



A STUDY ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR KNOWLEDGE ON CROP INSURANCE SCHEME

Darling B. Suji and J. Karthiyaeeni

Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University,
Annamalainagar – 608 002, Tamilnadu, India

Abstract

Indian agriculture is heavily dependent on rainfall which mainly occurs about two and half months during monsoon season. Natural calamity's effect on agriculture yield is much more. The abnormal behaviour of monsoon may cause natural disasters such as drought, floods, cyclones, etc. Agriculture has always been a risky business. Unlike the industrial sector it is subject to the vagaries of the nature. Uncertainty of crop yield is thus one of the basic risks, which every farmer has to face, more or less, in all the developing countries. To cover the risk which may occur in future, there is need to some provision and crop insurance is the only mechanism available to safeguard against production risk in agriculture. The study shows that nearly half of the respondents (48.33 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of knowledge followed by low (37.50 per cent) and high (14.17 per cent) of the respondents possess knowledge level on the crop insurance.

Keywords : Crop insurance scheme, age, education, occupation.

Introduction

Largest livelihood provider in India is agriculture. It plays an important role in Indian economic development. It is facing operational risk in cultivating different crops. Indian agriculture is heavily dependent on rainfall which mainly occurs about two and half months during monsoon season. Natural calamity's effect on agriculture yield is much more. The abnormal behaviour of monsoon may cause natural disasters such as drought, floods, cyclones, etc. Agriculture has always been a risky business. Unlike the industrial sector it is subject to the vagaries of the nature. Uncertainty of crop yield is thus one of the basic risks, which every farmer has to face, more or less, in all the developing countries. To cover the risk which may occur in future, there is need to some provision and crop insurance is the only mechanism available to safeguard against production risk in agriculture

The crop insurance is a potentially more effective risk-shifting mechanism to give protections to all types of farmers and the use of it as a risk management tool has grown rapidly in recent years. Also, the crop insurance subsidies help the farmer on various grounds. They give protection from different natural calamities. Agricultural insurance considerably strengthens the financial security of farmers and reduces the direct and indirect costs on the national economy. In India crop insurance is compulsory for the loanee farmers who borrow loan from banks and other financial institutions. For fulfilling this need the Government of India has made experiments and efforts by introducing various schemes of crop insurance.

Materials and Methods

Knowledge stage, the individual is exposed to the crop insurance scheme, but lack complete information about it. This process occurs by the chance or by the purposeful effect made by the person himself.

It is operationally defined as the behaviour of farmers through which he exposes to the crop insurance scheme, but lack complete information about it. Regarding crop insurance 31 statements were framed and the responses were elicited on

2-point continuum i.e. Known and unknown by assigning a score of 2 and 1 respectively. This procedure was followed by Belgavimath (1994) and Sharmila (2017).

1. Age

The results on distribution of respondents according to their age are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 : Distribution of respondents according to their age

(n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Young	20	16.67
2.	Middle	64	53.33
3.	Old	36.	30.00
Total		120	100.00

It could be seen from Table 1 reveals that majority (53.33 per cent) of the respondents were middle aged followed by old age (30.00 per cent) and young age (16.67 per cent). This may be due to the nature of the sample selected for the study. This finding is in line with the findings Dakeshwar (2018).

2. Educational status

The results on distribution of the respondents according to their educational status are presented in Table 2

Table 2 : Distribution of respondents according to their educational status

(n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Illiterates	20	16.67
2.	Functionally literates	16	13.33
3.	Primary education	16	13.33
4.	Middle school education	20	16.67
5.	Higher secondary education	32	26.67
6.	Collegiate education	16	13.33
Total		120	100.00

It could be observed from the Table 2 reveals that that nearly one-third of the respondents had higher secondary school level of education (26.67 per cent) followed by middle school level (16.67 per cent), primary school level (13.33 per cent), collegiate education level (13.33 per cent) and functionally literate level (13.33 per cent) and illiterate farmers (16.67 per cent). Majority of the respondents had formal education. The presence of a greater number of educational institutions might have enabled them to acquire formal education.

3. Family size

The results on distribution of respondents according to their family size are presented in Table 3.

It could be observed from the Table 3 that majority (70.00 per cent) of the respondents belong to medium family size followed by 20.00 per cent of the respondents belong to small family size and 10.00 per cent of the respondents belong to large family size. This might be reason for social changes and farmer's awareness about family planning.

Table 3 : Distribution of respondents according to their family size (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Small	24	20.00
2.	Medium	84	70.00
3.	Large	12	10.00
Total		120	100.00

4. Occupational status:

The results on distribution of respondents according to their occupational status are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 : Distribution of respondents according to their occupational status (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Agriculture as primary occupation	96	80.00
2.	Agriculture as secondary occupation	24	20.00
Total		120	100.00

It could be observed from the Table 4 that majority of the respondents (80.00 per cent) were found to have agriculture as their primary occupation. Respondents with agriculture as their secondary occupation constituted only a limited proportion (20.00 per cent). It could be concluded that majority of the farmers depend only on agriculture for their family income. There are no industries in the study area and most of the villages are hamlets without any basic infrastructure facilities. Hence, there was no option for them to get any other job. This finding is in line with the findings of Mariappan (2016).

5. Farm size (in acres):

The results on distribution of respondents according to their farm size are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 : Distribution of respondents according to their farm size (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Marginal farmers (< 2.5 ac)	30	25.00
2.	Small farmers (2.5 – 5 ac)	80	66.67
3.	Big farmers (> 5 ac)	10	8.33
Total		120	100.00

The data in Table 5 shows that more than half (66.67 per cent) of the respondents were Small farmers followed by marginal farmers (25.00 per cent) and only 8.33 per cent of the respondents were big farmers. These findings reveal that majority of the respondents were Small farmers in the study area. This might be reason for ancestral transfer of land holdings from generation to generation.

6. Farming experience

The results on distribution of the respondents according to their farming experience are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 : Distribution of respondents according to their farming experience (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	35	29.17
2.	Medium	67	55.83
3.	High	18	15.00
Total		120	100.00

The data in Table 6 shows that more than half of the respondents (55.83 per cent) had medium level of farming experience followed by low (29.17 per cent) and high (15.00 per cent) level of farming experience respectively. Majority of the farmers had medium level of experience in paddy cultivation may be due the reason that majority of the farmer were middle aged farmers.

7. Annual Income

The results on distribution of the respondents according to their annual income are presented in Table 7

Table 7 : Distribution of respondents according to their annual income (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	80	66.67
2.	Medium	30	25.00
3.	High	10	8.33
Total		120	100.00

It could be seen from the Table 7 that more than half of the respondents (66.67 per cent) had low annual income followed by medium (25.00 per cent) and only 8.33 per cent of the respondents had high annual income. This might be due to the fact that majority of the respondents were engaged only in farming traditionally which resulted in lesser income from agriculture. This finding is in line with the findings of Supriya (2018).

8. Extension Agency Contact:

The results on distribution of respondents according to their extension agency contact are given in Table 8.

Table 8 : Distribution of respondents according to their extension agency contact (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	36	30.00
2.	Medium	50	41.67
3.	High	34	28.33
Total		120	100.00

It could be observed from Table 8 that around two-fifth of the respondents (41.67 per cent) had medium level of extension agency contact followed by 30.00 per cent and 28.33 per cent of the respondents with low and high level of extension agency contact respectively. Lack of awareness about the extension agency and rare contacts with them might be the reasons for their poor extension agency contact. This finding is in line with the findings of Tamilselvan (2019).

9. Social participation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their social participation are presented in Table 9

Table 9 : Distribution of respondents according to their social participation (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	36	30.00
2.	Medium	72	60.00
3.	High	12	10.00
Total		120	100.00

It could be noticed from the Table 9 that more than half of the respondents (60.00 per cent) had medium level of social participation followed by 30.00 per cent of the respondents with low level of social participation. Only 10.00 per cent of the respondents belonged to high social participation. This might be due to the lack of awareness about the social organizations and lack of time for the farmers in the study area. This finding is in line with the findings of Kale (2011).

10. Risk Orientation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their risk orientation are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 : Distribution of respondents according to their risk orientation (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	42	35.00
2.	Medium	62	51.67
3.	High	16	13.33
Total		120	100.00

Table 10 shows that more than half of the respondents (51.67 per cent) had medium level of risk orientation followed by 35.00 per cent of the respondents with low and 13.33 per cent with high level of risk orientation. As most of the respondents were small farmers with medium land holdings and low annual income. This might be the reason for medium level of risk orientation. This finding is in line with the findings of Murugantham (2008).

11. Scientific Orientation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their scientific orientation are presented in Table 11.

Table 11 : Distribution of respondents according to their scientific orientation (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	40	33.33
2.	Medium	64	53.34
3.	High	16	13.33
Total		120	100.00

Table 11 shows that more than half (53.34 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of scientific orientation followed by low (33.33 per cent) and high (13.33 per cent) level of scientific orientation. This might be due to most of respondents had formal education.

12. Economic Motivation

The results on distribution of respondents according to their economic motivation are presented in Table 12

Table 12 : Distribution of respondents according to their economic motivation (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	35	29.17
2.	Medium	65	54.16
3.	High	20	16.67
Total		120	100.00

Table 12 reveals that more than half (54.16 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of economic motivation followed by 29.17 per cent of the respondents had low level of economic motivation and 16.67 per cent of the respondents with higher level of economic motivation. As most of the farmers have low annual income resulted in less economic motivation. This result is in line with the findings of Sujatha (2009).

13. Information Source Utilization

The results on distribution of respondents according to their Information Source Utilization are presented in Table 13.

Table 13 : Distribution of respondents according to their Information Source Utilization (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	60	50.00
2.	Medium	50	41.67
3.	High	10	8.33
Total		120	100.00

Table 13 reveals that half of the respondents (50.00 per cent) had low level of information source utilization followed by medium (41.67 per cent) and high (8.33 per cent) levels of information source utilization. This might be the reason for their medium level of social participation and extension agency contact.

14. Innovativeness

The results on distribution of respondents according to their innovativeness are presented in Table 14.

Table 14 : Distribution of respondents according to their innovativeness. (n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	30	25.00
2.	Medium	60	50.00
3.	High	30	25.00
Total		120	100.00

Table 14 reveals that half of the respondents (50.00 per cent) had medium level of innovativeness followed by low (25.00 per cent) and the remaining respondents (25.00 per cent) with high level of innovativeness. This might be reason for most of the farmers have low annual income.

THE KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS ON CROP INSURANCE SCHEME

Distribution of respondents according to their overall knowledge level on crop insurance scheme

Results of distribution of respondents according to their overall knowledge on crop insurance scheme are presented in Table -15.

Table 15 : Distribution of respondents according to their overall Knowledge level on crop insurance scheme

(n=120)

S. No	Category	Respondents	
		Number	Per cent
1.	Low	45	37.50
2.	Medium	58	48.33
3.	High	17	14.17
Total		120	100.00

The results in table 15, indicated that most (48.33 per cent) of the respondents had medium level of knowledge followed by low (37.50 per cent) and high (14.17 per cent) of the respondents possess knowledge level on the crop insurance.

Conclusion

Indian agriculture is heavily dependent on rainfall which mainly occurs about two and half months during monsoon season. Natural calamity's effect on agriculture yield is much more. This study clearly shows that nearly half of the respondents had knowledge on crop insurance scheme. So we have to conduct more awareness programmes.

Reference

- Agwane, R.M. (2013). Wheat production technology followed by Farmer. Unpublished M.Sc (Ag) thesis, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidhyapeeth, Rahuri.
- Dakeshwar, P. (2018). Assessment of the Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojanawith reference to satisfaction among the Rice Growers in Mahasamund district of chattisgarh, M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur.
- Kale, J.G. (2011). Knowledge and attitude of Farmers towards National Agricultural Insurance Scheme, M.Sc (Ag) Thesis, Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani.
- Mariappan, S. (2016). A study on knowledge and perception of farmers on crop insurance schemes in the Cauvery delta zone of Tamilnadu, Ph.D. Thesis, Indira Gandhi National open University, New Delhi.
- Varadan, J.R. and Pramod, K. (2012). Impact of crop insurance on Rice farming in Tamil Nadu. Agricultural Economics Research Review, 25(2): 291-293.