00%) of achievement motivation. Whereas (48.33%) of the non agri professionals had medium level of achievement motivation, followed by high (31.67%) and low (20.00%) level of achievement motivation. The reason behind both agri and non agri

professionals to had a medium level of achievement motivation was due to their inner drive, their exposure to the media, the trainings they had received, and their medium level of aspiration to succeed in life and take moderate risks. These middle-aged individuals also had a medium level of motivation to attain a higher status. Due to the fact that the majority of them were carrying out their parents' businesses, non-agri professionals exhibited lower levels of achievement motivation than their agri professional counterparts. But all in all, this led to a medium level of achievement motivation. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Sangeetha (2022) [18] and Ahmed *et al.* (2011) [1].

3.13 Decision making ability: It could be observed from the Table 1 that, majority of the agri professionals had medium level of decision making ability (55.00%) followed by high (35.00%) and low level (10.00%) of decision making ability. Whereas 46.67 per cent of the non agri professionals had medium level of decision making ability, followed by high (31.67%) and low (21.66%) level of decision making ability. Decision making ability of the agri and non agri professionals was determined on the basis of nature of decision making *viz.* individual (self-decision), joint or consultative that they were taken while performing farm business activities. As majority of the agri professionals had been taking joint and consultative decisions in their day to day business activities from selection of product, procurement of raw material, selection of market to marketing channel. Whereas majority of the non agri professionals had been taking self decision for selection of product, procurement of raw material, and selection of market and marketing channel. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Mubeena (2017) [12].

3.14 Self-confidence: It could be observed from the Table 1 that, majority (51.67%) of the agri professionals had medium level of self-confidence, followed by high (35.00%) and low level (13.33%) of self-confidence. Whereas (53.33%) of the non agri professionals had medium level of self-confidence, followed by high (26.67%) and low (20.00%) level of self-confidence. The reason for both agri and non agri professionals is that having same level self-confidence as they have confidence in their own abilities. They could solve the problems in business efficiently. They had contingency plans to address the labour problem, technical problem etc. they have the ability to convince others with their ideas and performs efficiently under continuous stress, pressure on stiff competition and challenges. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Sangeetha and Venkata pirabu (2022) [18].

3.15 Training undergone: It could be observed from the Table 1 that, majority (48.33%) of the agri professionals undergone 1-2 trainings followed by more than two trainings (45.00%) and no training undergone (6.67%). The agri professionals who are agriculture graduates having awareness regarding the training programmes, purpose and place of training have undergone more number of trainings than the non agri professionals. Whereas (56.67%) of non agri professionals undergone 1-2 training followed by no

training (30.00%) and more than two trainings 13.33 per cent. The trend is due to the fact that, unaware about the benefits of undergoing training, unaware of the purpose and place of training resulted in many of the non agri

professionals not received training. The above findings were in consonance with the findings of Ahmed *et al* (2011)^[1], Bandi and Reddy (2018)^[2], and Naik and Helen (2018)^[15].

Table 1: Distribution of agri professionals and non agri professionals based on their profile characteristics. N=120

S. No.	Characteristics	Agri professionals (n=60)		Non agri professionals (n=60)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Age (Years)				
	Young age (Up to 35 years)	12	20.00	6	10.00
	Middle age (35-55)	34	56.67	45	75.00
	Old age (Above 55)	14	23.33	9	15.00
2	Gender				
	Male	44	73.33	47	78.33
	Female	16	26.67	13	21.67
3	Family type				
	Nuclear family	51	85.00	49	81.33
	Joint family	9	15.00	11	18.67
4	Education				
	Under graduation	41	68.34	48	80.00
	Post-graduation	11	18.33	8	13.33
	Ph.D.	8	13.33	4	6.67
5	Annual income				
	Low	12	20.00	22	24.45
	Medium	35	58.33	38	42.22
	High	13	21.67	30	33.33
6	Financial support				
	Own funds/self-investment	52	86.66	54	90.00
	Friends & Relatives	19	31.66	20	33.33
	Banks/other financial sources	41	68.33	23	38.33
	Money lenders	5	8.33	9	15.00
7	Technical support				
	Government institutions	54	90.00	25	41.66
	Private institutions	29	48.33	26	43.33
	Friends/Relatives	7	11.66	23	38.33
8	Entrepreneurial motivation				
	Less favourable	8	13.33	14	22.33
	Moderately favourable	38	63.33	30	50.00
	Highly favourable	14	23.34	16	26.67
9	Innovativeness				
	Low	7	11.66	14	23.33
	Medium	41	68.34	31	51.67
	High	12	20.00	15	25.00
10	Risk taking ability				
	Low	5	8.33	6	10.00
	Medium	44	73.33	35	58.33
	High	11	18.34	19	31.67
11	Mass media contact				
	Low	9	15.00	21	35.00
	Medium	37	61.66	27	45.00
	High	14	23.34	12	20.00
12	Achievement motivation				
	Low	9	15.00	12	20.00
	Medium	39	65.00	29	48.33
	High	12	20.00	19	31.67
13	Decision making ability				
	Low	6	10.00	13	21.66
	Medium	33	55.00	28	46.67
	High	21	35.00	19	31.67
14	Self-confidence				
	Low	8	13.33	12	20.00
	Medium	31	51.67	32	53.33
	High	21	35.00	16	26.67
15	Training undergone				
	No training	4	6.67	18	30.00
	1-2 trainings	29	48.33	34	56.67
	>2 trainings	27	45.00	8	13.33

4. Conclusion

The study concluded that a significant proportion of the respondents fell under the medium category for most profile characteristics. But as compared to agri professionals, non agri professionals had undergone less number of trainings, low level of financial and technical support which significantly shows low level of entrepreneurial motivation, achievement motivation, self-confidence and decision making ability.

5. References

- Ahmed T, Hasan S, Haneef R. Entrepreneurial characteristics of the agripreneurs under the Scheme of Agriclincs & Agri-buisness Centres. *J Community Mobilization Sustain Dev*. 2011;6(2):145-149.
- Bandi P, Reddy MS. Rural young agricultural entrepreneurs in Chittoor and Nellore districts of Andhra Pradesh. *Int J Creative Res Thoughts*. 2018;6(2):420-429.
- Bairwa SL, Saket Kushwaha SK, Chandra Sen CS. Problems faced by agripreneurs in starting and operating agriventures under ACABCs scheme in Rajasthan state. *Int J Agric Sci Res*. 2015;5(2):203-207.
- Baljeeth S. Technology based entrepreneurship in agriculture - Role of agribusiness incubators. *Int J Manag Int Bus Stud*. 2014;4(3):249-255.
- Barau AA, Adesiji GB. Socioeconomic determinants influencing the willingness of agriculture undergraduates to participate in agripreneurship in northwest Nigeria. *Int J Agric Manag Dev*. 2018;8:25-34.
- Boye M, Ghafoor A, Badar H, Ali A. An understanding of the agripreneurial knowledge and motivation among Gambian young agripreneurs. *Int J Manag Res Emerg Sci*. 2022;12(4).
- Deepthi V, Rambabu P, Gopikrishna T, Vishnu D. Profile characteristics of agripreneurs in Andhra Pradesh. *Andhra Agric J*. 2018;65(1):230-234.
- Dumpala SR, Thomas A. Comparative analysis of attitude of agripreneurs towards Agri-clinics and Agribusiness Centres (ACABC) Scheme in Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. *J Ext Educ*. 2019;31(2).
- Elakkiya S, Asokhan M. Attitude of agripreneurs towards entrepreneurial motivation – A gender analysis. *Biol Forum*. 2021;13(4):1041-1045.
- Gayathri AP. Operational challenges and success factors behind women entrepreneurs in Hyderabad City, Telangana State, India. *Int J Manag*. 2021;12(3):503-514.
- Misra SK, Puri VK. *Indian Economy*. 33rd ed. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House; c2005.
- Mubeena. A study on entrepreneurial behaviour of rural women of Podupu Laxmi Ikya Sangam in Kurnool district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Guntur, India; c2017.
- Mubeena M, Lakshmi TL, Praveena PLR J, Nagavani AV, Murthy BR. Profile characteristics of rural youth agripreneurs of Andhra Pradesh. *The Pharma Innovation J*. 2020;9(6):314-319.
- Munyori KJ, Ngugi JK. Factors affecting the growth of small and micro enterprises dairy farmers in Kenya: Case of Gatundu South Farmer's Dairy Co-operative Society Ltd. *Int J Curr Bus Soc Sci*. 2014;1(1):48-63.
- Naik RP, Helen S. Socio-economic factors affecting entrepreneurial behaviour of agripreneurs of KAU technology. *Agric Update*. 2018;13(4):384-389.
- Pandi GR, Prabha SL. A study on prospects and problems among women entrepreneurs in Madurai city with special reference to tailoring unit. *Primax Int J Commerce Manag Res*. 2016;2321-3612.
- Ray Pranoy, Panigrahi RS, Mohapatra BP. Socio-economic scenario of farm youths engaged in agripreneurship in rural Odisha. *J Pharmacogn Phytochem*. 2020;9(4S):635-639.
- Sangeetha R. Socio-economic characteristics of COVID-19 resilient agripreneurs. *Young*. 2022;48:20-51.
- Santos KES, Nocum CLR, De Jesus CD. Assessment on motivation factors of agripreneurs in Nueva Ecija. *Int J Environ Agric Biotechnol*. 2021;6(6).
- Srishailam B, Jirli BP, Priyanka V, Manasa K. Socioeconomic profile of farm based agripreneurs in Sanga Reddy District of Telangana State, India. *Curr J Appl Sci Technol*. 2021;40(13):1-8.