



# Relation between Personal Profile Characteristics of the Staff and their Attitude towards the Farmer Producers Organization

Vavilala Priyanka<sup>a++\*</sup>, V. K. Singh<sup>a#</sup>, L. B. Singh<sup>a†</sup>,  
D. K. Singh<sup>a#</sup>, Vivek<sup>b‡</sup>, Bhim Singh<sup>c#</sup>  
and Chandrashekar Prajapathi<sup>a++</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, College of Agriculture, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Modipuram, Meerut, (U.P.), India.

<sup>b</sup> Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Modipuram, Meerut, (U.P.), India.

<sup>c</sup> Department of Basic Science, College of Agriculture, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Modipuram, Meerut, (U.P.), India.

## Authors' contributions

The work was carried out in collaboration among all the authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2023/v41i102141

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/104414>

**Original Research Article**

**Received: 10/06/2023**

**Accepted: 17/08/2023**

**Published: 28/08/2023**

<sup>++</sup> Ph.D. Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Professor;

<sup>†</sup> Head and Professor;

<sup>‡</sup> Dean, Head and Professor;

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: Vavilalapriyanka1995@gmail.com;

## ABSTRACT

The present research study was carried out during 2022-2023 to know the relation between attitude towards the organization and profile characteristics of the staff of Farmer Producers Organization in Zone III (Rajanna Siricilla) of state Telangana. Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. Zone III consists of five districts namely, Karimnagar, Rajanna Siricilla, Medak, Siddipet and Kamareddy. The total number of FPOs in the zone were 66. Out of these, 40 FPOs were selected and the data was collected from 5 respondents randomly from each FPO using structured interview schedule. Thus, the total numbers of respondents were 200. The findings of the research revealed that (41.50%) of the respondents were middle aged with (38.50%) having education up to graduation, (51.00%) were having low experience of 2-5 years and (40.50%) received medium number of trainings (5-8). About two-third (65.50%) respondents had reported that medium extension activities were taken up in the organization, (41.50%) were having medium interpersonal communication, (57.00%) were having neutral departmental working environment, (59.50%) were having medium attitude towards delegation of authority and (38.50%) were having low achievement motivation. It was also reported that majority of the respondents were having medium job involvement (48.50%), medium job satisfaction (49.00%), medium perception of work load (40.50%) and medium job stress (52.50%). Among this variables, experience, total number of trainings received, extension activities, attitude towards delegation of authority, job involvement, job satisfaction, perception of work load and job stress were found to be significant with the attitude of the staff towards the organization.

**Keywords:** Profile; attitude; farmer producers organization; achievement motivation; job involvement; extension activities; job satisfaction; job stress.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Millions of farmers depend on agriculture for their living making it the economic backbone of India. It contributed to 18.30% of the GDP in 2022-2023 and employs more than 58.00 % of the population of our nation. In India, agriculture has been crucial in providing for practically all of the nations food needs, and the trend in production has reached an admirable level of self-sufficiency. Although agricultural commodity production has greatly increased, growers income has not increased to the same extent. The Indian agricultural sector is currently dealing with a number of issue including, growing population, small and fragmented land holdings, using agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes as a result of urbanization and industrialization, youth disinterest in the agriculture sector, and a lack of an effective strategy to organize farmers and connect them to the market. As the majority of farmers in India are marginal and small farmers, it was felt that effective technology distribution systems were needed in order to meet the unique needs of them. The goal of the hour should be not only to boost Indian farmers profitability by increasing their capability to produce but also reduce their struggle to effectively and efficiently market their produce for

lucrative prices because there aren't enough markets, the infrastructure isn't up to par to store the produce in various parts of the country, and the farmers were lagging behind in the marketing of the produce.

A potential alternative for effective farming, information sharing, input delivery, marketing, and profit making is by mobilizing farmers for group action through developing farmers organizations which are an essential part of delivery systems and enable them to make decisions collectively for income enhancement through local agricultural development. According to the World Bank, producer organizations are "membership-based organizations with elected leaders accountable to other members/farmers" Trebbin[1]. These groups have been treated as a cross between profit businesses and cooperative societies. Under the Companies Act of 1956, the Indian government has been pushing a novel type of collectives known as Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs). According to Parthasarathi [2], nearly a third (32.50%) of the participants said that the State Department of Agriculture (SDA) was the primary force behind the creation of FPOs, followed by KVK (25.00%), NABARD (22.50%), and NGOs (20.00%).

The primary goal of including the farmers under an FPO is to address all the issues farmers were and are now facing, to raise their level of living by ensuring that they receive the same amount that the end user or consumer paid by eliminating the middlemen. In order for disadvantaged populations to "leapfrog" out of poverty such as small and marginal farmers, Landy [3] claims that the creation of FPOs is a crucial tactic. For any organization to function effectively, the staff plays an important role as they are the one who provide services and support to the farmers. It is very important to keep them updated about the knowledge, techniques and technologies and also know about their requirements. Keeping this in mind, the present research was conducted to study about the profile characteristics of the FPO staff and their relation with attitude towards the organization.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The present study was carried out during 2022-2023 in Telangana's zone III (Rajanna Siricilla) which consists of five districts namely, Kamareddy, Karimnagar, Medak, Rajanna Siricilla, and Siddipet. The state and zone were purposively chosen because of the highest concentration of FPOs. An ex-post facto research design was used for the study as the event has already occurred. In the zone III, there were 66 FPOs in all. Among these, 40 FPOs were chosen proportionately from each district and within the district FPOs were selected randomly. Five respondents were chosen at random to interview personally from each FPO to form a sample of 200 respondents with the help of a structured interview schedule. The profile variables used in the study were age, education, experience, total number of trainings received, extension activities, interpersonal communication, departmental working environment, attitude towards delegation of authority, achievement motivation, job involvement, job satisfaction, perception of work load and job stress. The statistical tools used in the study for the analysis of the data were percentage, frequency, class interval method and Karl Pearson's correlation coefficient.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 clearly shows that the majority of respondents (41.50 %) belonged to the medium age group of between 34-41 years, which was followed by the young age group (39.00%) of 25-33 years. The results were in line with those of Meena [4].

According to Table 1 findings, the majority (38.20%) of the respondents had completed their graduation followed by secondary education (34.50%), middle school (14.00%) and preparatory school (13.00 %). Education enables one to get knowledge of and an understanding of how FPOs operate. Agricultural graduates made up the majority of the respondents. They were selected for the higher positions to ensure that the FPOs operated effectively since they had a thorough understanding of agriculture and the activities involved. The results agreed with those of Sandip [5].

According to Table 1, 51.00% of the respondents had little experience of 2-5 years, followed by 27.50 % and 21.50 % of those with medium (5-8 years) and high (8-11 years) experience. The probable reason was majority of FPOs were established a few years ago, and the staff members were recruited recently and were in the medium to younger age range. The conclusions agreed with those of Harshadbhai [6].

According to the data from Table 1., two-fifths (40.50%) of the respondents received medium number of trainings [5-8], followed by more (32.00%) number of trainings (9-12) and (27.50%) of the respondents received less number of trainings (0-4). The probable reason for the result was the staff were given few trainings by the supporting agencies before and after joining the job. In order to improve the staff's managerial and working skills, the department should provide training programmes to the staff at nodal institutions like MANAGE, Hyderabad and NABARD branches. The conclusions agreed with those of Kumar [9].

According to the data in Table 2, two-thirds (65.50%) of respondents were engaged in medium number (5-6) of extension activities, while the remaining 22.50% and 12.00% were engaged in less (3-4) and more (7-8) number of extension activities. The probable reason for medium extension activities was organization inability to undertake the required number of activities which was most likely caused by the lack of trained personnel and infrastructure. The conclusions agreed with those of Gour [7].

Table 2 shows that 41.50% of the respondents reported medium interpersonal communication, followed by (35.50%) reported low interpersonal communication and the remaining 23.00% reported high interpersonal communication. The probable reason could be as majority of respondents were having little experience receiving few trainings accompanied with less

number of extension activities they were unable to have good relationship with their colleagues, farmers and higher officials. The results were consistent with those of Bavanji [11].

As shown in Table 2, more than half (57.00%) of the respondents indicated neutral departmental working environment, followed by (33.50%) of the respondents reported unfavorable departmental working environment and the remaining, 09.50% reported favorable departmental working environment. The probable reason for the results could be staff perception of being overworked, their tendency to take on multiple tasks at once, lack of adequate feedback on their performance, lack of interpersonal communication and the authoritarian behavior of their superiors. The results were consistent with Dinkarrao [12].

The data from the Table 3. about attitude towards the delegation of authority reports that

three-fifth (59.50%) of the respondents had a medium attitude towards delegation of authority, followed by high (31.50%) and low (09.00%) attitude towards delegation of authority. The reason for this could be staff was allowed freely to do their work-related activities by trusting them and it was believed that by doing so, the differences between the levels of personnel may be minimized. The results were consistent with those of Patel [10].

Table 3 depiction of data about achievement motivation shows that the majority (38.50%) of respondents had low achievement motivation, whilst 34.50% and 27.00% had medium and high levels of achievement motivation, respectively. Medium to low working environment in the department and the lack of appropriate recognition for the work were the most likely causes of medium to low achievement motivation. The results were consistent with those of Tamagond [13].

**Table 1. Distribution of respondents based on age, education, experience and total number of trainings received**

| (N =200)                           |                            |                |           |            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Sl. No                             | Category                   | Class Interval | Frequency | Percentage |
| Age (in years)                     |                            |                |           |            |
| 1.                                 | Young age                  | 25-33          | 78        | 39.00      |
| 2.                                 | Middle age                 | 34-41          | 83        | 41.50      |
| 3.                                 | Old age                    | 42-49          | 39        | 19.50      |
| Education                          |                            |                |           |            |
| 1.                                 | Preparatory (3 to 5 class) |                | 26        | 13.00      |
| 2.                                 | Middle (6 to 8 class)      |                | 28        | 14.00      |
| 3.                                 | Secondary (9 to 12 class)  |                | 69        | 34.50      |
| 4.                                 | Graduation                 |                | 77        | 38.50      |
| Experience (in years)              |                            |                |           |            |
| 1.                                 | Low                        | 2-5            | 102       | 51.00      |
| 2.                                 | Medium                     | 5-8            | 55        | 27.50      |
| 3.                                 | High                       | 8-11           | 43        | 21.50      |
| Total number of trainings received |                            |                |           |            |
| 1.                                 | Less number of trainings   | 0-4            | 55        | 27.50      |
| 2.                                 | Medium number of trainings | 5-8            | 81        | 40.50      |
| 3.                                 | More number of trainings   | 9-12           | 64        | 32.00      |

**Table 2. Distribution of respondents based on their extension activities, interpersonal communication and departmental working environment**

| (N =200)                         |                                       |                |           |            |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Sl. No                           | Category                              | Class Interval | Frequency | Percentage |
| Extension activities             |                                       |                |           |            |
| 1.                               | Less number of extension activities   | 3-4            | 45        | 22.50      |
| 2.                               | Medium number of extension activities | 5-6            | 131       | 65.50      |
| 3.                               | More number of extension activities   | 7-8            | 24        | 12.00      |
| Interpersonal communication      |                                       |                |           |            |
| 1.                               | Low                                   | 15-17          | 71        | 35.50      |
| 2.                               | Medium                                | 18-20          | 83        | 41.50      |
| 3.                               | High                                  | 21-23          | 46        | 23.00      |
| Departmental working environment |                                       |                |           |            |
| 1.                               | Unfavorable                           | 13-15          | 67        | 33.50      |
| 2.                               | Neutral                               | 16-18          | 114       | 57.00      |
| 3.                               | Favorable                             | 19-21          | 19        | 09.50      |

**Table 3. Distribution of respondents based on their attitude towards delegation of authority, achievement motivation and job involvement**

| (N =200)                                 |          |                |           |            |
|--|----------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Sl. No                                   | Category | Class Interval | Frequency | Percentage |
| Attitude towards delegation of authority |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                                       | Low      | 7-8            | 18        | 09.00      |
| 2.                                       | Medium   | 9-10           | 119       | 59.50      |
| 3.                                       | High     | 11-12          | 63        | 31.50      |
| Achievement motivation                   |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                                       | Low      | 10-12          | 77        | 38.50      |
| 2.                                       | Medium   | 13-15          | 69        | 34.50      |
| 3.                                       | High     | 16-18          | 54        | 27.00      |
| Job involvement                          |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                                       | Low      | 10-12          | 48        | 24.00      |
| 2.                                       | Medium   | 13-15          | 97        | 48.50      |
| 3.                                       | High     | 16-18          | 55        | 27.50      |

According to Table 3, nearly half (48.50%) of the respondents had medium job involvement, followed by high (27.50%) job involvement and low (24.00%) job involvement. The staff members ambition for the job and accountability for their work were the most likely causes for the results. The workers should be motivated to acquire the necessary knowledge of the responsibilities associated with their position in order to increase their job involvement. The results were consistent with those of Khamitkar [8].

Table 4 findings show that nearly half (49.00%) of the respondents reported having a medium level of job satisfaction, followed by high level (38.00%) and low level (13.00 %) of job satisfaction. The probable explanation for the result was that having a job with favorable working circumstances, good staff and

infrastructural facilities to carry out the work, competitive wage, sufficient work, appreciation for one's efforts, and involvement in the workplace. How content a person is with their job or work is frequently influenced by the level of personal and socio-psychological benefits they derive from the work. The findings agreed with those of Gopika [14].

According to Table 4, 40.00% of respondents reported that their workload was medium, compared to 35.50% who reported their workload was light, and 24.00% who reported their workload was high. The organization had sufficient number of employees, which was the most likely explanation. As a result, the workload was shared among the workforce fairly and without favoring any particular group. The results were consistent with those of Patel [15].

**Table 4. Distribution of respondents based on their job satisfaction, perception of workload and job stress**

| (N =200)               |          |                |           |            |
|------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Sl. No                 | Category | Class Interval | Frequency | Percentage |
| Job satisfaction       |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                     | Low      | 11-12          | 26        | 13.00      |
| 2.                     | Medium   | 13-14          | 98        | 49.00      |
| 3.                     | High     | 15-16          | 76        | 38.00      |
| Perception of workload |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                     | Heavy    |                | 48        | 24.00      |
| 2.                     | Medium   |                | 81        | 40.50      |
| 3.                     | Light    |                | 71        | 35.50      |
| Job stress             |          |                |           |            |
| 1.                     | Low      | 9-11           | 63        | 31.50      |
| 2.                     | Medium   | 12-14          | 105       | 52.50      |
| 3.                     | High     | 15-17          | 32        | 16.00      |

**Table 5. Correlation between personal profile characteristics of the staff with their attitude towards the organization**

| Sl. No | Variables                                | Coefficient of Correlation (r) |
|--------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1.     | Age                                      | 0.13                           |
| 2.     | Education                                | 0.02                           |
| 3.     | Experience                               | 0.29**                         |
| 4.     | Total number of trainings received       | 0.37**                         |
| 5.     | Extension activities                     | 0.34**                         |
| 6.     | Interpersonal communication              | 0.03                           |
| 7.     | Departmental working environment         | 0.02                           |
| 8.     | Attitude towards delegation of authority | 0.14*                          |
| 9.     | Achievement motivation                   | 0.05                           |
| 10.    | Job involvement                          | 0.45**                         |
| 11.    | Job satisfaction                         | 0.58**                         |
| 12.    | Perception of work load                  | -0.15*                         |
| 13.    | Job stress                               | -0.24**                        |

\* Correlation was significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation was significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed)

Table 4 data shows that majority (52.50%) of the respondents reported medium job stress, whereas the remaining (31.50%) and (16.00%) had low and high job stress, respectively. The probable reason for being under stress while performing their jobs was poor departmental working conditions, poor interdepartmental communication, and little prior experience with the organization which made the respondents stressed with their work in the organization. The results were consistent with those of Bortamuly [16].

To determine the relationship between the FPO staff's attitude towards the organization and their profile characteristics, Karl Pearson's correlation coefficient was used and results were presented in the Table 5. At 1% level of significance, it was reported that five variables—experience, total number of trainings received, extension activities, job engagement, and job satisfaction had a positive and significant relationship with staffs attitude towards the organization. At 1% level of significance, the variable job stress was found to have a negative and significant relationship with the staff's attitude. At 5% level of significance, it was reported that the attitude towards authority

delegation had a positive and significant relationship, whereas the perception of workload had a negative and significant relationship. Age, education, interpersonal communication, departmental working environment and achievement motivation were the other variables found to have no significant relationship with the staff's attitude towards the organization.

The most likely explanation for the results mentioned above is that when a person accumulates experience and participates in a variety of trainings and activities will either directly or indirectly help them to perform better at the profession. This encourages an individual to become more involved in the work and experience more job satisfaction, and when combined with the provision of all the tools necessary for the task his confidence increases and performs better at the job. Attitude towards the authorities and the organization improves when higher officials give them the freedom to make decisions on the job. This may be the cause of the substantial relationship between staff attitude towards the organization and variables like experience, total number of trainings received, extension activities, job involvement, and job satisfaction. The probable reasons for the negative correlation between perceived workload and job stress with the attitude towards the organization was that when the workload increases at work place, stress levels increases which can be noted from his poor work performance favoring him to have negative attitude towards the organization.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

It was concluded from the results that majority of the respondents were middle aged with education of graduation having low experience and received medium number of trainings and medium number of extension activities. It was also reported that they had medium interdepartmental communication, neutral

departmental working environment, medium attitude towards delegation of authority, low achievement motivation, medium job involvement, medium job satisfaction, medium perception of workload and medium job stress. The variables experience, total number of trainings received, extension activities, attitude towards delegation of authority, job involvement, job satisfaction, perception of work load and job stress were found to have significant relation with the attitude of the staff towards the organization. The supporting organizations and government should provide required trainings, conduct more extension activities, have sufficient facilities and higher officials should appreciate for the work done which leads to have good departmental working environment, high achievement motivation, job involvement and job satisfaction such that they will help in improving the efficiency of the staff as well as the organization in the long run.

### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### REFERENCES

1. Trebbin A, Hassler M, Farmers' producer companies in India: A new concept for collective action. *Envir. and Planning-Part A*. 2012;44(2):411.
2. Parthasarathi S. Farmers organisation's inclusion in reorganized extension system-farmers' perspective. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 2019;19(4):89-91.
3. Landy F. From trickle down to leapfrog, *Eco. & Poli. Weekly*. 2013;48(24):43.
4. Meena N. An Assessment on job perception, performance and job satisfaction of agriculture supervisors of Jaipur division of Rajasthan. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Extension Education, S.K.N College of Agriculture, Jobner; 2020.
5. Sandip JA, Farmer's attitude towards the farmer producer organization. Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Pune, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidhyapeeth, Rahuri, Maharashtra; 2018.
6. Harshadbhai PP. Attitude of agricultural personnel towards e-agricultural portal. M.Sc. Thesis. Institute of Distance Education, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat; 2017.
7. Gour CL, An Analytical Study on Role Performance of Leaders in Panchayati Raj System of Hoshangabad District Madhya Pradesh. Department of Extension Education. Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidhyalaya, Gwalior, College of Agriculture, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh; 2015.
8. Khamitkar PS. Achievement motivation and job performance of assistant agricultural officers. Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Dharwad, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; 2015.
9. Kumar TP. Organizational effectiveness and job performance of research and extension scientists in Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Agriculture Extension, College of Agriculture, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Guntur Andhra Pradesh; 2017.
10. Patel GJ. Extension management ability of training organizer of KVK. Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished), GAU, SK, Nagar; 2001.
11. Bavanji GH. Managerial ability of veterinary officers working under Panchayat in Saurashtra region of Gujarat. College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh; 2006.
12. Dinkarrao SS. Job performance and job satisfaction of subject matter specialists and perception of the farmers towards extension service of Krishi Vigyan Kendra. Ph.D. (Thesis), Department of Extension Education, Post Graduate Institute, Dr Punjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Krishnanagar PO, Akola, Maharashtra; 2019.
13. Tamagond P, A study on role perception and role performance of farm facilitators under bhoochetana programme of KSDA in Raichur District. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpub.), University of Agricultural Science, Raichur, Karnataka; 2013.
14. Gopika MH. Participation in decision making, job performance and job satisfaction of assistant horticulture officers. M.Sc. Thesis submitted to Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore; 2014.
15. Patel R. A study on performance of Raitha Samparka Kendras (RSKs) in Davanagere district of Karnataka. Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, Karnataka; 2014.

16. Bortamuly D. A study on the role performance of the agricultural extension personnel in the revitalized extension system in the state of Assam. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Extension Education, Faculty of Agriculture, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam; 2015.

© 2023 Priyanka et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/104414>