# Personal profile of Cooperative and Private Agri input dealers in Jaipur region of Rajasthan


## Abstract

The study assessed Personal profile of Cooperative and Private Agri input dealers in Jaipur region of Rajasthan. The study was conducted in 2022-23 and the data was collected from 240 cooperative and private agri input dealers from Jaipur and Tonk district of Rajasthan. It was revealed from the data that majority of cooperative agri input dealers belong to middle age group (51.67%) with secondary and senior secondary school education level (66.67%) and had medium level of annual turnover with seed, insecticide & pesticide and fertilizer dealership (65.83%), had medium experience with medium level exposure visit in medium category information seeking behaviour and had medium category market orientation with (64.17%) agri input dealers were belonged to the Member of one organization. had majority of cooperative agri input dealers (55%) medium category of mass media participation. While in case of private agri input belong to middle age group (46.67%) with graduate education level (65.83%) and had medium to high level of annual turnover (65%) with seed, insecticide & pesticide and fertilizer dealership (84.17%) and had medium experience of dealership, high category exposure visit (61.67%) with high category of information seeking behaviour (40.83%) and had no member of any organization category (58.33%) with the medium category of mass media participation.



***Keyword:*** *Agri* input dealers, Private, Cooperative, Personal profile, Age, education,


## 1. Introduction

Agriculture is the backbone of the India economic system. It is the major source of economic livelihood for the majority of population of our country. Agricultural development in India is very important because 69% of the population is dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. It has been realized that the public sector extension system on its own is not capable enough to meet the ever increasing and multifaceted demands of the farming community due to several constraints or weaknesses in the system.

Agri input dealers are businesses that sell agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and other farm supplies to farmers. These dealers may operate independently or as part of a larger network, and they often work with manufacturers or distributors to obtain their

products. They typically provide guidance to farmers on selecting the appropriate inputs for their specific crops and conditions, as well as advice on how to properly use these products to maximize yields and minimize environmental impact. Agri input dealers play an important role in the agricultural supply chain, helping to ensure that farmers have access to the tools and resources they need to be successful.

## 2. Materials and methods

The present study was conducted in Jaipur region of Rajasthan. Jaipur region comprises of four districts *viz.*, Ajmer, Jaipur, Dausa and Tonk. Out of these Jaipur and tonk districts were selected purposely on the basis of maximum number of agri inputs dealers in comparison to other districts of Jaipur region. Jaipur and Tonk districts comprised of 21 and 7 tehsils, respectively. Out of which 6 tehsils were selected proportionately with random allocation by using simple random sampling. In this way 5 tehsils from Jaipur district *viz*Chomu, Sahpura, Kotputli, Amber and KishangarhRenwal and one tehsil from Tonk district *viz*Malpura was selected for the study purpose. 20 Gram Panchayats from each tehsil was selected randomly for the study purpose by using simple random sampling method. One private and one cooperative agri input dealer selected from each gram panchayat. In this way 120 cooperative and 120 privates were selected. Thus, the total sample was comprised of 240 agri input dealers. To study the personal profile of agri input dealers, personal profile variables were measured through different scales *viz.*Age (Chronological age in years); Education(Scale developed by *Wani 2019* was used with some modifications) ; Annual turnover(Schedule was developed by the investigator) ;Type of dealership (Schedule was developed by the investigator) ;Experience (Experienced was measured in years) ;Exposure visits (Schedule was developed by the investigator) ;Information seeking behaviour (Scale developed by *Rao 1985* was used with slight modifications) ;Market orientation (Scale developed by *Samanta 1977* was used with slight modifications) ;Social participation (Schedule developed by T*rivedi 1963* was be used) ;Mass media participation (Schedule developed by *Rao 1995*was used with slight modifications).a personal profile test was developed the interview schedule was prepared in the local language in light of the objectives of the study and was pre-tested. The data of this study were collected through personal interview. The collected data were classified, tabulated, analysed and interpreted in order to make the findings meaningful.

## 3. Results and discussion

**Table:1Distribution of Agri Input dealers according to personal profile**

| S. No | Categories of variables | Cooperative Agri Input Dealers ($n_1$=120) | | Private Agri Input Dealers ($n_2$=120) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **F** | **%** | **F** | **%** |
| | **A. Age** | | | | |
| 1 | Young (up to 35 year) | 27 | 22.50 | 28 | 23.33 |
| 2 | Middle (from 36 year to 50 year) | 62 | 51.67 | 56 | 46.67 |
| 3 | Old (Above 50 year) | 31 | 25.83 | 36 | 30.00 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | **B. Education** | | | | |
| 1 | Middle | 8 | 6.67 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Secondary and Sr. secondary | 80 | 66.67 | 30 | 25.00 |
| 3 | Graduate | 31 | 25.83 | 79 | 65.83 |
| 4 | Post Graduation | 1 | 0.83 | 11 | 9.17 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | **C. Annual turnover** | | | | |
| 1 | Low (up to ₹ 5666667) | 20 | 16.67 | 17 | 14.17 |
| 2 | Medium(From ₹ 5666668 to ₹ 9833333) | 85 | 70.83 | 78 | 65.00 |
| 3 | High (Above ₹ 9833333**)** | 15 | 12.50 | 25 | 20.83 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | **D. Types of dealerships** | | | | |
| 1 | Seed | 3 | 2.50 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Fertilizer | 2 | 1.67 | 3 | 2.50 |
| 3 | Fertilizer and seed | 36 | 30.00 | 16 | 13.33 |
| 4 | Seed, Insecticide, Pesticide and Fertilizer | 79 | 65.83 | 101 | 84.17 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | E. **Experience of dealership** | | | | |
| 1 | Low experience (up to 10 year) | 51 | 42.50 | 31 | 25.83 |
| 2 | Medium experience (from 11 to 19 year) | 47 | 39.17 | 55 | 45.84 |
| 3 | High experience (above 19 years) | 22 | 18.33 | 34 | 28.33 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | F. **Exposure visit** | | | | |
| 1 | Low (up to 3.33 scores) | 26 | 21.67 | 10 | 8.33 |
| 2 | Medium (from 3.34 to 6.67 scores) | 52 | 43.33 | 36 | 30.00 |
| 3 | High (above 6.67 scores) | 42 | 35.00 | 74 | 61.67 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| | G. **Information seeking behaviour** | | | | |
| 1 | Low (up to 22.33 score) | 30 | 25.00 | 8 | 6.67 |
| 2 | Medium (from 22.33 to 34.67 score) | 66 | 55.00 | 43 | 35.83 |
| 3 | High (above 34.67 scores) | 24 | 20.00 | 69 | 57.50 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. **Market orientation** | | | | | |
| 1 | Low (up to 9.33 score) | 47 | 39.17 | 30 | 25.00 |
| 2 | Medium(from 9.34 to 13.67 score) | 54 | 45.00 | 41 | 34.17 |
| 3 | High(above 13.67 score) | 19 | 15.83 | 49 | 40.83 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| I. **Social Participation** | | | | | |
| 1 | No member of any organization | 0 | 0.00 | 67 | 55.83 |
| 2 | Member of one organization | 77 | 64.17 | 41 | 34.17 |
| 3 | Member of more than one organization | 43 | 35.83 | 12 | 10.00 |
| | Total | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |
| J. **Mass media participation** | | | | | |
| 1 | Low (up to 11.33 score) | 44 | 36.67 | 15 | 12.50 |
| 2 | Medium (from 11.34 to 18.66 score) | 66 | 55.00 | 70 | 58.33 |
| 3 | High (above 18.66 score) | 10 | 8.33 | 35 | 29.17 |
| | **Total** | **120** | **100.00** | **120** | **100.00** |

*F= Frequency %= Percentage*

**3.1 Age:**

The data presented in Table 1 that majority of 51.67 per cent cooperative agri input dealers belonged to the middle age group,whereas25.83per cent of input dealers were found in theoldage group and only22.50 per cent of cooperative agri input dealers were in theyoung age group.

While in case of private agri input dealers reported that majority 46.67 per cent of private agri input dealers belong to middle age group followed by old age (30%) and middle age group (23.33%), respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Borah *et al.* (2021) and Panja *et al.* (2021).

**3.2 Education**

The data presented in Table 1 observed that majority (66.67%) of cooperative agri input dealers belong to Secondary and Senior Secondary School level of education followed by graduate (25.83%), middle school (6.67%) and only 0.83 per cent of cooperative Agri input dealers belongs to post graduate education level, respectively.

In this instance of private agri input dealers Table 1 indicated that majority (65.83%) of private agri input dealers belong to graduate education level followed by Secondary and senior secondary (25.00%) and only 9.17 per cent of private agri input dealers belong to post graduation education level, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Panja *et al.* (2021) and Singh *et al.* (2021).

### 3.3 Annual turnover

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that 70.83 per cent of cooperative agri input dealers belonged to the middle annual turnover group, whereas 16.67 per cent of input dealers were found in the low annual turnover group and only 12.50 per cent of cooperative agri input dealers were in the high annual turnover group, respectively.

But in case of private agri input dealers' data presented in Table 1 reveal that majority of 65 per cent private agri input dealers belonged to the medium annual turnover group, whereas 20.83 per cent input dealers were found in the high annual turnover group and only 14.17 per cent of agri input dealers were in the low annual turnover group.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Jhansi *et al.* (2022).

### 3.4 Types of dealerships

The data presented in Table 1 observed that majority of 65.83 per cent cooperative agri input dealers belong to seed, insecticide pesticide and fertilizer dealership followed by fertilizer & seed dealership (30%), seed dealer (2.50%) and only 1.67 per cent of cooperative agri input dealers belong to fertilizer dealers, respectively.

In case of private agri input dealers it was concluded that majority of 84.17 per cent private agri input dealers belong to seed, insecticide pesticide and fertilizer dealership followed by fertilizer & seed dealership (13.33%) and only 2.50 per cent of private agri input dealers belong to fertilizer dealership, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Reddy *et al.* (2020).

### 3.5 Experience of dealership

The data presented in Table 1 observed that majority of 42.50 per cent cooperative agri input dealers belong to low experience category followed by medium experience (39.17%) and high experience (18.33%) of cooperative agri input dealers, respectively.

The data exhibited in Table 1 found that majority of 45.84 per cent of private agri input dealers belong to medium experience category followed by high experience (28.33%) and low experience (25.83%) of private agri input dealers in dealership, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Sharma (2017) and Kumar *et al.* (2020).

### 3.6 Exposure visit

The data exhibited in Table 1 show that majority of 43.33 per cent cooperative agri input dealers belong to medium exposure visit category followed by high exposure visit (35%) and low exposure visit (21.67%) of cooperative agri input dealers.

The details revealed in Table 1 indicated that majority of 61.67 per cent private agri input dealers belong to high exposure visit followed by medium exposure visit (30%) and only 8.33 per cent private agri input dealers had belong to low exposure visit, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Borah *et al*. (2019).

### 3.7 Information seeking behaviour

The data presented in Table 1 indicates that majority of 55.00 per cent cooperative agri input dealers were belonged to medium category followed by 25 and 20.00 per cent agri input dealers in the lowand high level of Information seeking behaviour group, respectively.

The data given in Table 1 also reveals that in case of private agri input dealer'smajority of 57.50 per cent were belonged to medium level of Information seeking behaviour followed by 35.83 per cent in the medium level and only 6.67 per cent private agri input dealers were found in the category of high level of Information seeking behaviour group.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Panja *et al.* (2021).

### 3.8 Market orientation

The data given in Table 1 indicate that majority of 45 per cent cooperative agri input dealers were belonged to medium level of market orientation, followed by 39.17 and 15.83 per cent agri input dealers in the low and high level of market orientation, respectively.

The data given in Table 1 indicate that majority 40.83 per cent of private agri input dealers were belonged to high level of market orientation, followed by 34.17 and 25.00 per cent agri input dealers in the medium andlow-level market orientation group, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings Reddy *et al.* (2020).

### 3.9 Social Participation

The data given in Table 1 indicate that majority of 64.17 per cent cooperative agri input dealers were belonged to member of one organization group, and 35.83 per cent agri input dealers belong to member of more than one organization, respectively

In case of private agri input dealers indicate that majority of 55.83 per cent of private agri input dealers were belonged to no participation group, followed by 34.17 and 10.00 per cent

agriinput dealers belong to the member of one organization and member of more than one organization, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings of Prasad *et al.* (2019) and Jhansi *et al*. (2022).

**3.10 Mass media participation**

The data given in Table 1 indicate that majority of 55.00 per cent cooperative agri input dealers were belonged to medium mass media participation, followed by 36.67 and 8.33 per cent agri input dealers in the low and high mass media participation group, respectively.

The data given in Table 1 indicate that majority of 58.33 per cent private agri input dealers were belonged to medium level of mass media participation, followed by 29.17 and 12.50 per cent agri input dealers in the high and low level of mass media participation group, respectively.

The present findings are similar with the findings Panja *et al.* (2021) and Jaiswal *et al.* (2022).

**4. Conclusion**

It was found that majority of cooperative agri input dealers belong to middle age group (51.67%) with secondary and senior secondary school education level (66.67%) and had medium level of annual turnover with seed, insecticide & pesticide and fertilizer dealership (65.83%), had medium experience with medium level exposure visit in medium category information seeking behaviour and had medium category market orientation with (64.17%) agri input dealers were belonged to the Member of one organization. had majority of cooperative agri input dealers (55%) medium category of mass media participation. While in case of private agri input belong to middle age group (46.67%) with graduate education level (65.83%) and had medium to high level of annual turnover (65%) with seed, insecticide & pesticide and fertilizer dealership (84.17%) and had medium experience of dealership, high category exposure visit (61.67%) with high category of information seeking behaviour (40.83%) and had no member of any organization category (58.33%) with the medium category of mass media participation.

**4. References**

Borah Adrija, Sundar Barman, Rekhamoni Gogoi and Indrajit Barman. 2021. A study on effectiveness of advisory services rendered by agro-input dealers in Jorhat district,

Assam. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences,* **10**(08): 42-50.

Jhansi, B., Ragini, M., Pawar, J. L. B. and Sankanagoudar, S. (2022). A Study on Socio-Personal Profile of Daesi Input Dealers. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 40(12): 344-351.

Kumar, S., Roy, S., Atal, R., Panda, C. K. and Sohane, R. K. (2020). Knowledge gap of agri-input dealers in farm production. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 39(4): 92-101.

Panja, A., Gowda, N. S., Kusumalatha, D. V. and Mamathalakshmi, N. 2021. Profile characteristics of agricultural input dealers in West Bengal. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, **10**(02): 2100-2109.

Patel, S. A., Patel, J. K. and Patel, H. A. 2019. Attitude and Technological Knowledge of the Input Dealers Regarding Agro Services. *Gujarat Journal of Extension Education*, (SI).

Prasad, C. V., Pradhan, K. and Das, T. K. 2019. Assessing the Behavioural Component of 'Diploma in Agricultural Extension Services for Input Dealers (DAESI)' Programme Trainees towards ICTs usage for Sustainable Agriculture in the Sub-Himalayan Region. *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Biosciences,* **7**(2): 267-274.

Rao, R. J. 1995. A study on the knowledge and adoption level of paddy farmers in Hospet Taluk of Tungabhadra Command Area in Karnataka. Unpublished M.Sc. (Agri.) *Thesis,* University of Agriculture Science, Bangalore, Karnataka, India.

Rao, V. G. K. 1985. Prediction analysis of the farming performance of farmers through entrepreneurial behavior factors. Unpublished Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India.

Reddy, U. K. K., Satyagopal, P. V., Sailajaand, V. and Prasad, S. V. (2020). "Profile Characteristics of Agri-Input Dealers". Department of Agricultural Extension, SV Agricultural College, ANGRAU, Tirupati, 517502.

Samanta, R. K. 1977. A study of some agro-economic, socio- physical and communication variables associated with repayment behaviour of agriculture credit users of a nationalized bank. Unpublished Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis. Bidhan Chandra Krishi Vidyalaya, Haringhat, West Bengal, India.

Singh, N., Gupta, B. K. and Gautam, U. S. 2021. Training Needs Assessment of Agro-input Dealers in Banda District of Uttar Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, **57**(2): 56-62.

Trivedi, G. 1963. Measurement and analysis of socio-economic status of rural families. Ph.D. thesis (Unpub), IARI, New Delhi.

Wani, R. T. 2019. Socioeconomic status scales-modified Kuppuswamy and Udai Pareekh's scale updated for 2019. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, **8**(6): 1846.