

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2019.808.232>

Estimating Profile of the Farmer Producer Company Members

S. L. Chopade, P.S. Kapse and V.G. Dhulgand*

Department of Extension Education, VNMKV, Parbhani. (M. S.), India

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Osmanabad district, randomly selected from Marathwada region of Maharashtra state during the year 2018-2019. From Osmanabad district, Osmanabad blocks were selected purposively based on considerable number of respondent as a member of 'Farmer Producer Company'. From one selected blocks, 3 villages were selected randomly based on considerable number of members of Farmer Producer Company. From each selected village, 40 farmers were selected randomly. In this way a total of 120 farmers were considered as respondent for the present study. These selections were done by using simple random sampling method for the purpose of the study. For estimating profile of the farmer producer company members, it was found that, majority (63.33%) of the respondents were middle aged, 35.00 per cent middle school level of education, (84.17%) were found medium annual income, (46.67%) per cent having small size of land holding. It was observed that, 27.50 per cent of the respondents were engaged in agriculture and similar percentage were engaged in agriculture with livestock as occupation, majority (65.00%) of them having medium social participation, 59.17 per cent were found medium extension contact, more than half (70.83%) of them having medium economic motivation, (59.17%) of them having medium cosmopolitaness and 64.17 per cent of them having medium level of risk orientation.

Keywords

Profile analysis,
Members of farmer
producer company

Article Info

Accepted:

15 July 2019

Available Online:

10 August 2019

Introduction

Agriculture remains the largest source of livelihood in Indian economy. About 45 per cent Indian population depend on agriculture for employment. In India role of small farms (and small holdings) in poverty reduction is well recognized (Lipton, 2006) However, in the absence of robust public/private support system at the ground level farmers face challenges in accessing land, water, inputs, credit, technology and market. Then, there are emerging challenges like risk and vulnerabilities due to climate change and

natural calamities (Thapa and Gaiha, 2011). FPO's are Collectivization of producers, especially low and marginal farmers, into the producer organization has come out as one of the most efficient pathways to address the many challenges of agriculture, but more significantly, improved approach to investments, technology and inputs and markets. Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India has identified farmer, producer organization registered under the particular provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 as the most appropriate institutional form around

which to mobilize farmers and establish their capacity to jointly leverage their production and selling effectiveness.

The basic purpose envisioned for the FPOs is to collectivize small farmers for backward linkage for inputs like seeds, fertilizers, credit, insurance, knowledge and extension services; and forward linkages such as collective marketing, processing, and market-led agriculture production (Mondal, 2010)

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in Osmanabad district, randomly selected from Marathwada region of Maharashtra state during the year 2018-2019. Selected district eight tahsils were selected purposively. From Osmanabad district, Osmanabad blocks were selected purposively based on considerable number of respondent as a member of 'Farmer Producer Company'. From one selected blocks, 3 villages were selected randomly based on considerable number of members of Farmer Producer Company. From each selected village, 40 farmers were selected randomly. In this way a total of 120 farmers were considered as respondent for the present study.

These selections were done by using simple random sampling method for the purpose of the study. For estimating profile of the farmer producer company members. Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this study. The data were collected with the help of pretested interview schedule. The statistical methods and tests such as frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were used for the analysis of data.

Objective

Profile of members of farmer producer company

Research Finding

Personal and socio-economic characteristics of members of farmer producer company

Age

The data presented in Table 1 shows that majority (63.33 %) of the respondents were found in middle age group.

Whereas 21.67 per cent of respondent were in the young age group and 15.00 per cent of the respondent were in old age group.

Education

Data in the Table 2 shows that 35.00 per cent of the respondents had middle school level of education, followed by 16.68 per cent, 14.16 per cent and 13.33 per cent, 12.50 per cent and 5.00 and 3.33 per cent of the respondents who were having education up to primary school, can read only, illiterate, read and write, high school and college level respectively.

Annual income

The data presented in Table 3 shows that majority (84.17%) of the respondents had annual income in between Rs 71960/- to Rs 426042/- followed by 12.50 per cent of the respondents who had annual income above Rs 426042. /- high income only 2.50 per cent of the respondents had low annual income i.e 71059/-

Land holding

The data presented in Table 4 revealed that nearly half (46.67%) of the respondents had small size (1.01 to 2.00 ha) of land holding, followed by 28.33 per cent, 19.17 per cent and 3.33 per cent of the respondents who had medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha), marginal (Up to 1.00 ha) and semi medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha)

size of land holding, respectively. Only 2.50 per cent of the respondent had large size (10.01 ha and above) of land holding.

Occupation

The data presented in Table 5 indicates that 27.50 per cent of the respondents were engaged in agriculture and similar percentage were engaged in agriculture with livestock, followed by 20.00 per cent of the respondents were engaged in agriculture with agriculture allied business and 18.34% per cent of the respondents were engaged in agriculture with

poultry and 3.33 per cent of the farmers engaged in agriculture with agriculture services and business. From the above data it is concluded that majority of the respondents (55.00%) were engaged either in agriculture and agriculture with livestock.

Social participation

Table 6 indicates that 65.00 per cent had medium level social participation. While 24.17 per cent of the respondents had low social participation and only 10.83 per cent of the respondents had high social participation.

Table.1 Distribution of respondents according to their age group

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Young (Up to 33)	26	21.67
2.	Middle (34 to 49)	76	63.33
3.	Old (above 49)	18	15.00
Total		120	100

Table.2 Distribution of respondents according to their level of education

Sr. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Illiterate	16	13.33
2.	Can read only	17	14.16
3.	Can read and write	15	12.50
4.	Primary school (1 to 4)	20	16.68
5.	Middle school (5 to 10)	42	35.00
6.	High school (11 to 12)	06	05.00
7.	College level (above 12)	04	03.33
Total		120	100

Table.3 Distribution of the respondents according to their annual income

Sr. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (Up to Rs 71059/-)	04	03.33
2.	Medium (Rs 71960/- to Rs 426042/-)	101	84.17
3.	High (above Rs 426042/-)	15	12.50
Total		120	100.00
Mean= 249000; SD = 177042			

Table.4 Distribution of the respondents according to their land holding

Sr. No.	Land Holding	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Marginal (Up to 1.00 ha)	23	19.17
2.	Small (1.01 to 2.00 ha)	56	46.67
3.	Medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha)	34	28.33
4.	Semi Medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha)	06	05.00
5.	Big (10.00 Ha. Above)	01	0.83
Total		120	100

Table.5 Distribution of the respondents according to their occupation

Sr. No.	Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Agriculture only	33	27.50
2.	Agriculture + Livestock	33	27.50
3	Agriculture + Poultry	22	18.34
4	Agriculture + Agriculture allied business	24	20.00
5	Agriculture + Service	04	3.33
6	Agriculture + Business	04	3.33
Total		120	100

Table.6 Distribution of the respondents according to their social participation

Sr. No.	Social Participation	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 3)	29	24.17
2.	Medium (4 to 7)	78	65.00
3.	High (above 7)	13	10.83
Total		120	100
Mean =5.14; SD=2.04			

Table.7 Distribution of the respondent according to their extension contact

Sr. No.	Extension Contact	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 3)	25	20.83
2	Medium (4 to 8)	71	59.17
3	High (above 8)	24	20.00
Total		120	100
Mean = 5.79; SD=2.62			

Table.8 Distribution of the respondents according to their economic motivation

Sr. No.	Economic Motivation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 18)	24	20.00
2	Medium (19 to24)	85	70.83
3	High (above 24)	11	09.17
Total		120	100
Mean = 20.94; SD = 3.09			

Table.9 Distribution of the respondents according to their cosmopolitaness

Sr. No.	Cosmopoliteness	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 6)	34	28.33
2	Medium (7 to 11)	71	59.17
3	High (above 11)	15	12.50
Total		120	100
Mean= 8.33; SD = 2.73			

Table.10 Distribution of the respondents according to their risk orientation

Sr. No.	Risk Orientation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 19)	31	25.83
2	Medium (20 to 24)	77	64.17
3	High (above 24)	12	10.00
Total		120	100
Mean = 21.42; SD = 2.86			

Extension contact

It is evident from Table 7 that a majority of the respondents (59.17 %) had medium level of extension contact followed by 20.83 per cent had low level of extension contact and 20 per cent had high level of extension contact.

Economic motivation

Table 8 revealed that 70.83 per cent of the respondents had medium level of economic motivation, followed by 20.00 per cent and 9.17 per cent of the respondents who had low and high level of economic motivation, respectively.

Cosmopolitaness

The data reported in Table 9 shows that 59.17 per cent of the respondents had medium level of cosmopolitaness, followed by 29.17 per cent and 12.50 per cent of the respondents who had low and high level of cosmopolitaness, respectively.

Risk orientation

The data reported in Table 10 shows that majority of the respondents (64.17%) had medium level of risk orientation, followed by 25.83 per cent and 10.00 per cent of the respondents who had low and high level of

risk orientation, respectively. Majority (63.33%) of the respondents were middle aged, 35.00 per cent middle school level of education, (84.17%) were found medium annual income, (46.67%) per cent having small size of land holding. It was observed that, 27.50 per cent of the respondents were engaged in agriculture and similar percentage were engaged in agriculture with livestock as occupation, majority (65.00%) of them having medium social participation, 59.17 per cent were found medium extension contact, more than half (70.83%) of them having medium economic motivation, (59.17%) of them having medium cosmopolitaness and 64.17 per cent of them having medium level of risk orientation.

References

- Agarwal B. (2010). Rethinking agricultural production collectivities. *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 27, 2010. 55 (9): 64-78.
- Ahire, R.D. (2000). A Study on the Consequences of Watershed Development Programme. Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Agriculture University, Parbhani.
- Ahire, R.D. and P. S. Kapse (2015). Socio-economic Impact of Commodity Interest Group among Pomegranate Growers. *Agresco Report 2014-2015 VNMKV*, Parbhani.
- Aitwadw, N.M., (2017). Impact of Shri Hanuman Sahakari Dudh Vyvasayik Krishi Purak Sanstha Maryadit, Yalgad: A case study, PhD. (Agri.) Thesis, MPKV Rahuri
- Ampaire, E. L., Macheche, C. L., Birachi, E. (2013). The role of rural producer organizations in enhancing market participation of smallholder farmers in Uganda: Enabling and disabling factors. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 8(11): 963-970.
- Asante, B., Victor, A.S and Daniel, S. 2011. Determinants of small scale farmers' decision to join farmer based organizations in Ghana. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*. 6: 2273-2279
- Bhandari, S.D. (2014). Socio-economic impact of Mahatma Gandhi national rural employment guarantee act on the beneficiaries. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Vasantao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani (Maharashtra).
- Bhosale, J.S. (2014). Impact of integrated pest management technology in cotton on beneficiary farmers of farmers' field school. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (Maharashtra).
- Garg, S.K., S.K. Badodiya, O.P. Daipuriya and Rawat, U. (2012). Impact of Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojna on poverty alleviation in Morar block of Gwalior district. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* (I), pp: 189-191.
- Khalache, P.G. and Gaikwad, J.H. (2011). Impact of watershed development programme of watershed organization trust (WOTR) on the beneficiaries in Ahmednagar district. *Indian Journal of Extension Education* (47), No. 3 and 4, pp: 104-108.
- Khandave, S.R. and Suryawanshi P.S. (2015). Impact of National Horticulture Mission on beneficiaries. *J. Agric. Res. Technol.* 40 (2), pp: 348-350.
- Mankar, D.M., P.P. Wankhade and Kale, N.M. (2014). Socio-economic impact of improved Soybean technology on farmers. *International J. Exten. Edu.* (10), pp: 146-152.
- Mankar, D.M., P.P. Wankhade and Shambharkar, Y.B. (2013). Impact of National Horticulture Mission on its beneficiaries. *International Journal of Exten. Edu.* (9), pp: 72-80.

How to cite this article:

Chopade, S.L., P.S. Kapse and Dhulgand, V.G. 2019. Estimating Profile of the Farmer Producer Company Members. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 8(08): 1988-1994.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2019.808.232>