



E-ISSN: 2278-4136  
P-ISSN: 2349-8234  
[www.phytojournal.com](http://www.phytojournal.com)  
JPP 2020; 9(6): 950-954  
Received: 22-09-2020  
Accepted: 29-10-2020

**Mohammad Hashim**  
Research Scholar, Department of  
Extension Education, Institute  
of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras  
Hindu University, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**AK Singh**  
Professor, Department of  
Extension Education, Institute  
of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras  
Hindu University, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Socio-personal profile of agripreneurs of Varanasi district (U.P.)

**Mohammad Hashim and AK Singh**

### Abstract

A careful investigation regarding socio-economic profile of agripreneurs was carried out in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. The findings of the study revealed that majority (18.50 %) of the respondents were having education up to middle school, were having Floriculture as their main occupation (41.00 %), belonged to medium house hold category (67.00 %), belonged to OBC category (62.00 %), medium category of sources of information utilization (80.00 %), medium category of ability to coordinate farming activities (79.50 %), medium category of value orientation (82.00 %), medium category of annual income (74.00 %), medium category of extension agency contact (74.50 %), medium category of mass media exposure (76.50 %).

**Keywords:** Agripreneurs, information utilization, socio-economic status, training

### Introduction

Agriculture all over the world is going through a phase of transition. In this changing scenario, agriculture is taking new shape and expanding its scope beyond the limits of mere crop cultivation and animal husbandry for livelihood of rural population. Activities like diversification, value addition, precision farming, high-tech agriculture, *Agripreneurship*, global marketing, organic farming etc., are gradually getting due attention of people involved on redefining agriculture. Growing of flowers and ornamental crops is a rapid expanding global enterprise in today's world (Prasad and Kumar, 2010)<sup>[7]</sup>. However, floriculture in India is still in infancy. Government of India has identified floriculture as a sunrise industry and accorded it 100 per cent export oriented status (Misra, 2011)<sup>[5]</sup>.

Socio-personal characteristics of agripreneurs is one the important parameters that decide the success or failure of an agripreneur. In spite of availability of socio economic profile of farmers, it is necessary to identify the socio-personal profile of the target agripreneurs pertaining to a different demographic condition. Thus, the present investigation was carried out to find and understand such characteristics of agripreneurs of Varanasi district in Uttar Pradesh.

### Methodology

The study was conducted in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. Out of eight blocks of the district, two blocks with maximum area under flower cultivation were selected. Top ten villages in terms of area under flower cultivation were identified from each block and thus, in total twenty villages were selected purposively. The respondents from each village were selected randomly by means of proportionate random sampling. In total 200 respondents were selected (75 from Kashi Vidyapeeth blok and 125 from Chiragaon blok).

### Results and discussion

#### 1. Education

**Table 1:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their education (n=200)

S. No.	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Illiterate	12	6.00
2.	Primary School	23	11.50
3.	Middle School	37	18.50
4.	High School	31	15.50
5.	Intermediate	34	17.00
6.	Graduation	15	7.50
	Total	200	100.00

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Mohammad Hashim**  
Research Scholar, Department of  
Extension Education, Institute  
of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras  
Hindu University, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

It can be easily observed from Table 1 that majority (18.50 %) of the respondents were having education up to middle school followed by intermediate (17.00 %), high school (15.50 %), primary school (11.50 %), graduation (7.50 %) while only six

percent were illiterate. This finding deviates from the findings of Gondkar *et al.* (2012)<sup>[2]</sup> and Mainroodi (2012).

## 2. Occupation category

**Table 2:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their occupation category (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)		Chiraigaon		Overall	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Floriculture	34	45.33	48	38.40	82	41.00
Floriculture + Agriculture	16	21.33	35	28.00	51	25.50
Floriculture + Dairy	14	18.67	28	22.40	42	21.00
Floriculture + Business	9	12.00	6	4.80	15	7.50
Floriculture + Service	2	2.67	8	6.40	10	5.00
Total	75	100.00	125	100.00	200	100.00

It can be seen from the Table 2 that majority (45.33 %) of respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block were having Floriculture as their main occupation followed by Floriculture and Agriculture (21.33 %), Floriculture and Dairy (18.67 %), Floriculture and Business (12.00 %) and Floriculture and Service (2.67 %). Majority (38.40 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon block were having Floriculture as their main occupation followed by Floriculture and Agriculture (28.00 %), Floriculture and Dairy (22.40 %), Floriculture and

Service (6.40 %) and Floriculture and Business (4.80 %). It can be seen that overall, majority (41.00 %) of the respondents were having Floriculture as their main occupation, followed by Floriculture and Agriculture (25.50 %), Floriculture and Dairy (21.00 %), Floriculture and Business (7.50 %) and Floriculture and Service (5.00 %).

## 3. Socio-economic status

**Table 3:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their socio-economic status (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<10.24	18	24.00	<10.43	24	19.20	<10.36	42	21.00
Medium	10.24-13.95	50	66.67	10.43-14.46	84	67.20	10.36-14.27	134	67.00
High	>13.95	7	9.33	>14.46	17	13.60	>14.27	24	12.00
	Mean= 12.09 SD= 1.85			Mean=12.45 SD=2.01			Mean= 12.32 SD= 1.96		

It can be seen from Table 4 that majority (66.67 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block had medium socio-economic status followed by low (24.00 %) and high socio-economic status while majority (67.20 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon block had medium socio-economic status followed by low (19.20 %) and high (13.60 %) socio-economic status. Overall, majority (67.00 %) of the

respondents had medium socio-economic status followed by low (21.00 %) and high (12.00 %) socio-economic status. This finding is in line with the findings of Ram *et al.* (2013)<sup>[7]</sup>.

## 4. Caste

**Table 4:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their to their caste (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)		Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)		Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Unreserved	29	38.67	47	37.60	76	38.00
OBC	46	61.33	78	62.40	124	62.00
SC/ST	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

It can be observed from Table 5 that majority (61.33 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to OBC category followed by unreserved category (38.67 %) while none of the respondents belonged to SC and ST category. Majority (62.40%) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to OBC category followed by unreserved category (37.60 %) while none of the respondents belonged to SC and

ST category. Overall, majority (62.00 %) of the respondents belonged to OBC category followed by unreserved category (38.00 %) while none of the respondents belonged to SC and ST category.

## 5. Training received

**Table 5:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to training received (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)		Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)		Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
No training	50	66.67	81	64.80	131	65.50
1-2 trainings	13	17.33	38	30.40	51	25.50
3-5 trainings	9	12.00	6	4.80	15	7.50
>5 trainings	3	4.00	0	0.00	3	1.50

It can be seen from Table 6 that majority (66.67%) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block did not receive any training followed by 1-2 trainings (17.33 %), 3-5 trainings (12.00 %) and more than 5 trainings (4.00 %). Majority (64.80 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon did not receive any training followed by 1-2 trainings (30.40 %), 3-5 trainings (4.80 %) and also, none of the respondents received

more than 5 trainings. Overall, majority (65.50 %) of the respondents did not receive any training followed by 1-2 trainings (25.50 %), 3-5 trainings (7.50 %) and more than 5 trainings (1.50 %). This finding deviates from the findings of Gondkar *et al.* (2012)<sup>[2]</sup>.

## 6. Sources of information utilization

**Table 6:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their sources of information utilization (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<16.02	26	34.67	<16.28	12	9.60	<16.18	18	9.00
Medium	16.02-20.33	40	53.33	16.28-19.96	83	66.40	16.18-20.10	160	80.00
High	>20.33	9	12.00	>19.96	30	24.00	>20.10	22	11.00
	Mean= 18.17 SD= 2.15			Mean=18.12 SD=1.84			Mean= 18.14 SD= 1.96		

It can be easily depicted from Table 8 that majority (53.33 %) of the respondents from Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to the medium category of sources of information utilization followed by low category (34.67 %) and high category (12.00 %) of sources of information utilization. Majority (66.40 %) of the respondents of Chiraigaon belonged to the medium category of sources of information utilization followed by high category (24.00 %) and low category (9.60 %) of sources of information utilization category. Overall, it can be seen that

majority (80.00 %) of the respondents belonged to the medium category of sources of information utilization followed by high category (11.00 %) and low category (9.00 %) of sources of information utilization category. This finding is in line with the findings of Sharma *et al.* (2011)<sup>[9]</sup>, Patel *et al.* (2014)<sup>[6]</sup> and Sanjeev and Saroj (2014)<sup>[8]</sup>.

## 7. Ability to coordinate farming activities

**Table 7:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their ability to coordinate farming activities (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	< 9.32	14	18.67	< 9.41	23	18.40	< 9.37	12	6.00
Medium	9.32-12.65	49	65.33	9.41-12.29	85	68.00	9.37-12.43	159	79.50
High	>12.65	12	16.00	>12.29	17	13.60	>12.43	29	14.50
	Mean= 10.99 SD= 1.66			Mean=10.85 SD=1.44			Mean= 10.9 SD= 1.53		

It is clear from Table 10 that majority (65.33 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of ability to coordinate farming activities followed by low category (18.67 %) and high category (16.00 %) of ability to coordinate farming activities. Majority (68.00 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to medium category of ability to coordinate farming activities followed by low category (18.40 %) and high category (13.60 %) of ability to coordinate farming activities. Overall, majority

(79.50 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of ability to coordinate farming activities followed by high category (14.50 %) and low category (6.00 %) of ability to coordinate farming activities. This finding is in line with the findings of Mehta and Sonawane (2012), Patel *et al.* (2014)<sup>[6]</sup> and Boruah *et al.* (2015).

## 8. Value orientation

**Table 8:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to their value orientation (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<13.38	15	20.00	<13.83	16	12.80	<13.65	14	7.00
Medium	13.38-17.69	44	58.67	13.83-18.39	94	75.20	13.65-18.14	164	82.00
High	>17.69	16	21.33	>18.39	15	12.00	>18.14	22	11.00
	Mean= 15.53 SD= 2.15			Mean=16.11 SD=2.28			Mean= 15.90 SD= 2.24		

It can be easily depicted from Table 12 that majority (58.67 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of value orientation followed by high category (21.33 %) and low category (20.00 %) of value orientation. Majority (75.20 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to medium category of value orientation followed by low category (12.80 %) and high category (12.00

%) of value orientation. Overall, majority (82.00 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of value orientation followed by high category (11.00 %) and low category (7.00 %) of value orientation.

## 9. Experience in flower growing

**Table 9:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to experience in flower growing (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<11.49	2	2.67	<17.81	23	18.40	<15.22	37	18.50
Medium	11.49-34.22	64	85.33	17.81-34.75	75	60.00	15.22-34.77	127	63.50
High	>34.22	9	12.00	>34.75	27	21.60	>34.77	36	18.00
	Mean= 22.85 SD= 11.36			Mean=26.28 SD=8.47			Mean= 25 SD= 9.77		

Table 13 clearly shows that majority (85.33 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of experience in flower growing followed by high category (12.00 %) and low category (2.67 %) of experience in flower growing. Majority (60.00 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to medium category of experience in flower growing followed by high category (21.60 %) and low category (18.40 %) of experience in flower growing.

Overall, majority (63.50 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of experience in flower growing followed by low category (18.50 %) and high category (18.00 %) of experience in flower growing. This finding is in line with the findings of Gondkar *et al.* (2012)<sup>[2]</sup>.

## 10. Annual Income

**Table 10:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to annual Income (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<68395	13	17.33	<68212	15	12.00	<68116	28	14.00
Medium	68395-230751	52	69.33	68212-209196	93	74.40	68116-217444	148	74.00
High	>230751	10	13.33	>209196	17	13.60	>217444	24	12.00
	Mean= 149573.3 SD=81178			Mean=138704 SD=70492			Mean= 142780 SD= 74664		

It can be seen from Table 14 that majority (69.33 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of annual income followed by low category (17.33 %) and high category (13.33 %) of annual income. Majority (74.40 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to

medium category of annual income followed by high category (13.60 %) and low category (12.00 %) of annual income. Overall, majority (74.00 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of annual income followed by low category (14.00 %) and high category (12.00 %) of annual income.

## 11. Extension agency contact

**Table 11:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to extension agency contact (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<11.21	11	14.67	<11.57	17	13.60	<11.44	28	14.00
Medium	11.21-15.29	54	72.00	11.57-15.16	95	76.00	11.44-15.21	149	74.50
High	>15.29	10	13.33	>15.16	13	10.40	>15.21	23	11.50
	Mean= 13.25 SD=2.04			Mean=13.37 SD=1.79			Mean= 13.33 SD=1.89		

It can be observed from Table 16 that majority (72.00 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of extension agency contact followed by low category (14.67 %) and high category (13.33 %) of extension agency contact. Majority (76.00 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to medium category of extension agency contact followed by low category (13.60 %) and high category (10.40 %) of extension agency contact.

Overall, majority (74.50 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of extension agency contact followed by low category (14.00 %) and high category (11.50 %) of extension agency contact. This finding deviates from the findings of Gondkar *et al.* (2012)<sup>[2]</sup>.

## 11. Mass media exposure

**Table 12:** Distribution of agripreneurs according to mass media exposure: (n=200)

Category	Kashi Vidyapeeth (n <sub>1</sub> =75)			Chiraigaon (n <sub>2</sub> =125)			Overall (n <sub>1</sub> +n <sub>2</sub> =200)		
	Value	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Low	<9.59	9	12.00	<9.67	17	13.60	<9.64	26	13.00
Medium	9.59-13.16	57	76.00	9.67-13.06	96	76.80	9.64-13.10	153	76.50
High	>13.16	9	12.00	>13.06	12	9.60	>13.10	21	10.50
	Mean= 11.37 SD=1.78			Mean=11.37 SD=1.70			Mean= 11.37 SD=1.73		

It can be depicted from Table 18 that majority (76.00 %) of the respondents of Kashi Vidyapeeth block belonged to medium category of mass media exposure followed by equal percentage (12.00 %) of respondents who belonged to low

and high category of mass media exposure. Majority (76.80 %) of the respondents from Chiraigaon belonged to medium category of mass media exposure followed by low category (13.60 %) and high category (9.60 %) of mass media

exposure. Overall, majority (76.50 %) of the respondents belonged to medium category of mass media exposure followed by low category (13.00 %) and high category (10.50 %) of mass media exposure. This finding deviates from the findings of Gondkar *et al.* (2012)<sup>[2]</sup>.

### Conclusion

The socio-personal profile of the agripreneurs affects their level of success and failure in the field of Agripreneurship. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the agripreneurs were educated upto middle school, were having medium level of socio-economic status, sources of information utilization, ability to coordinate farming activities, value orientation, experience in flower growing, annual income, extension agency contact, belonged to OBC category and have received no trainings. These socio-personal characteristics must be taken into account while formulating and implementing any area specific schemes or developmental programmes.

### References

1. Boruah R, Borua S, Deka CR, Boraah D. Entrepreneurial behavior of tribal winter vegetable growers in Jorhat district of Assam. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2015;15(1):65-69.
2. Gondkar S, Singh BK, Kumbhare NV. Entrepreneurial Characteristics of Protected Cultivation Entrepreneurs in Pune District (Maharashtra). *Indian Journal of Extension Education* 2012;48(1-2):91-94.
3. Mehta BM, Sonwane M. Entrepreneurial behaviour of mango entrepreneurs of Valsad district of Gujarat. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2012;12(1):78-82.
4. Mianroodi FK. Factors affecting the development of entrepreneurship in agricultural advisory services of Iran. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 2012;2(4):11-15.
5. Misra KK. *Ornamental Gardening in India* Biotech books 2011, 1-2.
6. Patel P, Patel MM, Badodia SK, Sharma P. Entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2014;14(2):46.
7. Prasad S, Kumar U. *A Handbook of floriculture* Agrobios (India) 2010,4-9.
8. Ram D, Singh MK, Chaudhary KP, Jayarani L. Entrepreneurship behaviour of women entrepreneurs in Imphal of Manipur. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2013;14(3):59-66.
9. Sanjeev MV, Saroj PL. Technology utilization and its socio-economic determinants among cashew farmers of Karnataka. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2014;14(3):59-66.
10. Sharma P, Patel MM, Singh VB. Entrepreneurial Orientation of Garlic Producers, *Indian Journal of Extension Education* 2011;47(1-2):107-112.