Plant Archives Vol. 26, No. 2, 2026 pp. 2715-2722 e-ISSN:2581-6063 (online), ISSN:0972-5210

Plant Archives

Journal homepage: http://www.plantarchives.org

DOI Url : https://doi.org/10.51470/PLANTARCHIVES.2026.v26.no.2.372

EFFECTIVENESS OF FARMER PRODUCER COMPANIES IN BHARUCH DISTRICT OF SOUTH GUJARAT: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASSESSMENT

Harshad J. Lokhande*, Rajeshkumar M. Bhuva and V.C. Sanjay

Department of Agricultural Extension & Communication, NMCA, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari-396 450, Gujarat, India.

*Corresponding author E-mail : harshad.j.lokhande@gmail.com

(Date of Receiving-12-07-2026; Date of Revision-04-09-2026; Date of Acceptance-11-09-2026)

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was conducted in Bharuch district of South Gujarat, which was selected due to its relatively higher concentration of FPCs in South Gujarat. An *ex post facto* research design was adopted for the study. Five FPCs that had been functioning successfully for more than two years were selected through simple random sampling. From each selected FPC, 25 members were selected randomly, constituting a total sample size of 125 respondents. Primary data were collected through personal interviews using a structured interview schedule. The profile characteristics of the respondents revealed that 47.20 per cent belonged to the middle age group (35 to 50 years), 52.00 per cent had attained high school education, 54.40 per cent had a family size of 5 to 6 members, 33.60 per cent possessed marginal landholdings (0.01 to 1.00 ha), 61.60 per cent had a low level of farming experience, 38.40 per cent had an annual income ranging from ` 2,00,001 to ` 4,00,000, 55.20 per cent had membership in one organization, 76.00 per cent had a medium level of mass media exposure, 60.80 per cent had a medium level of economic motivation, 45.60 per cent had received two to three trainings related to Farmer Producer Companies, 52.80 per cent had a medium level of participation in FPC activities, 64.00 per cent had a medium level of market orientation, 41.60 per cent had a medium level of risk orientation, 76.00 per cent had a medium level of scientific orientation and 49.60 per cent adopted innovations after evaluation and trial. The findings revealed that 60.00 per cent of the respondents perceived very high effectiveness in the people dimension of FPCs, whereas, 38.40 per cent and 40.00 per cent of the respondents perceived very low effectiveness in the finance and marketing dimensions, respectively, while 46.40 per cent and 57.60 per cent perceived medium effectiveness in the service and sustainability dimensions, respectively. Overall, 35.20 per cent of the respondents perceived medium effectiveness of FPCs.

Key words : Farmer Producer Company, Effectiveness, Multidimensional assessment, Profile characteristics, South Gujarat.

Introduction

The agriculture and allied sectors constitute a significant component of the Indian economy, contributing nearly one-fifth of the country's national income at current prices and providing employment to about 46.10 per cent of the population. (Ministry of Finance, 2026) Furthermore, nearly 89.40 per cent of the farming community comprises small and marginal farmers owning less than two hectares of land (PIB Delhi, 2023). Smallholder farmers face considerable difficulties in accessing modern production technologies, obtaining and utilizing market information effectively, marketing their produce and purchasing inputs on favourable terms, which ultimately affects the profitability of farming. Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) help overcome these challenges by promoting collectivization, enabling farmers to achieve economies of scale in both on-farm and off-farm activities across the pre-production, production and post-production stages (NAARM, 2022).

Farmer Producer Organization (FPO) is a broad term used for organizations of farmers registered either under Part IXA of the Companies Act or under the respective State Co-operative Societies Acts, with the objective of promoting collective action and achieving economies of scale in the production and marketing of agricultural and allied commodities (Directorate of Marketing and

Inspection, 2020). The Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare, Govt. of India has recognized farmer producer organization registered under the special provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 (As amended in 2002 and subsequently under the Companies Act, 2013) as the most appropriate institutional mechanism for aggregating farmers (Paty and Gummagolmath, 2018).

The existing literature reveals a research gap in assessing the effectiveness of Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs) through a multidimensional framework. Most previous studies have emphasized the long-term impact of FPCs, limited attention has been given to evaluating the extent to which they achieve their intended objectives. As the FPC model is widely recognized and receives considerable support from the government, it is essential to examine whether these FPCs have achieved the objectives for which they were established. Accordingly, the present study aimed to assess the extent to which an organization is able to realize the objectives for which, it was established i.e. the effectiveness of FPCs. Assessing effectiveness across the people, finance, marketing, service and sustainability dimensions helps identify strengths and areas requiring improvement, thereby providing valuable guidance for policymakers and supporting agencies. In addition, the study aimed to understand the profile of FPC members, thereby contributing to farmer mobilization and facilitating membership expansion in Farmer Producer Companies.

In view of the above, the present study was undertaken with the following objectives: (1) to study the profile of Farmer Producer Companies members and (2) to assess the effectiveness of Farmer Producer Companies.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in Bharuch district of South Gujarat, which was purposively selected due to the relatively higher concentration of Farmer Producer Companies in the region (SFAC India, 2022 and SFAC India, 2024). Out of the total FPCs located in Bharuch district, five FPCs that had been operating successfully for more than two years, namely Bharuch Kisan Agrofed Producer Company Limited, Gau Bhakti Farmer Producer Company Limited, Jambusar Kisan Farmer Producer Company Limited, Hansot Taluka Farmer Producer Company Limited and Rajpardi Krushi Farmer Producer Company Limited, were selected through simple random sampling. Further, 25 members were selected randomly from each FPC, constituting a total sample of 125 respondents. An *ex post facto* research design was adopted for the investigation. The structured schedule was developed to measure the effectiveness of FPCs. The effectiveness of FPCs was assessed through five dimensions *viz.*, People, Finance, Marketing, Service and Sustainability. A set of statements covering these dimensions was framed and arranged on a three-point continuum of agree, undecided and disagree, with scores of 3, 2 and 1 assigned to positive statements and 1, 2 and 3 assigned to negative statements, respectively. The total score obtained by the respondents indicated the overall effectiveness of the FPCs. The study considered fifteen profile characteristics of the selected FPC members to understand the type of farmers participating in FPC. The data were collected through personal interviews using a well-structured and pretested interview schedule. The collected data were classified, tabulated and analysed by using statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and arbitrary method.

Results and Discussion

Profile characteristics of FPC members

Age

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that 47.20 per cent of the respondents belonged to the middle age group, followed by 32.80 per cent in the old age group and 20.00 per cent in the young age group. This might be because middle-aged and older farmers have greater farming experience and awareness of the benefits of collective action, encouraging their participation in FPCs. These findings are in line with the findings of Amitha *et al*. (2021), Babu *et al*. (2021), Barman *et al.* (2021), Sharma *et al*. (2022), Sangappa *et al*. (2023) and Hussain *et al*. (2024).

Education

The distribution presented in Table 1 revealed that 52.00 per cent of the respondents had completed high school, followed by 19.20 per cent with middle school education, 12.80 per cent with college or postgraduate education, 06.40 per cent with primary school education, 05.60 per cent who were functionally literate and 04.00 per cent, who were illiterate. The higher proportion of respondents (52.00%) with high school education might be because better educational awareness and wider access to schooling have enabled farmers to attain this level of education, which is sufficient to understand and participate in FPC activities. These findings are supported by the findings of Babu *et al*. (2021), Barman *et al*. (2021), Revanth and Kote (2024).

Family size

The results of the Table 1 indicated that 54.40 per

Table 1 : Distribution of FPC members according to their profile (n=125).

S. no.	Variables	Categories	(*f*)	(%)
1.	Age	Young age (Up to 35 years)	25	20.00
		Middle age (35 to 50 years)	59	47.20
		Old age (Above 50 years)	41	32.80
2.	Education	Illiterate	05	04.00
		Functionally literate	07	05.60
		Primary school	08	06.40
		Middle school	24	19.20
		High school	65	52.00
		College/Post graduation	16	12.80
3.	Family size	Above 8 members	05	04.00
		7 to 8 members	21	16.80
		5 to 6 members	68	54.40
		3 to 4 members	30	24.00
		1 to 2 members	01	00.80
4.	Land holding	Landless (0.00 ha)	00	00.00
		Marginal (0.01 to 1 ha)	42	33.60
		Small (1.01 to 2 ha)	37	29.60
		Semi medium (2.01 to 4 ha)	25	20.00
		Medium (4.01 to 10 ha)	17	13.60
		Large (above 10 ha)	04	03.20
5.	Farming experience	Low (5 to 23 years)	77	61.60
		Medium (24 to 42 years)	45	36.00
		High (43 to 60 years)	03	02.40
6.	Annual income	Up to ₹ 2,00,000	25	20.00
		₹ 2,00,001 to ₹ 4,00,000	48	38.40
		₹ 4,00,001 to ₹ 6,00,000	26	20.80
		₹ 6,00,001 to ₹ 8,00,000	10	08.00
		Above ₹ 8,00,000	16	12.80
7.	Social Participation	Member of one organization	69	55.20
		Member of more than one organization	51	40.80
		Holding position in any organization	05	04.00
8.	Mass media exposure	Low (Up to 3)	15	12.00
		Medium (4 to 10)	95	76.00
		High (above 10)	15	12.00
9.	Economic motivation	Low (up to 17)	22	17.60
		Medium (18 to 24)	76	60.80
		High (above 24)	27	21.60

Tabld 1 continued...

cent of the respondents had 5 to 6 family members, followed by 24.00 per cent with 3 to 4 family members, 16.80 per cent with 7 to 8 family members, 04.00 per cent had above 8 family members and 00.80 per cent with 1 to 2 family members. The predominance of respondents (54.40%) having 5 to 6 family members might be because rural households commonly follow joint family systems. These results are in line with the results of Singh *et al*. (2019), Dechamma *et al*. (2020), Saikia *et al*. (2024) and Malaisamy *et al*. (2025).

Land holding

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that 33.60 per cent of the respondents belonged to the marginal land holding category, followed by 29.60 per cent with small land holding, 20.00 per cent with semi medium land holding, 13.60 per cent with medium land holding, 03.20 per cent with large land holding and none of them were landless. This may be because Farmers with marginal and small land holdings are more likely to join FPCs to increase their bargaining power and enhance access to inputs, credit and markets through collective action. The results of the present study are similar to those reported by Singh *et al*. (2019), Hussain *et al*. (2024), Nirosha *et al*. (2024), Malaisamy and Arun (2024) and Malaisamy *et al*. (2025).

Farming experience

The results of the Table 1 highlighted that 61.60 per cent of the respondents had a low farming experience, followed by 36.00 per cent with medium farming experience and 02.40 per cent with high farming experience. This might be due to the dominance of middle-aged farmers in the study area who have been engaged in farming for a moderate period (5 to 23 years). The present findings are similar to those reported by Amitha *et al*. (2021), Barman *et al*. (2021) and Prema and Manonmani (2022).

Annual income

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that 38.40 per cent of the respondents had an annual family income ranging from `

Tabld 1 continued...

10.	Training received	No training received	17	13.60
		Received 1 training	25	20.00
		Received 2 to 3 trainings	57	45.60
		Received more than 3 trainings	26	20.80
11.	Participation in the activities of FPC	Low (0 to 3)	34	27.20
		Medium (4 to 7)	66	52.80
		High (8 to 10)	25	20.00
12.	Market orientation	Low (7 to 16)	08	06.40
		Medium (17 to 25)	80	64.00
		High (26 to 35)	37	29.60
13.	Risk orientation	Low (3 to 7)	24	19.20
		Medium (8 to 12)	52	41.60
		High (13 to 18)	49	39.20
14.	Scientific orientation	Low (up to 17)	15	12.00
		Medium (18 to 24)	95	76.00
		High (above 24)	15	12.00
15.	Innovative-ness	Adoption after observing other farmers	44	35.20
		Adoption after evaluation and trial	62	49.60
		Immediate adoption upon awareness	19	15.20

2,00,001 to ` 4,00,000, followed by 20.80 per cent with annual family income between ` 4,00,001 to ` 6,00,000, 20.00 per cent with annual family income up to ` 2,00,000, 12.80 per cent of the respondents had annual family income above ` 8,00,000 and 08.00 per cent had annual family income between ` 6,00,001 to ` 8,00,000. The predominance of respondents (59.20%) with an annual family income between ` 2,00,001 and ` 6,00,000 might be because most respondents had marginal to small landholdings and depended mainly on agriculture, while allied activities and participation in FPCs supplemented their income. The obtained results are in line with the study conducted by Sangappa *et al*. (2023).

Social participation

The data in the Table 1 indicated that 55.20 per cent of the respondents had the membership of one organisation, followed by 40.80 and 04.00 per cent of them were member of more than one organisation and holding position in any organisation. This finding might be attributed to all the respondents being members of an FPC, which ensured membership in at least one formal organization, whereas limited time and agricultural commitments restricted their social involvement. These findings are supported by the findings of Barman *et al*. (2021), Hussain *et al*. (2024) and Gavkare *et al*. (2025).

Mass media exposure

The data depicted in the Table 1 revealed that 76.00 per cent of the respondents had medium level of mass media exposure, followed by 12.00 per cent each with low and high levels of mass media exposure. The possible reason might be that farmers tend to utilize these media to a certain extent for agricultural and general information, but not at an intensive level. While multiple media channels are available, their utilization remains moderate due to accessibility, literacy and relevance to farmers' needs. These results are in line with the results of Singh *et al.* (2019), Dechamma *et al*. (2020), Babu *et al*. (2021), Kumar *et al*. (2021), Hussain *et al*. (2024), Waigaonkar *et al*. (2024) and Mondal *et al*. (2025).

Economic motivation

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that 60.80 per cent of the respondents had medium level of economic motivation, followed by 21.60 per cent with high level and 17.60 per cent with low level of economic motivation. The predominance of respondents with a medium level of economic motivation might be because they had a balanced economic outlook and were interested in improving their livelihood through farming and allied activities.

These results are in line with the study conducted by Chopade *et al*. (2019), Dechamma *et al*. (2020), Sahoo *et al*. (2022), Barman *et al*. (2021), Hussain *et al*. (2024) and Mondal *et al*. (2025).

Training received

The distribution presented in Table 1 revealed that 45.60 per cent of the respondents had received 2 to 3 trainings, followed by 20.80 per cent who had received more than 3 trainings, 20.00 per cent who had received only 1 training and 13.60 per cent of the respondents had not received any training. The possible reason might be that not all FPCs organized frequent training programmes and even when such trainings were conducted, not all farmers were able to attend them regularly. These findings are in line with the findings of Revanth and Kote (2024) and Mondal *et al*. (2025).

Participation in the activities of FPC

The results shown in Table 1 indicated that 52.80 per cent of the members had medium level of participation in the activities of the FPC, followed by 27.20 per cent with

low level and 20.00 per cent with the high level of participation in the activities of the FPC. This finding might be attributed to members' participation in key organizational activities, but their involvement remained moderate due to farm commitments, varying awareness and institutional involvement. Moreover, differences in the type and extent of activities across FPCs also influenced their level of participation. The present findings are similar to those reported by Naveenkumar and Rathakrishnan (2017), Sahoo *et al*. (2022) and Prema and Manonmani (2022).

Market orientation

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that 64.00 per cent of the respondents had medium level of market orientation, followed by 29.60 per cent with high level and 06.40 per cent with low level of market orientation. The medium level of market orientation among most respondents might be because they had moderate exposure to market information and services through FPCs, while not all FPCs are engaged in marketing activities, which might have limited the development of higher market orientation among the respondents. The results of the present study are similar to those of Singh *et al*. (2019), Babu *et al*. (2021), Sahoo *et al*. (2022) and Sangappa *et al*. (2023).

Risk Orientation

The data in the Table 1 revealed that 41.60 per cent of the respondents had medium level of risk orientation, followed by 39.20 per cent with high level and 19.20 per cent with low level of risk orientation. The predominance of respondents with a medium level of risk orientation might be because they preferred to evaluate available information and likely outcomes before making farming decisions. These findings are supported by the findings of Chopade *et al*. (2019), Babu *et al*. (2021), Barman *et al*. (2021), Sahoo *et al*. (2022), Hussain *et al*. (2024), Revanth and Kote (2024) and Mondal *et al*. (2025).

Scientific orientation

The distribution presented in Table 1 highlighted that 76.00 per cent of the respondents had medium level of scientific orientation, followed by 12.00 per cent each with low and high levels of scientific orientation. This may be attributed to respondents' exposure to technical guidance, advisory services and training programmes through FPCs and other extension agencies. The results of the present study are similar to those reported by Dechamma *et al*. (2020), Babu *et al*. (2021), Barman *et al*. (2021), Hussain *et al*. (2024) and Mondal *et al*. (2025).

Innovativeness

The data indicated in Table 1 revealed that 49.60 per cent of the respondents adopted innovation after evaluation and trial, 35.20 per cent immediately adopt after awareness and 15.20 per cent adopt after observing other farmers. The predominance of respondents adopting innovations after evaluation and trial might be because they preferred to assess new ideas before adopting them in their farming activities. These findings are in line with the findings of Dechamma *et al*. (2020) and Vivek (2019).

Effectiveness of Farmer Producer companies

People dimension

The data presented in Table 2 revealed that under the people dimension, 60.00 per cent of the respondents perceived very high effectiveness, followed by 27.20 per cent with high effectiveness and 12.80 per cent with medium effectiveness, while none of the respondents perceived low and very low effectiveness. The higher proportion of respondents reporting very high effectiveness under the people dimension might be attributed to the inclusive and democratic functioning of FPCs, where members actively participated in decision-making. Further, transparency, clear rules, training programmes and cooperation among members strengthened trust, coordination and organizational functioning.

Finance dimension

The results shown in Table 2 indicated that in case of finance dimension, 38.40 per cent of the respondents perceived very low effectiveness, followed by 20.80 per cent with low effectiveness, 17.60 per cent with high effectiveness, 12.00 per cent with very high effectiveness and 11.20 per cent with medium effectiveness. The majority of the respondents reported low to very low effectiveness under the finance dimension. This might be because many FPCs had limited involvement in providing institutional credit and insurance. Moreover, variations in the scale of operations and activities across FPCs resulted in unequal financial benefits, employment opportunities and income improvement among member farmers.

Marketing dimension

The distribution presented in Table 2 highlighted that, with respect to the marketing dimension, 40.00 per cent of the respondents perceived very low effectiveness, followed by 32.00 per cent with very high effectiveness, 12.00 per cent with medium effectiveness and 08.00 per cent each with low and high effectiveness. The respondents' perception of the marketing dimension was

Table 2 : Dimension wise effectiveness of the FPCs (n=125).

S. no.	Effectiveness dimensions	Categories	Range	Frequency (*f*)	Percentage (%)
1.	**People**	Very low	(25 to 35)	00	00.00
		Low	(36 to 45)	00	00.00
		Medium	(46 to 55)	16	12.80
		High	(56 to 65)	34	27.20
		Very high	(66 to 75)	75	60.00
2.	**Finance**	Very low	(7 to 10)	48	38.40
		Low	(11 to 13)	26	20.80
		Medium	(14 to 15)	14	11.20
		High	(16 to 18)	22	17.60
		Very high	(19 to 21)	15	12.00
3.	**Marketing**	Very low	(11 to 15)	50	40.00
		Low	(16 to 20)	10	08.00
		Medium	(21 to 24)	15	12.00
		High	(25 to 29)	10	08.00
		Very high	(30 to 33)	40	32.00
4.	**Service**	Very low	(15 to 21)	00	00.00
		Low	(22 to 27)	28	22.40
		Medium	(28 to 33)	58	46.40
		High	(34 to 39)	39	31.20
		Very high	(40 to 45)	00	00.00
5.	**Sustainability**	Very low	(18 to 25)	00	00.00
		Low	(26 to 32)	03	02.40
		Medium	(33 to 40)	72	57.60
		High	(41 to 47)	25	20.00
		Very high	(48 to 54)	25	20.00

Table 3 : Overall effectiveness of the FPCs (n=125).

S. no.	Categories	Range	Frequency (*f*)	Percentage (%)
1	Very low	76 to 106	00	00.00
2	Low	107 to 137	12	09.60
3	Medium	138 to 167	44	35.20
4	High	168 to 198	34	27.20
5	Very high	199 to 228	35	28.00

polarized, with responses concentrated at both lower and higher levels of effectiveness. This variation might be due to differences in marketing capacities among FPCs. Some FPCs might have actively carried out marketing activities and established market linkages, whereas others might have been limited mainly to input supply activities.

Service dimension

The results shown in Table 2 revealed that under the service dimension, 46.40 per cent of the respondents perceived medium effectiveness, followed by 31.20 per cent with high effectiveness and 22.40 per cent with low effectiveness, while none of the respondents perceived very low and very high effectiveness. This highlights that none of the respondents perceived very low or very high effectiveness. This might be because all FPCs provided extension and advisory services, although the type and range of services varied across FPCs. Moreover, differences in financial capacity and operational activities limited the provision of comprehensive services by any single FPC.

Sustainability dimension

The data in the Table 2 revealed that in case of sustainability dimension, 57.60 per cent of the respondents perceived medium effectiveness, followed by 20.00 per cent each with high and very high effectiveness and 02.40 per cent with low effectiveness, while none of the respondents perceived very low effectiveness. The majority of the respondents reported medium effectiveness under the sustainability dimension. This might be because FPCs effectively utilized member feedback, government support and available funds, while members adopted farm diversification and resource management practices. However, variations in the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices across FPCs, along with the absence of renewable energy investments and formal risk mitigation plans, might have limited higher sustainability effectiveness.

Overall effectiveness of the FPCs

The results depicted in Table 3 revealed that 35.20 per cent of the respondents perceived medium overall effectiveness of FPCs, followed by 28.00 per cent with very high effectiveness, 27.20 per cent with high effectiveness and 09.60 per cent with low effectiveness, while none of the respondents perceived very low effectiveness. These findings are supported by the findings of Adhikari *et al.* (2021).

Conclusion

It can be concluded that a considerable proportion of the respondents belonged to the middle age group, had

education up to the high school level, a family size of 5 to 6 members, membership in one organization, received 2 to 3 trainings related to FPCs, medium level of participation in the activities of FPC, medium risk orientation and adopted innovations after evaluation and trial. A sizeable proportion had marginal landholdings and an annual family income of ` 2,00,001 to ` 4,00,000. A majority had low farming experience, medium mass media exposure, medium economic motivation, medium market orientation and medium scientific orientation. A majority of the respondents perceived very high effectiveness in the people dimension of FPCs, while a sizeable proportion perceived very low effectiveness in the finance and marketing dimensions. A considerable proportion perceived medium effectiveness in the service dimension, whereas a majority perceived medium effectiveness in the sustainability dimension. Overall, a sizeable proportion of the respondents perceived a medium level of effectiveness of FPCs. The results revealed that FPCs performed relatively well in the people and sustainability dimensions, whereas the service, finance and marketing dimensions were comparatively weaker. This implies that although FPCs have been successful in establishing themselves as sustainable farmer institutions, the benefits and services perceived by members in these dimensions require further improvement.

Acknowledgement

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, for the valuable guidance, constant encouragement and constructive suggestions throughout the course of this research. The author is also thankful to the officials of the selected Farmer Producer Companies and all the respondent FPC members of Bharuch district for their wholehearted cooperation and valuable support during the data collection process.

References

Adhikari, A., Pradhan K., Chauhan J.K. and Reddy S.K. (2021). Analysing the perceived impact of farmers' producer organization (FPOs) on sustainable economic development. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Educ.*, **21(2-3)**, 80-82.

Amitha, C.D., Savitha B., Rani V.S. and Laxminarayana P. (2021). Farmer producer organizations (FPOs)–analysis of profile of FPOs and its members in Medak district of Telangana. *Curr. J. Appl. Sci. Technol.*, **40(11)**, 24-31.

Babu, T.M., Lakshmi T., Prasad S.V., Sumathi V. and Murthy B.R. (2021). Profile of Farmer Producer Organization (FPO) members in Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh. *The Pharma Innov. J.*, **10(4)**, 501-505.

Barman, M., Das P.K., Barman I. and Deka S.D. (2021). Characteristics of Farmer Producer Company members and their perceived constraints with reference to commercial potato production and marketing. *Biological Forum : An Int. J.*, **13(4)**, 98-103.

Chopade, S.L., Kapse P.S. and Dhulgand V.G. (2019). Estimating profile of the Farmer Producer Company members. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, **8(8)**, 1988-1994.

Dechamma, S., Krishnamurthy B., Shashidhar B.M. and Vasanthakumari R. (2020). Profile characteristics of members of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs). *Int. J. Agricult. Sci.*, **12(23)**, 10422-10429.

Directorate of Marketing and Inspection (2020). Formation and promotion of 10,000 Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) operational guidelines, https://dmi.gov.in/Documents

/FPO_Scheme_Guidelines_FINAL_English.pdf

Gavkare, N.J., Singh H.C., Kumar M., Rohit and Singh S. (2025). Socio Demographic and economic determinants of farmers' attitude towards Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) in Maharashtra, India. *J. Scient. Res. Rep.*, **31(8)**, 71-77.

Hussain, I., Das P.K., Hazarika B., Dutta P. and Gogoi M. (2024). Socio-economic profile characteristics of the members of farmer producer company with reference to potato production in Assam. *Int. J. Agricult. Ext. Soc. Develop.*, **7(9)**, 861-866.

Kumar, S., Sankhala G., Kar P. and Meena D.K. (2021). Socio-economic profile, motivational sources and reason behind joining the Farmer Producer Companies by the dairy farmers in India. *Int. J. Plant Soil Sci.*, **33(14)**, 35-44.

Malaisamy, A. and Arun S. (2024). Evaluating the Socio-Economic Status and Economic Performance of Farmer Producer Companies in the Southern Districts of Tamil Nadu, India. *J. Exp. Agricult. Int.*, **46(10)**, 700-711.

Malaisamy, A., Rithika S. and Raswanthkrishna M. (2025). Sustainable agriculture and farmer welfare: A study of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) and their impact on rural livelihood in Ramanathapuram district. *Plant Sci. Today*, **12(3)**, 1-11.

Ministry of Finance (2026). Economic Survey 2025-26, Agriculture and food management: raising productivity securing incomes and ensuring food security, https://www.indiabudget. gov.in/economicsurvey/doc/eschapter/echap06.pdf

Mondal, A.H., Dana S.S., Sarkar M.R., Kavi S., Karjee R. and Rej N. (2025). Knowledge level and extent of adoption of scientific fish farming practices among members of Fish Farmers Producer Organizations. *Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika*, **40(1)**, 64-71.

NAARM (2022). FPOs in India: Creating Enabling Ecosystem for their Sustainability. https://naarm.org.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/FPO-Policy-Paper.pdf

Naveenkumar, M.R. and Rathakrishnan T. (2017). Diagnosing socio-personal characteristics of Farmers Interest Group

members of guava in Tamil Nadu. *J. Interacademicia*, **21(4)**, 470-473.

Nirosha, R., Mansingh J. P. and Nisha A. (2024). Impact Study on Empowerment of Women Through Women Farmer Producer Organization (WFPO) in Tiruvannamalai Districts. *Sci. Technol. Public.*, 204-208.

Paty, B.K. and Gummagolmath K.C. (2018). *Extension Digest*, National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management, Hyderabad, 2 p.

PIB Delhi (2023). *Improving condition of small and marginal farmers*. https://www.pib. gov.in/ PressReleaseIframePage.aspx? PRID=1910357&reg= 48&lang=2

Prema, M. and Manonmani S. (2022). Farmar Producer Organization (FPO): A study in Cuddalore District. *Math. Stat. Engg Applic.*, **71(4)**, 10882-10889.

Revanth, D. and Kote P. (2024). Profile characteristics of members of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) in Andhra Pradesh. *The Andhra Agricult. J.*, **71(1)**, 120-124.

Sahoo, S.L., Das S., Mohapatra B.P., Sahoo B. and Dash A. (2022). Communication behavior analysis of the member farmers of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs). *Biolog. Forum : An Int. J.*, **14(1)**, 1656-1660.

Saikia, P., Das P. and Deka P. (2024). Impact of farmer producer organizations on boosting economic empowerment of farmers. *Gujarat J. Ext. Educ.*, **38(2)**, 24-31.

Sangappa, D., Rafi D., Laxmi B., Tengli M.B. and Ravi S.C. (2023). Determinants of Managerial Abilities of Farmers: Insights from Millet based Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) of Karnataka. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Educ.*, **23(4)**, 117-121.

SFAC India (2022). Statewise and Implementing Agencies wise details of Registered FPOs under Central Sector Scheme for Formation and Promotion of 10,000 FPOs. https://sfacindia.com/UploadFile/Statistics/Statewise%20and%20IA's%20wise%20details%20of%20Registered%20FPOs%20as%20on%2030-11-2022.pdf

SFAC India (2024). State wise list of registered FPOs details under Central Sector Scheme for Formation and Promotion of 10,000 FPOs by SFAC, https://sfacindia.com/PDFs/Tenders/State%20wise%20list%20of%20registered%20FPOs%20details%20under%20 Central%20Sector%20Sch eme%20for%20Formation%20and%20Promotion%20of%2010,000%20FPOs%20by%20SFAC%20as%20on%2013-06-2024.pdf

Sharma, N.R., Khare N.K., Singh P.K. and Bisht K. (2022). Socio personal and economic traits of tribal FIGs of farmer producer company. *The Pharma Innov. J.*, **11(3)**, 1123-1125.

Singh, D., Singh B.P., Bharti R. and Pordhiya K.I. (2019). A socio - economic and socio-psychological appraisal of Farmer Producer Organisations. *The Pharma Innov. J.*, **8(4)**, 686-689.

Vivek, S. (2019). Analysis of dimensions of entrepreneurial behaviour of members of Coconut Producer Companies, *Thesis M. Sc. (Agri.)*, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur.

Waigaonkar, S., Landge S., Banthiya V. and Kamble A. (2024). Socio economic profile and constraints faced by self help group (SHG) members in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. *The Pharma Innov. J.*, **13(2)**, 2830-2834.