

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

Abstract

The study assessed the Personalpersonal profile of Cooperative and Private Agri-inputagri-input dealers in the Jaipur region of Rajasthan. The study was conducted in 2022-23 and the data were as collected from 240 cooperative and private agri-input dealers from Jaipur and Tonk district of Rajasthan. It was revealed from the data that the majority of cooperative agri-input dealers belong to the middle age group (51.67%) with secondary and senior secondary school education level-levels(66.67%) and had medium level-levelsof 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 belonged to the Member of one organization. had a majority of cooperative agri-input dealers (55%) medium category of mass media participation. While in case of private agri-input belongs to the middle age group (46.67%) with a graduate education level (65.83%) and had medium to high level levelsof annual turnover (65%) with seed, insecticide & pesticide, and fertilizer dealership (84.17%) and had medium experience of the 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.

Comment [M1]: What is the objective of the study??

Keywords: Agri-input dealers, Private, Cooperative, Personal profile, Age, education,

Comment [M2]: Implications of this work??

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

1. Introduction Elaborate this part and validate with reported literature on the subject!!!

Agriculture is the backbone of the India- Indian economic system. It is the major source of economic livelihood for the majority of the population of our country. Agricultural development in India is very important because 69% of the population is dependent depends 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 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~~ guide 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.

[What is the objective of this research?](#)

[How is this paper organized?](#)

2. Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in the 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 the~~ maximum number of agri-inputs dealers in comparison to other districts of the Jaipur region. Jaipur and Tonk districts comprised of 21 and 7 tehsils, respectively. Out of which six (6) tehsils were selected proportionately with random allocation by using simple random sampling. In this way, five (5) tehsils from Jaipur district *viz* Chomu, Sahapura, Kotputli, Amber, and Kishangarh Renwal and one tehsil from Tonk district *viz* Malpura was selected for the study purpose. 20 Gram Panchayats from each tehsil ~~was~~ were selected randomly for the study purpose by using a simple random sampling method. One private and one cooperative agri-input dealer waere selected from each gram panchayat. In this way, 120 cooperatives 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

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Trivedi (1963) was used; Mass media participation (Schedule developed by Rao (1995) was used with slight modifications). A personal profile test was developed and 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 interviews. The collected data were classified, tabulated, analysed, and interpreted in order to make the findings meaningful.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

2.1 Data Analysis

Formatted: Font: Bold

Hejase & Hejase (2011) contend that giving data meaning leads to useful information. Furthermore, according to Hejase and Hejase (2013), “descriptive statistics deals with describing a collection of data by condensing the amounts of data into simple representative numerical quantities or plots that can provide a better understanding of the collected data” (p. 272). Therefore, the primary data were coded and analysed using a Microsoft Excel package. Descriptive statistics included frequencies and percentages presented in Table 1 for simplicity.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Distribution 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 shows that the majority of 51.67 per cent percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to the middle age group, whereas 25.83 per cent percent of input dealers were found in the old age group and only 22.50 per cent percent of cooperative agri-input dealers were in the young age group.

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

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

3.2 Education

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

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

The present findings are similar ~~with-~~to 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~~percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to the middle annual turnover group, whereas 16.67 ~~per cent~~percent of ~~agri-~~input dealers were found in the low annual turnover group and only 12.50 ~~per cent~~percent of cooperative agri-input dealers were in the high annual turnover group, respectively.

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

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

3.4 Types of dealerships

The data presented in Table 1 observed that the majority of 65.83 ~~per cent~~percent cooperative agri-input dealers belong to seed, insecticide pesticide, and fertilizer dealerships

followed by fertilizer & seed dealerships (30%), seed dealers (2.50%), and only 1.67 per cent of cooperative agri-input dealers belong to fertilizer dealers, respectively.

In the case of private agri-input dealers, it was concluded that the majority of 84.17 per cent private agri input dealers belong to seed, insecticide pesticide, and fertilizer dealership followed by fertilizer & seed dealerships (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 the dealership

The data presented in Table 1 observed that the majority of 42.50 per cent cooperative agri-input dealers belong to the 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 the majority of 45.84 per cent of private agri-input dealers belong to the medium experience category followed by high experience (28.33%) and low experience (25.83%) of private agri-input dealers in dealerships, 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 shows that the majority of 43.33 per cent cooperative agri-input dealers belong to the medium exposure visit category followed by high exposure visits (35%) and low exposure visits (21.67%) of cooperative agri-input dealers.

The details revealed in Table 1 indicated that the majority of 61.67 per cent private agri-input dealers belong to high exposure visits followed by medium exposure visits (30%) and only 8.33 per cent private agri input dealers belong to low exposure visits, 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 belong to medium category followed by 25 and 20.00 per

~~centpercent~~agri input dealers in the low and high level of ~~Information-seeking Information-seeking~~ behaviour group, respectively.

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

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

3.8 Market orientation

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

The data given in Table 1 indicates ~~s~~ that ~~the~~ majority 40.83 ~~per centpercent~~ of private agri-input dealers ~~were~~ belonged to ~~a~~ high level of market orientation, followed by 34.17 and 25.00 ~~per centpercent~~agri-input dealers in the medium and low-level market orientation groups, respectively.

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

3.9 Social Participation

The data given in Table 1 indicate that ~~the~~ majority of 64.17 ~~per centpercentof~~ cooperative ~~agri inputagri-input~~ dealers ~~were belongedbelonged~~ to members ~~s~~ of one organization group, and 35.83 ~~per centpercent~~agri input dealers ~~belong- belongedto~~ ~~a~~ member of more than one organization, respectively

In ~~the~~ case of private agri-input ~~s~~ dealers indicate that ~~a~~ majority of 55.83 ~~per centpercent~~ of private agri input dealers ~~were~~ belonged to no participation group, followed by 34.17 and 10.00 ~~per centpercent~~agri-input dealers ~~belong- belongedto~~ the member of one organization and member of more than one organization, respectively.

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

3.10 Mass ~~media participation~~Media Participation

The data given in Table 1 indicates that majority of 55.00 ~~per cent~~ cooperative agri input dealers ~~were belonged~~ 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 indicates that ~~the~~ majority of 58.33 ~~per cent~~ private agri-input dealers ~~were~~ belonged to ~~the~~ medium level of mass media participation, followed by 29.17 and 12.50 ~~per cent~~ agri input dealers in the high and low levels of mass media participation group, respectively.

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

4. Conclusion

It was found that ~~the~~ majority of cooperative agri-input dealers belong to ~~the~~ middle age group (51.67%) with secondary and senior secondary school education level (66.67%) and had medium levels 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~~ belonged to the Member of one organization. had ~~a~~ majority of cooperative agri-input dealers (55%) medium category of mass media participation. While in case of private agri-input belongs to ~~the~~ middle age group (46.67%) with ~~a~~ graduate education level (65.83%) and had medium to ~~the~~ high level of annual turnover (65%) with seed, insecticide & pesticide and fertilizer dealership (84.17%) and had ~~a~~ medium experience of ~~the~~ 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.

Comment [M3]: Add implications of this work?

An limitations for this research???

4. References Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency and completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements. Make sure all references are used in the text

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

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.

Hejase, A.J. and Hejase, H.J. (2011). *Foundations of Management Information Systems*. (1st Ed.) Beirut: Sader Publishers.

Hejase, A.J. and Hejase, H.J. (2013). *Research Methods, A Practical Approach for Business Students*. (2nd Ed.) Philadelphia, PA: Massadir Inc.

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 agro-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.