CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN

This Chapter deals with procedures of investigation. It contains the locale of study, sampling analysis, statistical analysis, independent variables and components of entrepreneurship. Specifically, these are explained as given below:

1. Objectives of the study;
2. Locale of the study;
3. Selection of Respondents;
4. Selection of Variables
5. Components of Entrepreneurial Behaviour;
6. Sources of Information and Statistical Tools;
7. Limitations of the Study; and
8. Profile of the Sample Respondents.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Specifically, the study has been conducted with the following objectives:

a. To identify the motivations and ambitions of the agricultural entrepreneurs;

b. To analyse the structural distribution of Agricultural entrepreneurs in the background of their entrepreneurial efforts;

c. To identify the problems faced by agricultural entrepreneurs at different stages of entrepreneurial activity; and

d. To offer suggestions for developing entrepreneurship in agriculture.
2. LOCALE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the locale analysis is to provide the background information on the economy of Mysore District, which forms the basis for the present study. The following aspects have been covered: (i) Selection of State; (ii) Selection of District; (iii) Area and Population; (iv) Topography; (v) Rivers; (vi) Climate; (vii) Soils; (viii) Forests (ix) Flora and Fauna; (x) Agriculture; (xi) Size of Land Holding; (xii) Irrigation; (xiii) Rainfall (xiv) High Yielding Varieties; (xv) Cropping Patterns; (xvi) Infrastructure; (xvii) Marketing; and (xviii) Credit facilities.

(i) Selection of State:

For any social research involving farmers as the unit of study, direct communication between the researcher and the respondents is necessary to build up good rapport and to ensure satisfactory response. With this basic consideration in view, Karnataka State was chosen by the researcher, so that familiarity with the area, people and officials would be helpful in collecting the data.

Karnataka is situated on the Western side of the Central Deccan Plateau in Southern part of India. It extends from 11.5° to 19° North latitude and from 74° to 78.6° East Longitude. It is bounded on the west by the Arabian Sea, on the North by Maharastra, on the east by Andhra Pradesh and on the South by
Tamil Nadu and Kerala. The State has a pleasant climate, without any sharp variations in temperature. Its proximity to the sea, a large forest area and an average elevation of 2400 feet of its extensive plateau area save it from the extremes of tropical climate.

The State has more than 50% of the total area under the plough and is self-sufficient in foodgrains. The main crops grown are rice, ragi (finger millets) jowar, bajra, cow gram, black gram, groundnut, caster, cotton, tobacco, turmeric, sugarcane, mulbery, coconut, arecanut, coffee, betal vine, pepper and cardamom.

(ii) Selection of District:

The study was conducted in Mysore District of Karnataka. This area was chosen since it has certain important features relevant to the study. The district approximates the average conditions of South Eastern Karnataka in agro-climatic conditions as well as socio-economic characteristics unlike Northern Karnataka and Western Karnataka. The district is highly characterized by dryland cultivation. However, the underground water potential has been estimated to be very high leading to exploitation of this potential to convert a dry-land into an irrigable land by digging borewells. In tune with the State level trend, the State Department of Agriculture has taken keen interest in agriculture development in the District. There is considerable cropping activities throughout the year in the area.
Further, data collection was possible in the area without heavy cost of time and money. Lastly, the District was chosen from the viewpoint of cohesiveness and research feasibility.

Mysore District lies between 11°30' and 12°50' North Latitude and 75°41' and 77°45' East Longitude. It is bounded on the north by Hassan, and Mandya districts; on the south by Cannanore district of Kerala State and Udagamandalam district of Tamilnadu; on the west by Coorg District and on the east by Coimbatore and Salem districts of Tamilnadu.

(iii) Area and Population:

The total geographical area of the district is 12017 square kilometers with a population of 31,55,803 out of which 22,16,702 live in rural parts of the district, thus reflecting the rural ethos. It consists of eleven taluks namely Chamarajanagar, Gundlupet, H.D. Kote, Hunsur, Kollegal, K.R. Nagar, Mysore, Nanjangud, Periyapatna, T.Narasipur and Yelandur.

(iv) Topography:

The territory covered by the district forms an undulating table land. While the extreme south forms a terrain in dense forests, the western taluks are bounded by lofty mountain ranges of the Western Ghats. The general slope of the land lies in the direction of south west to east and north-east. The western and southern margins have an elevation of more than 1100 meters; and in the east and north-east the mean elevation is 700 meters. The Western part of the district, flanked by the eastern slopes of
the Western Ghats, is called the semi-malnad region, and the eastern part is known as the maidan region.

(v) Rivers:

The river Cauvery and its tributaries form the drainage basis of the district. The Cauvery rises in the Coorg district, flows eastwards and reaches its confluence with the rivers Hemavathi and Lakshmanathirtha at Krishnarajasagar dam in Mandya district. It re-enters Mysore district in the north-east and flows thereafter in the eastern direction to join the river Kabini at T.Narasipur and flows in Kollegal taluk before reaching Tamilnadu. Its course within the district traverses a total distance of about 250 kilometers. The rivers are not navigable but are used for irrigation purposes.

(vi) Climate:

The climate of the district is moderate throughout the year, which may be divided into four seasons. The summer from March to May is followed by monsoon season from June to September, post monsoon season from October to November and winter from December to February. April is the hottest month with a mean daily maximum temperature of 36 degree C and a minimum of 21.4 degree C. December is the coldest month with a mean maximum temperature of 27 degree C and a minimum of 16.5 degree C.

(vii) Soils:

The soils of the district are predominantly red loams and vary from pure sandy soils to typical black cotton soils. The
hilly regions of the western taluks are covered with shallow gravelly soils. The eastern taluks contain deep red loams, occasionally interspersed with black soils.

(viii) Forests:

Mysore district has an area of 3.38 lakhs hectares under forests forming 27.15 percent of total geographical area of the district. It is the third richest district in the State as far as forest resources are concerned. Timber, bamboo, sandalwood, tamarind, gooseberry and firewood are the products of these forests.

(ix) Flora and Fauna:

The western margin of the district, which is the leeward slope of the Western Ghats, receives a fairly good amount of rainfall. The vegetation in this zone is called "Moist Deciduous." In the maidan region, which recives less rainfall and has a longer dry period, the vegetation is characterized by "Dry Deciduous," and the trees growing there are shorter. The forests of the district offer a good habitat for wild life, and hence the district has a rich and colourful heritage in respect of wild life.

(x) Agriculture:

Mysore district is one of the prosperous agricultural districts of the State. The western and southern parts of the district, being on the edge of Western Ghats, are well endowed with sufficient rainfall and are known for the production of a
variety of rainfed crops. In addition to rainfed cultivation, the canal network of the river Cauvery and its tributaries and innumerable tanks and wells, also promote intensive agriculture.

(xi) Size of land holding:

The total number of land holders stands at 3.79 lakhs consisting of 2.98 lakhs as marginal and small land holders, 0.58 lakh as medium land holders and 0.23 lakh as large landholders representing 78.63 percent, 15.30 percent and 6.07 percent respectively. Thus the district, in tune with national trend, is characterized by scattered marginal and small farmers owning 2.57 lakh hectares representing 45.58 percent of the agricultural land.

(xii) Irrigation:

The district has an irrigation potential of 22.30 percent of the total area under cultivation. The total sown area is 4.81 lakh hectares, out of which 1.07 lakh hectares are irrigated by all sources and the balance of 3.74 lakh hectares are based on rainfed cultivation. Of the total irrigated area, 64.15 percent is irrigated by canals, 6.94 percent by tanks, 28.38 percent by wells and 0.53 percent by other sources. It is also estimated that the exploitation of groundwater potential will result in irrigability of dry land to the tune of 1.37 lakh hectares representing 36.63 percent of the present dry land cultivation.
(xiii) Rainfall:

The rainfall is spread over a period of about six calendar months from the later half of April to October. The average annual rainfall in the district is 771.9 mm. October is the rainiest month.

(xiv) High Yielding Varieties:

During the country's Third Five Year plan, a new thrust was given to agriculture in Mysore district by the introduction of High Yielding Varieties which has followed by intensive application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, insecticides and weedicides. As a result, some of the traditional local varieties of seeds have been gradually replaced by improved seeds. The area under High Yielding Varieties amounts to 1.82 lakh hectares forming 37.84 percent of the area sown.

(xv) Cropping Patterns:

A great variety of crops are being cultivated in the district. Table 3.1 presents the average cropping pattern for the period between 1986-1990. Out of the gross cropped area of 6,51,029 hectares, the area under food crops stood at 4,49,390 hectares representing 69.03 per cent and the area under non-food crops stood at 2,01,639 hectares constituting 30.97 per cent. The major food crop was ragi, which had an area of 1,24,249 hectares representing 19.09 per cent and this was followed by rice and jowar having the share of 12.74 per cent and 12.10 percent respectively. The leading non-food crop in the district was mulberry, which accounted for 61,195 hectares constituting 4.40
### TABLE 3.1
**CROPPING PATTERN : MYSORE DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cropping Pattern</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Gross Cropped Area</td>
<td>6,51,029</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Area Under Food Crops:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ragi</td>
<td>1,24,249</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Rice</td>
<td>82,939</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Jowar</td>
<td>78,793</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Maize</td>
<td>17,048</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Others</td>
<td>1,46,361</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,49,390</td>
<td>69.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Area Under Non-Food Crops:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Mulberry</td>
<td>61,195</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Cotton</td>
<td>33,901</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Sugarcane</td>
<td>14,339</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Tobacco</td>
<td>12,259</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Others</td>
<td>79,945</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,01,639</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


...per cent of the average gross cropped area. This was followed by cotton, sugarcane and tobacco, which accounted for 33,901 hectares, 14,339 hectares and 12,259 hectares respectively representing 5.21 per cent, 2.20 per cent and 1.88 per cent of the gross cropped area. Eventhough the cropping pattern is dominantly characterized by food crops, we find the trend towards more cropping area being devoted to non-food crops in view of 80,082 hectares being used for raising crops more than once a year and the presence of irrigation pumpsets numbering 35,614.
(xvi) Infrastructure:

The District has got a well developed infrastructural network. It has railway route length of 119.83 Kilometers along with road length of 9,752 Kilometers aided by 599 post offices, 344 telegraphic offices, 89 telephone exchanges, 25,426 personal telephones and 710 public telephone booths.

(xvii) Marketing:

In order to provide a platform to sell the agriculture produce in the District, there are 18 regulated markets out of which 6 are main markets and the remaining 12 are sub-markets. The total turnover in all the markets in the district was Rs. 10,824 lakhs. All the taluks except Yelandur taluk have regulated markets.

(xviii) Credit Facilities:

There is a large number of commercial and co-operative banks in the District. Each taluk has one Primary Land Development Bank, totalling 11 in the district. There are 24 credit co-operative banks, 178 branches of commercial banks and 73 branches of Cauvery Grameena Bank. These banks are a great help to agricultural community. The total strength of all the branches of banks is 285, out of which 115 branches are situated in Mysore taluk.

On the whole, the district has been endowed with a sound base constituting topography, climate, ground water potential and infrastructural facilities. This has sparked off entrepreneurial
attitude in farmers to diversify into commercially oriented agricultural operations.

(3) SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

Agricultural entrepreneur for the purpose of this study is defined as any individual, who converts a barren land or rainfed land hitheto mainly used to grow traditional crops like ragi, (finger millets), jowar and cereals into irrigable land through digging borewells or open wells or through river or canal water by installing irrigation pumpsets with own or borrowed funds to grow commercial crops like banana, mulbery, cotton, turmeric, sugarcane, etc. along with the allied activities like poultry, sericulture, fishing and dairying with the sole objective of earning profit. He is responsible for the production of cash crops, in which the elements of risk and uncertainty bearing exist in one stage or the other. This responsibility starts from the stage of crop planning and ends with the stage of produce being raised, processed and marketed and/or from the stage of rearing young animals to the stage of selling them or their products.

There were 21,287 pumpsets in 1986 in Mysore District. The main feature of their distribution was that they were almost evenly distributed with a moderate concentration in Mysore Taluk. On the basis of stratified random sampling, 33 villages were selected out of the inhabited villages numbering 1,641 spread over eleven taluks of the District. These 33 villages constituted 2.01 per cent of total villages. Further, 240
respondents were selected out of 21,287 pumpset owners on the basis of stratified random sampling and these respondents constituted 1.13 per cent. Seven sample respondents were selected from each village so selected, resulting in 231 respondents and the remaining 9 respondents were selected from Mysore taluk, which had the highest number of irrigation pumpsets. These 240 respondents had started their agricultural venture in 1986. The respondents having started their ventures only from this year were selected because of gestation period for their activity, which ranged between 4 years and 5 years.

(4) SELECTION OF VARIABLES

The independent variables influencing the entrepreneurial behaviour included (1) Age; (2) Education; (3) Farm Size; (4) Caste; (5) Type and Size of Family; (6) Occupational Background; (7) Annual Income; (8) Economic Status; (9) Social Participation; and (10) Extension Participation.

(5) COMPONENTS OF ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR

The entrepreneurial behaviour has been analysed as consisting of (i) Achievement Motivation; (ii) Decision Making; (iii) Risk Taking Ability; (iv) Coordinating Ability; (v) Innovativeness; (vi) Information Seeking; (vii) Knowledge of Farming; (viii) Assistance of Management Services; (ix) Leadership Ability; and (x) Cosmopoliteness. The conceptualization of these components and measurement process are presented below.
(i) Achievement Motivation:

Mc Clelland (1961) defined achievement motivation as a social value that emphasizes excellence in order for an individual to attain a sense of personal accomplishment. In order to understand the pattern of achievement motivation, sentence completion method, which was advocated by Morrison (1962) was adopted by Neil (1963), Rogers and Swenning (1969) and Nandapurkar (1982) because they felt that it was easier and found to be suitable to farmer's socio-cultural conditions. However, in the present study, it could not be used because of recall limitations. Hence, the responses were elicited in terms of preferences for motivation and filling up the specific information for a given item. Further, the relationship between motivation and independent variables on selective basis was analysed and interpreted.

(ii) Decision Making:

It refers to the degree to which an individual justifies his selection of most efficient means from among the available alternatives on the basis of rationality for achieving maximum profits. Singh (1978) measured this component by asking twelve multiple choice items relating mostly to management of farm operations and resources. In the present study, only five items relevant to this study were used to measure the decision making by respondents. The respondents were asked to tick five different decision criteria under "not considered," "considered after consultation with others," and "considered independently." The
relationship between decision making and the relevant independent variables was also tested.

(iii) Risk Taking Ability:

It refers to the ability of farmers in taking risk, and facing uncertainty in solving farm problems. This ability was studied from the viewpoint of growing different crops, effect of changes in price levels, occupation, cropping intensity, land utilization pattern, diversification and allied occupations and the relationship of these factors with size of land holdings.

(iv) Coordinating Ability:

It is defined as the ability of an individual in coordinating different actions from the viewpoint of time. The level of abilities adopted were "well in advance," and "at the nick of the time." The relationship of the ability was tested using the most relevant independent variables.

(v) Innovativeness:

It refers to the adoption of new ideas relatively earlier than others in respondent's farms. Ten different innovations were considered in the study and the responses were analysed from the viewpoint of frequency of adoption. The relationship between innovation and relevant variables was also tested along with distribution pattern.

(vi) Information Seeking:

It refers to the sources of contacts by respondents with various information sources and these sources of information were
grouped under five categories only. These sources of information seeking with their respective frequencies were analysed and the relationships were also analysed.

(vii) Knowledge of Farm Practices:

It is the level of factual information possessed by the respondents regarding the farming practices. Lokhande (1959), Jaiswal and Dave (1972) and Nandapurkar (1982) measured this variable by asking simple questions. In the present study, it was measured by using "Yes" or "No" types of questions along with the number of items known and the relationships were also studied on selective basis.

(viii) Assistance of Management Services:

It refers to the advisory assistance received from different sources in managing a farm. The management services included in the study numbered eight and the respondents were asked about the source and degree of assistance in terms of "always," "occassional," and "never." The formal and informal sources were also quantified and the relationships were analysed between management services and relevant variables.

(ix) Leadership Ability:

It refers to the ability of an individual to initiate or motivate the action of other fellow farmers. The study incorporated six abilities and sought the response in terms of "always," "occassional," and "never." The relationship between leadership ability and the relevant variables was also tested along with the distribution pattern.
(x) Cosmopoliteness:

It refers to the extent to which an individual is oriented outside his social system. According to Pareek and Nadkarni (1978), it results in support system, which can promote entrepreneurship through reinforcing behaviour and adopting norms of informal working. The studies by Sen (1962), Fliezel (1966), Frey (1966) and Nandapurkar (1982) included trips made to urban centres and Lerner (1958) measured it on the basis of contact with foreigners. In the present study, membership in organizations and consulting specialists and resource persons only were included. The degree of usefulness of membership was analysed through the criteria of "not useful," "moderately useful," and "highly useful."

(6) SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND STATISTICAL TOOLS

The study relies upon primary data and secondary data. The primary data presented in the study has been based on the responses elicited from 240 respondents to the questionnaire. The response elicitation was conducted between April 1991 and March 1993. The primary data covers mainly qualitative and personalised information. The relevant secondary data and information were collected from the census reports, government publications and the statistics made available from District Statistical Office and these data were collected to throw light on the current issues and trends in agricultural development. The main statistical tools used in the study were percentages, average value, preference scale, weighted points and Chi-Square test.
(7) LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It was proved to be an uphill task to contact 240 farmers living in 33 villages and 11 taluk headquarters spread in the District, involving travels of vast distances. Extracting responses to such an elaborate schedule took at least two hours of each farmer's time. They were mostly contacted at their homes in the evenings and at their farms in the morning as per their convenience. Most of the respondents were highly suspicious of the intentions of the study. They rather resisted initially to divulge information pertaining to financial matters for obvious reasons. Therefore, the assistance of Tahasildars was sought in each taluk headquarters, and they advised the Village Accountants to help in getting the required information from the farmers. The farmers were assured that the results of the survey would have no legal implications on them. Only then, the respondents came forward to give the details of their farm operations.

The study is mainly based on the information provided by the sample respondents. Hence the study lacks the rigour of a controlled experiment. Further, in collecting information for this study, the respondents were required to recall some facts during the interview. Thus, the data are subject to the usual recall limitations. However, meticulous care has been taken to get the right information through cross verification and an honest attempt has been made to record and report the opinions expressed by the respondents with utmost objectivity.
Another limitation of the study was that the number of sub-components under each component of entrepreneurial behaviour were synthesized with a view to achieve cohesiveness in analysis and interpretation of data. Further, there would have been innumerable relationships to be established for each sub-component of the ten main components of entrepreneurial behaviour. In view of the study becoming unwieldy, the relationships were established by considering the most relevant independent variables to the different sub-components under each component of entrepreneurial behaviour. Lastly, there was a large time gap in the provisioning of secondary data by the government institutions, which took almost four years to update the data. Hence the secondary data, especially at the State level and District level, could not be fine-tuned. Further, the data provisioning was not consistent and uniform. Lastly, the time and resource constraints prevented the inclusion of more than one region.

(8) PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE RESPONDENTS

Agricultural entrepreneurship, which is a dependent variable in the present study, has been viewed as a complex process influenced by various psychological, social, economic and personal characteristics. These are considered as the most important factors in entrepreneurial behaviour of farmers. In the background of these factors, the profile of 240 respondents has been presented under (1) Age; (2) Education; (3) Farm Size; (4) Caste; (5) Type and Size of Family; (6) Occupational Background;
(7) Annual Income; (8) Economic Status; (9) Social Participation; and (10) Extension Participation.

(1) Age:

Categorization of age has been done on the basis of cultural notions that man is active and vigorous up to the age of 35 years and mature in decision making after 35 years and get older after 50 years. So the respondents were grouped into three categories; (i) Young Farmers (upto 35 years); (ii) Middle Aged Farmers (36 years to 50 years); and (iii) Old Farmers (above 50 years) to know how far the age of the farmer was related with entrepreneurship. The data has been presented in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group (in years)</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young (35 and below)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (36 to 50)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old (Above 50)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.

Almost one-third of respondents belonged to young age. More than half (54.59 per cent) were in the middle age-group. A relatively small group (10.83 per cent) consisted of old age farmers. The young and middle-age groups, together constituting 89.17 percent, dominated the sample. The age range in the sample was 25 to 60
years, the mean age being 41.24 years. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Kolte (1973), Patel (1975), Shetay (1976) and Waghmare and Waghmare (1987).

(2) Education:

Emphasizing the importance of literacy in farming community, Schultz (1969) observes: "The key to growth is in acquiring and using effectively some modern factors of production. This, in turn, depends much on farmers learning how to use modern agricultural factors effectively. Growth in agriculture is possible by a high degree of literacy and skills among farming people." Hence, there is a need to study the influence of education on entrepreneurship. The information about education received by the respondents was collected and they were

TABLE 3.3
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDS BY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and Write</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.
classified into (i) Illiterate (no education); (ii) Read and Write (2 to 4 years of schooling); (iii) Primary (5 to 8 years of schooling); (iv) Secondary (9 to 11 years of schooling); (v) College (above 11 years of schooling); and (vi) Professional. The data in Table 3.3 shows that the majority (61.25 per cent) of the respondents had college education and professional education and this group was followed by respondents having secondary education numbering 48 with 20 per cent. The reason for this is clear that the respondents were chosen in the background of those converting dry land by digging a borewell or connecting a motor to the source of water at the surface level and this could be taken by those who had large holdings and good education. As a result, these findings differ from sample selection made in the studies of Jadon (1973), Kolte (1973) and Waghmare and Waghmare (1987).

(3) Farm Size:

Farm size is an important factor in influencing entrepreneurship. Therefore, information about the farm size operated by the respondents was obtained. Table 3.4 presents the distribution of respondents according to sizes of land holding consisting of (1) small farmers (upto 5 acres); (ii) Medium farmers (6 to 10 acres); and large farmers (above 10 acres). It was observed that the medium farmers were large in number constituting 66.25 per cent of the respondents and this group was followed by small farmers constituting 18.33 per cent. The least number of respondents could be found under large farmers.
representing 15.42 per cent. The size range was found to be 4 acres and 25 acres and the average holding was 8.31 acres.

TABLE 3.4
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY FARM SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Size</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.

(4) Caste:
The caste factor has to be considered in studying the entrepreneurs as the entrepreneurship demands the presence of a particular culture, which certain castes seem to have imbibed in themselves. Further, it has been observed that some communities have been producing more number of entrepreneurs than others. As a result, this fact is attributed to the influence of prevailing social and cultural factors. This situation is not only prevalent in India, but also in other countries. For instance, the entrepreneurs mainly came from business background in Britain, United States and Turkey. Similarly, Kilby (1971) and Nafziger (1977) proved that people of certain communities had a greater achievement motivation than others.

In view of India being characterized by highly complex caste pattern, nomenclatures and classifications of castes vary with State and place and each researcher has his own way of
classifying them. In the present study, the respondents came from 38 different castes. The categorization was made to facilitate our reasoning based on the government policy in this regard. Hence these respondents coming from 38 different castes were classified under (i) Forward Communities (mainly brahmins, lingayats and vysyas); (ii) Backward Community (mainly vokkaligas and shepherds); (iii) Backward Caste (mainly smiths, potters and fishermen); (iv) Minority (mainly muslims and christians); and (v) Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (SCs and STs). The distribution of the respondents has been presented in Table 3.5. Majority of the respondents basically belonged to backward communities and castes and their number stood at 152 representing 63.34 per cent. The main occupation of these two categories was agriculture. The respondents from forward community were 38 representing 15.83 per cent and their traditional occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Group</th>
<th>Respondents Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward Community</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward Community</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward Caste</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Caste And Tribe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.

were priesthood, business and agriculture. Similarly, minority
respondents stood at 32 along with schedule castes and schedule tribes at 18 representing 13.33 per cent and 7.50 per cent respectively.

(5) Type and Size of Family:

The type and size of family are likely to affect farm operations in terms of availability of labour force, income and motivation. There are two types of families, viz., nuclear and joint. A nuclear family consists of husband, wife and children. A joint family consists of more members having blood relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Type of Family:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Size of Family:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (upto 5 members)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (6 to 10 members)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (Above 10)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

common residence and common kitchen. In this study, size of the family refers to the number of people living with the respondent.
under a common residence. Table 3.6 presents the distribution of respondents by type and size of family. It could be seen from the data that majority of the respondents representing 73.33 per cent had nuclear family of medium size with 56.25 per cent. The probable reason for nuclear families was fragmentation. Further, requirement of more people in agricultural operations was associated with more number of medium size families and this finding was opposite to observations made by Patel (1971) and Dongaonkar (1975).

(6) Occupational Background:

It was observed that the respondents were involved in other occupations or employment also. In view of their occupational background presumed to be influencing entrepreneurship, it was also included as one of the independent variables. The data has been presented in Table 3.7. Agriculture alone was the occupation of 127 respondents representing 52.92 per cent. It was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Background</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture only</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture + Business</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture + Profession</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture + Employment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.
interesting to observe that 51 respondents representing 21.25 per cent were in jobs and they also managed the farms. There were 38 respondents representing 15.83 per cent having restored to agriculture along with business. Lastly, professionals numbering 24 were owning the farms along with professional practice.

(7) Annual Income:

Farm activities require expenditure as a prelude to earn income. Therefore, information was sought from the respondents regarding their annual income and care was taken to see that the respondents revealed the correct incomes through cross verification with the neighbours, village level workers and village heads. Table 4.8 presents the distribution of sample respondents on the basis of their annual incomes. There were 117 respondents forming 48.75 per cent in the income range of Rs 25001 and Rs 50,000 and this was followed by 86 respondents representing 35.83 per cent who had the income range of Rs. 50001 and Rs. 75,000. There were 21 respondents representing 8.75 per

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income (Rupees)</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Rs. 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 to 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 to 75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.
cent with income above Rs. 75,000 and 16 respondents representing only 6.67 per cent had income below Rs. 25,000. The range of income varied between Rs. 16,000 and Rs. 1,10,000 with an average of Rs. 43,583.

(8) Economic Status:

This factor is conceptualized in terms of kinds and extent of visible resources at the command of a farmer. The major indicators of economic status have been the annual income, farm size, tractors and cultivators owned and vehicles for personal use. There are two approaches to measure the economic status, viz, opinion approach and resource accounting approach. Vidyarthi (1967) and Sharma (1967) followed the opinion approach in the sense that the opinions of the Village Chairman and Village Accountant were used for measuring economic status. However, this is considered to be a rough measure. Rogers (1962) suggests the resource accounting method and includes income, farm size, and wealth. However, he also opines that wealth is difficult to estimate since hoarded wealth is seldom openly mentioned. Hence, a different approach has been followed in the present study on the presumption that wealth is exhibited in the form of tangible items like farm house, tractor, power tiller, four wheeler, two wheeler and telephone. Those, who had all items were placed under high economic status. Those, who had all those items except tractor, tiller and four wheeler, were identified under medium economic status. Those, who had only a two wheeler or none of them, were placed under low economic status. The owning of borewell was not considered in view of agricultural entrepreneur
being defined as one, who had a borewell or a pumpset in the present study. Table 3.9 portrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>49.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic status of respondents. There were 119 respondents forming 49.58 per cent of total respondents and they had medium economic status. This group was followed by 104 respondents representing 43.33 per cent under low economic status. There were only 17 respondents constituting 7.09 per cent under high economic status.

(9) Social Participation:

In view of entrepreneurship being influenced by social participation also, it is defined as participation of the respondents in the village institutions like panchayat and credit co-operative societies and producers' co-operative societies. According to Choudhari and Singh (1964), social participation results in support system, which can promote entrepreneurship through reinforcing behaviour and adopting norms of internal working. Such participants were classified into the three groups, viz., high, medium and low based on number of representations
they had in the above types of village institutions. Respondents having membership in all these were placed in high category.

### TABLE 3.10
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Participation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>45.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey.

Respondents having membership in two institutions were placed in middle category and the respondents having membership in credit co-operative societies only or no participation anywhere were placed under low category. Table 3.10 portrays the distribution of respondents under social participation. More respondents could be observed under medium category. There were 109 respondents representing 45.42 per cent and this category was followed by 78 and 53 respectively in low group and high group forming 32.50 per cent and 22.08 per cent respectively.

(10) Extension Participation:

Extension participation refers to the extent of involvement of the respondent farmer in the extension education activities conducted by the Government departments and other agencies. According to Muniraju (1975), extension participation helped positively in raising yields and earning more income. The categorization was made on the basis of number of extension
activities conducted. The respondents not participating or participating in one activity only were categorized under low participation. Those, who participated in two or three activities, were placed under medium participation and those who participated in more than three activities were placed under high participation. Table 3.11 unveils the distribution of respondents under extension participation. It was clearly discernible that 143 respondents representing 59.58 per cent had low level participation and this group was followed by 76 respondents represents 31.67 per cent under medium participation and only 21 respondents representing 8.75 per cent had high level participation. The main reason for this low level participation was found to be the emphasis on extension education towards small and marginal farmers.
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