Personal profile of Cooperative and Private Agriinput dealers in the Jaipur region of Rajasthan,India

Abstract

The study assessed thepersonal profile of cooperative and private agri-input dealers in the Jaipur region of Rajasthan. The study was conducted in 2022-23, and the data were collected from 240 cooperative and private agri-input dealers from the 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 levels (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 belonged to the Member of one organization. had a majority of cooperative agri-input dealers (55%) medium category of mass media participation. Case of private agri-inputbelongs to the middle age group (46.67%) with a graduate education level (65.83%) and had medium to high levels of 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. This study considers government schemes for agri-input dealers according to their socio-economic condition.

Keywords:*Agri-input* dealers, Private, Cooperative, Personal profile, Age, education, socio-economic condition

1. Introduction

Agriculture is the backbone of the Indian economic system. It is the primary source of economic livelihood for the majority of the population of our country. Agricultural development in India is significant because 69% of the population depends on agriculture for their livelihood. It has been realized that the public sector extension system needs to be more capable of meeting the ever-increasing and multifaceted demands of the farming community due to several constraints or weaknesses in the system.

Agri-input dealers sell agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and other farm supplies to farmers. These dealers may operate independently or as part of a more extensive network, and they often work with manufacturers or distributors to obtain their products. They typically guide farmers on selecting the appropriate inputs for their specific crops and conditions, as well as how to properly use these products to maximize yields and minimize environmental impact. Agri-input dealers play an essential role in the agricultural supply chain, helping to ensure that farmers have access to the tools and resources they need to be successful.

2. Objective of Research

To study personal profile of agri-input dealers

3. 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,the 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 Trivedi 1963) ;Mass media participation (Schedule developed by Rao 1995was 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.

The present study was conducted in the Jaipur region of Rajasthan. Jaipur region comprises four districts viz., Ajmer, Jaipur, Dausa and Tonk. Out of these, Jaipur and Tonk districts were selected purposely on the basis of a maximum number of input dealers compared to other districts of the Jaipur region. Jaipur and Tonk districts comprised of 21 and 7 tehsils, respectively. Out of these, six (6) tehsils were selected proportionately with random allocation using simple random sampling. In this way, five (5) tehsils from Jaipur district viz Chomu, Sahpura, Kotputli, Amber, and KishangarhRenwal and one (1) tehsil from Tonk district viz Malpura were selected for the study purpose. 20 Gram Panchayats from each tehsil were randomly chosen for the study purpose using a simple random sampling method. One private and one cooperative agri-input dealer was 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. Personal profile variables were measured using different scales to study the individual profiles of agri-input dealers. Age (Chronological age in years); Education (Scale developed by Wani 2019 was used with some modifications); Annual turnover (The investigator developed schedule); Type of dealership (The investigator developed schedule); Experience (Experienced was measured in years); Exposure visits (The investigator developed schedule); Information seeking behaviour (Scale developed by Rao 1985 was used with slight modifications); Market orientation (Scale developed by Samanta 1977 was used with slight changes); Social participation (Schedule developed by Trivedi 1963 was be 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 study's objectives. It was also pre-tested. The data of this study were collected through personal interviews. The collected data were classified, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted to make the findings meaningful

3.1 Data Analysis

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.

4. 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 shows that 51.67 percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to the middle age group, whereas 25.83 percent were in the old age group, and only 22.50 percent were in the young age group.

In the case of private agri-input dealers, it was reported that the majority of private agri-input dealers, 46.67 percent, belong to the middle age group, followed by the old age group (30%) and the middle age group (23.33%).

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

4.2 Education

Result (Table 1) also show that the 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 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 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 percent 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).

4.3 Annual turnover

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that 70.83 percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to the middle annual turnover group, whereas 16.67 percent of input dealers were found in the low annual turnover group and only 12.50 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 reveal that majority of 65 percent private agri-input dealers belonged to the medium annual turnover group, whereas 20.83 percent input dealers were found in the high annual turnover group and only 14.17 percent of agri-input dealers were in the low annual turnover group.

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

4.4 Types of dealerships

The data presented in Table 1 observed that the majority of 65.83 percent 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 percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belong to fertilizer dealers, respectively.

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

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

4.5 Experience of the dealership

The data presented in Table 1 observed that the majority of 42.50 percent 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 percent 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 dealership, respectively.

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

4.6 Exposure visit

The data exhibited in Table 1 show that the majority of 43.33 percent 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 percent private agri-input dealers belong to high exposure visit followed by medium exposure visit (30%) and only 8.33 percent private agri-input dealers had belonged to low exposure visits, respectively.

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

4.7 Information-seeking behaviour

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

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

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

4.8 Market orientation

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

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

The present findings are similar 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 percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to member of one organization group, and 35.83 percent of agri-input dealers belong to member of more than one organization, respectively

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

The present findings are similar to 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 the majority of 55.00 percent of cooperative agri-input dealers belonged to the medium mass media participation group, followed by 36.67 and 8.33 percent of agri-input dealers in the low and high mass media participation groups, respectively.

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

The present findings are similar to those 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 a 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 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-inputs belong to the middle age group (46.67%) with graduate education level (65.83%) and had

medium to high levels of 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.

5. Implication

It was the implication in studying the personal profiles of agri input dealers; you're looking at their age, education, experience, and even their motivations for getting into the business. This can reveal a lot about how they manage their operations and interact with their customers, who are usually farmers.For instance, a dealer with a strong educational background in agriculture might be more adept at understanding and selling complex products, like high-tech fertilizers or genetically modified seeds. This could lead to better crop yields for the farmers.On the flip side, dealers with limited education or experience might struggle with these advanced products, affecting the farmers' productivity. If we notice that many dealers lack certain skills, it could signal governments or organizations to step in with training programs to boost their knowledge.Also, understanding the personal motivations of dealers can help manufacturers or suppliers tailor their approaches. For example, if dealers are motivated by community impact rather than just profit, suppliers might focus on the long-term benefits of their products for the community. So, by getting to know the dealers personally, you can start to see patterns and opportunities for growth, not just for the dealers themselves but for the whole agri-input supply chain and the farming sector they serve.

6. 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.