Journal of Agricultural Development and Policy, 2026
Volume 36, No. 1, 92-100
https://doi.org/10.63066/23220457.36.1.012

NAAS - 4.34
UGC CARE List Journal

A Study on Management Practices and Market Orientation of FPOs in Maharashtra

Dere Aishwarya, Babita Kumar and Rakesh Rathore

School of Business Studies, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab

Abstract

The present study was undertaken to analyze management practices and market orientation of FPOs. A total of 30 FPOs of Maharashtra were selected. Primary data were collected in 2022 using a pre-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. The results of the study revealed that FPOs prepared a written business plan. The majority of FPOs do not have formal organizational structures. FPOs prepared financial statements (4.56) and analysed them for financial management. Members are involved in FPO meetings (4.63), and regular meetings of directors and members are held to discuss the organization's financial management (4.76). The majority (60 per cent) of FPOs were not branding their products, and FPOs sell their products after the grading process (4.73). Cumbersome registrations and statutory process compliances were important problems faced by FPOs.

Key Words: Farmer producer organization, Management practices, Business plan

JEL classification: M10, M31, Q13

Introduction

The Farmer Producer Organization (FPO) is a means to bring together small and marginal farmers/producers in the rural region and help to build their own business enterprises and managed by their own and professionally (Salokhe, 2016). Farmer Producer Organizations engaged in post-harvest processing and organic production of crops (Trebbin, 2016). Collective actions through Farmer Producer Organization are turning into key factors in increasing farmer income through better access to markets (Hellin *et al.*, 2009). The central region of the country has the highest average number of FPOs (Agarwal and Goyal, 2022). Through FPO, farmer members can access quality agri-input at low cost, market-related information, and new technology-related information. FPO is the way of linking primary producers to the market to get better prices for their produce (Papnai *et al*., 2021). A producer company is a hybrid between a private limited company and a cooperative society. Producer Company combines the goodness of cooperation and efficiency of a cooperative company (Venkattakumar and Sontakki, 2012). Stakeholder cooperation is important for the viability of the producer company (Dey, 2018). Multi-commodity and value addition approaches are vital for producer company success (Govil *et al*., 2020).

The Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) are evolving as a novel type of formal farmers' organization in the Indian agricultural sector. Producer organizations are an example of profit-oriented forms of organization, mainly for farmers and farming communities. Producer Companies create and nurture an entrepreneurial ecosystem at the grassroots level. By providing production management decisions and major resources in the hands of farmers, it contributes to their empowerment. At the same time, Producer Companies try to permit access to new markets by forming flexible linkages to specialized demands (Trebbin and Hassler, 2012). National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development has tremendous potential to promote producer organizations (Tagat and Tagat, 2016). Farmers' Clubs, Self-Help Groups, Joint Liaison Groups, and people's institutions can promote Farmer Producer Organization in the country. Effective capacity building of member farmers is vital for the success of the produce organization. Promoting institutions, ease of doing business and the number of markets are key factors in the success of an organization (Manaswi *et al*., 2019). Farmer Producer Company has an inherent structural problem that primarily restricts the flow of equity capital (Sarma *et al*., 2019).

Lack of branding, statutory compliance, farmer awareness, and convergence with government schemes highlight the need for a more integrated and strategic approach for promotion and strengthening of the Farmer Producer Organizations (Anonymous, 2025). Lack of mobilization of

Corresponding author email: rathore@pau.edu

working capital and financial support to FPOs, manpower attrition leading to problems in the formation of FPOs, lack of organization management capabilities, such as administration and financial management, and inadequate business and marketing skills among farmers were important problems (Sawairam, 2016; Bishnoi and Shivani, 2020).

The success of a FPO mainly depends on the commitment of its farmer members, the credibility and leadership of the organization, and its acceptance within the community. A clear understanding of the business environment is one of the most crucial factors for the effective functioning of Producer Organizations. The FPOs facilitate the aggregation of agricultural resources, generating positive socio-economic benefits and improving farmers' livelihoods. To achieve sustainable growth, the organization must provide reliable market information, ensure market access and maintain strong linkages with target markets. Their business operations commonly include aggregation, processing, production, marketing, input supply and sales, and procurement of agricultural commodities such as tomatoes, onions, cereals, oilseeds, pulses, cotton, dairy products, and other farm produce.

Several studies have examined the role of Farmer Produce Organizations (FPOs) in improving farmers' income (Vedasri and Mishra, 2021, Renuka and Singh, 2021), as well as the impact of FPO on both member and non-member farmers and the overall development of FPOs have received comparatively less attention, despite being critical determinants of organizational success (Agarwal and Goyal, 2022). However, the management and market orientation dimensions of FPOs have received comparatively less attention, despite being critical determinants of organizational success. Effective management practices and a strong market orientation are essential for enhancing the performance, sustainability and competitiveness of FPOs. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to analyze the management practices and market orientation of Farmer Producer Organizations in Maharashtra.

Data Source and Methodology

The population of the study consisted of all the FPO working in Maharashtra. There were 771 FPOs promoted by NABARD (National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development) and SFAC (Small Farmers Agribusiness Consortium) operational in various districts of Maharashtra. Three districts of Maharashtra with the maximum number of registered FPOs were selected purposively. The districts with the maximum number of FPOs are Pune (85), Nashik (48), and Ahmednagar (34). From the FPOs located in the three districts, 10 FPOs per district were randomly selected, yielding a total sample of 30 FPOs. Primary data was collected during the year, 2022 through a well-designed and pre-structured interview schedule, which was based on parameters for understanding the management practices, market orientation, and problems of FPOs. The data was collected from the Chief Executive Officer/ or Members of the Board of Directors and member farmers on various aspects regarding management, market orientation, and problems of FPOs. The data were analysed using various statistical tools i.e.one sample t-test and ANOVA.

One sample t-test: The one sample t-test assesses whether the average of a single group differs significantly from a known or expected population average.

$$t = \frac{\bar{x} - \bar{\mu}}{S / \sqrt{n}}$$

Where, $\bar{x}$ = sample mean n = sample size S = sample standard deviation μ = population mean

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance): ANOVA is a statistical method used to evaluate if there are significant differences among the means of different independent groups. ANOVA compare the means of three or more independent groups at the same time in order to determine whether at least one group mean differs significantly from the others.

$$\text{F-statistics} = \frac{\text{Variance between groups}}{\text{Variance within groups}}$$

The F-Statistic: This formula computes an F-ratio, which represents the variance between groups divided by the variance within groups.

$$F = \frac{MSB}{MSW}$$

(Where, MSB = Mean Square Between and MSW = Mean Square Within).

Results and Discussion

Organization structure and business plan of FPOs

The study revealed that most FPOs (27) did not have a formal organizational structure. All 30sampled FPOs possessed office space and a venue for meetings. In terms of infrastructure, 13 FPOs owned plant and machinery, 22 had a collection centre, 18 had storage space, 25 operated a retail outlet, and 13 had transportation facilities. All FPOs prepare business plans covering 6-12 months; however, 90 per cent of them were established with no prior business plan. It was also observed that every FPO maintained its financial records, although the responsibility for record-keeping varied across organizations. A majority of FPOs (21) employed a full-time permanent accountant to maintain accounts, while 28 FPOs used computers for data management. Regarding sales practices, 60 per cent of the FPOs sold their products on cash basis, whereas 40 per cent sold on credit, with a fixed credit period. Among those offering credit, most FPOs (10) provided a credit period between 15 to 30 days. The majority of FPOs (19) members participated in any training programme aimed at enhancing their knowledge and skills.

Table 1: Demographic profile of FPOs (n=30)

Profile	Frequency	Per cent (%)
Age		
Before 2010	1	3.33
2010-2015	26	86.67
2016-2020	3	10.00
Supporting organization		
NABARD	5	16.67
SFAC	4	13.33
Other	2	6.67
None	19	63.33
Size of FPO (number of members)		
0-249	8	13.00
250-499	13	49.90
500- 750	9	30.00
Active members (%)		
60-79	10	33.33
80-100	20	66.67
Average land holding of farmer members (acre)		
1.0	6	20
1.5	7	23.33
2.0	14	46.67
2.5 and more	3	10
Increasing members in FPO		
Yes	28	93.33
No	2	6.67
Rotation of the BOD (Board of Director)		
Yes	14	46.67
No	16	53.33
Frequency of Board meetings		
Monthly	18	60
Quarterly	12	40
Annual meeting with members		
Yes	30	100
Total	30	100

(Source: Primary data, 2022)

In terms of marketing channels, most FPOs (23) sold their produce directly to buyers, while 15 relied on agents for sales. The majority of the FPOs (18) did not use branding strategies when marketing their products.

A perusal of Table 1 revealed that the majority of the selected FPOs (86.67 per cent) were established during the period 2010-2015, while 10 per cent were established between 2016 and 2020, and only 3.33 per cent were established before 2010. Most FPOs had between 250 and 499 associated members, with 80-100 members actively participating in FPO activities. The majority of member farmers possessed approximately two acres of land, followed by those owning 1.5 acres. Membership in the most FPOs was observed to be increasing over time. A few FPOs practiced the rotation of the Board of Directors and annual meetings with members were regularly conducted to facilitate governance and member

Table 2: Different aspects of business plan of FPOs (n=30)

Aspects of Business Plan	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Business plan in written form	5.00	0.00	-	-
Communicate plan to members	5.00	0.00	-	-
Make efforts to implement business plan into actions	4.30	0.46	15.27	<.001
Adequate resources available for implementing the business plan	3.30	0.83	1.96	0.06
Attention to inter-linkages among functional plans	2.03	1.12	-4.69	<.001
Plan contains sub-plans for different functional areas	2.03	1.09	-4.82	<.001
Overall mean	3.61	0.58	1.93	<.001

Note: p<.001 means significant at 1 per cent level

participation.

The respondents' perception of different aspects of the business plan of FPOs was measured on a Likert scale, with the mean score of all the statements compared with the mid-value of the scale (μ=3), and it was found to be significant. The study revealed that all FPO members had a business plan in written form and they also communicated the plan with members. FPO also makes an effort to implement the business plan into action. The findings confirm that FPOs prepare a written business plan, communicates it to the members and makes efforts to implement the business into action. The least mean score was observed for the statement regarding inter-linkages among functional plans of FPOs, and the plan contains sub-plans for different functional areas.

Table 3 revealed financial aspects of FPOs, states the highest mean score was recorded for the statement indicating that the level of payables was reviewed regularly, followed by the ability of FPOs to obtain funds from financial institutions whenever business needs arise. Another highly ranked statement reflected the tendency of FPOs to prioritize current expenditures over long-term savings. In contrast, the lowest mean score was observed for the statement related to easy access to banks and other financial institutions, followed by the statement indicating that FPOS did not experience cash shortages. The findings further revealed that all FPOs prepared financial statements, including profit and

Table 3: Financial aspects of FPOs (n=30)

Statement	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value
FPO prepares financial statements	5.00	0.00	-	-
FPO prepares financial budget/plan	5.00	0.00	-	-
FPO analyze the financial statements to track business performance	4.46	0.57	14.06	<.001
Seek expert help in preparation of financial budget	4.20	0.71	9.20	<.001
Level of payables for your business are reviewed at regular intervals	4.16	0.98	6.48	<.001
Easily raise funds from the financial institutions if a sudden business need arises	4.06	0.90	6.44	<.001
Find it more satisfying to spend money than to save it for the long term	4.06	0.78	7.44	<.001
There is adequate financial management skills for managing FPO	4.00	0.58	9.32	<.001
Level of receivables for your business are reviewed at regular intervals	3.73	1.04	3.83	<.001
FPO able to calculate total cost or average cost for product	3.73	0.78	5.11	<.001
FPO able to bifurcate total cost into fixed and variable cost	3.70	0.74	5.11	<.001
There is decide minimum cash balance to be maintain	3.50	1.13	2.40	0.02
You are meeting financial obligations on time	3.46	1.16	2.19	0.03
Find it easy to recover the payments due from the debtors	3.10	0.95	0.57	0.57
FPO usually does not face cash shortage	2.73	1.08	-1.35	0.18
Having easy access of credit to the banks and other financial institutions	2.70	0.10	-1.60	0.11
Perform forecasting within FPO regarding the future sales or profit	2.23	0.97	-4.32	<.001

Note: p<.001 means significant at 1 per cent level loss accounts, balance sheets and financial budgets. These financial records were regularly used to monitor and evaluate organizational performance. The least mean score among the financial management practices were associated with forecasting future sales and profits, followed by the ability of FPOs to calculate total, fixed and variable costs accurately. The FPO regularly reviews its financial statements to monitor organisational performance. Professional assistance is sought while preparing a financial budget. The organization continuously assesses its accounts payable to ensure effective financial management. It is able to calculate the average or total cost of its product accurately. Additionally, the FPO maintains an adequate minimum cash balance and meets its financial obligations on time. Bharti and Kumari (2025) found that marketing activities and institutional support significantly impact the financial performance of the FPOs. The organizations require financial support from the government agency and other institutions as well (Renuka and Singh, 2021).

The reliability test was conducted to assess the consistency of the management practice statements. The results indicated that the instrument was reasonably reliable, with alpha coefficient of 0.60. The respondents evaluated the statements on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, (5 denoted strongly agree and 1 denoted strongly disagree). The mean score of all the statements was compared with the mid-value of the scale (μ=3). The analysis revealed that all statements were statistically significant except the statement related to the measures adopted by FPOs to address repeated failures in a plan. The management practices of the FPOs were subsequently analyzed and the findings are presented in Table 4. The results indicated that meetings of the Board of Directors and FPO members were conducted regularly to discuss financial and organizational activities. Information regarding the targets and objectives of FPOs activities was effectively communicated to members and staff. FPOs also undertook regular audits of their financial performance and provided support to members through the supply of farm inputs and various agricultural services. Financial statements were prepared on a regular basis, and all departments actively

Table 4: Management Practices of FPOs (n=30)

Statement	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value
Regular meetings of directors and members are held to discuss financial activities of the organization	4.76	0.43	22.49	<.001
Targets are passed on to members/staff	4.70	0.46	19.97	<.001
You regularly audit the financial statements	4.70	0.46	19.97	<.001
All the staff/ members are involved in meetings	4.63	0.49	18.25	<.001
FPO supports its members by providing them inputs, finances and various extension services	4.56	0.50	17.02	<.001
You regularly prepare financial statements	4.56	0.50	17.02	<.001
Information about the profits is shared with the members	4.53	0.50	16.55	<.001
Targets are linked to overall objectives of the organization	4.50	0.50	16.15	<.001
You follow the objectives, targets and business models given in the business plan	4.50	0.50	16.15	<.001
Members/Staff are pushed in meeting their target	4.46	0.50	15.83	<.001
Staff has clarity of the given target	4.20	0.55	11.93	<.001
You compare performance on basis of achieved targets	4.20	0.59	7.41	<.001
You try to identify the root cause in case of failure to achieve performance in meetings	4.16	0.59	10.79	<.001
You are able to meet you targets timely	3.46	0.86	2.97	<.001
You measure to deal with repeated failures for a plan	2.90	1.09	-.50	0.62
You follow a particular strategy to add farmer members in our organization	2.06	0.90	-5.63	<.001
FPO has a set criterion which is follow, while exposed with any problem	2.00	0.87	-6.28	<.001
Funding agencies provides regular support in the form of funds	1.80	0.55	-11.93	<.001
Funding agencies provides training for running FPO and enhancing business	1.76	0.62	-10.79	<.001
Targets are set by the member farmers themselves	1.63	0.49	-15.27	<.001

Note: p<.001 means significant at 1 per cent level

Table 5: Market Orientation of FPOs (n=30)

Statement	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
FPO sell produce/products after grading	4.73	0.45	21.11	<.001
Members give suggestions/contribute to add/develop/expand products and services	4.70	0.47	19.98	<.001
FPO are doing efforts to provide information to the member farmers	4.70	0.47	19.98	<.001
Collective buying is preferred for standard inputs	4.63	0.49	18.25	<.001
Members are ready to change (production) as per market requirements	4.63	0.49	18.25	<.001
FPO products have all the information on labels and packets	4.63	0.49	18.25	<.001
FPO tries to gather information and disseminate it in a timely manner to the members	4.57	0.50	17.03	<.001
FPO products are at par with those of competitors	4.57	0.50	17.03	<.001
We have our own FPO retail outlets	4.47	0.82	9.80	<.001
We meet customers at least once a year to find out what products or services will be needed in the future	4.40	0.50	15.39	<.001
FPO undertakes the promotion of products regularly	4.37	0.49	15.27	<.001
Even if we came up with a marketing plan, we probably would not be able to implement it in a timely	4.37	0.49	15.27	<.001
FPO products conform to FSSAI standards	4.30	0.75	9.50	<.001
FPO objectives are driven primarily by the profit of farmer members	4.23	0.43	15.70	<.001
The likely effects of changes in markets are reviewed regularly	4.23	0.50	13.40	<.001
The strategy to combat competition is always on the agenda	4.07	0.87	6.73	<.001
CEO, BOD regularly receives feedback from our current and prospective customers of the organization	4.03	0.67	8.46	<.001
FPO tracks prices regularly to buy inputs for members	4.03	0.61	9.20	<.001
FPO has the knowledge and skills required to label the products	3.90	1.32	3.73	<.001
We take feedback to customers at least once a year to assess the quality of the product/service	3.80	0.48	9.05	<.001
We have acquired training regarding the labelling of products	3.63	1.79	1.94	0.062
We are aware of hygienic and sanitary practices	3.60	1.10	2.98	0.006
We are aware of FSSAI, labelling, and packaging	3.53	1.74	1.68	0.103

Note: p<.001 means significant at 1 per cent level

participated in organizational activities. However, the findings revealed that member farmers were generally not involved in setting organizational targets, highlighting the need for additional training and capacity-building initiatives supported by funding agencies. Members were regularly informed about the profits earned by FPOs and both staff and members were encouraged to achieve organizational goals. The objectives of the FPO were clearly communicated to the staff and performance evaluation was primarily based on the attainment of predetermined goals. In cases where targets were not achieved, efforts were made to identify and address the underlying causes. Overall, the FPOs demonstrated the ability to accomplish their objectives within the stipulated timeframe. There is a need for credit support (Navaneetham *et al.*, 2017). The study of Renuka and Singh (2021) found that overall, a surge in income of selected FPO members was 15.71 per cent which was primarily due to the change in the cropping pattern and the awareness for timely use of agri-inputs by farmers, such as seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, insecticides and the use of inputs at a subsidized rate.

Market orientation practices of the FPOs revealed that organizations sell their produce after proper grading and actively encourage members to provide suggestions for expanding products and services (Table 5). Efforts were made to disseminate relevant information to members, while branding and labelling activities were also undertaken for marketed products. Many FPOs sold their products through their own retail outlets and their products complied with the FSSAI standard. The mean of all the statements has

Table 6: Difference in management practices and market orientation of FPOs, i.e. of establishment, supporting organization and number of active members (n=30)

Particular	Management Practices			Market Orientation		
	Mean (SD)	F-value	p-value	Mean (SD)	F-value	p-value
Age						
Before 2010	3.38 (-)	3.74	0.03	3.76 (-)	0.32	0.72
2010-2015	3.82 (0.16)			3.61 (0.19)		
2016-2020	3.94 (0.34)			3.65 (0.19)		
Supporting agency						
NABARD	3.89 (0.18)	2.72	0.06	3.53 (0.19)	1.13	0.35
SFAC	4.00 (0.25)			3.67 (0.21)		
Other	3.62 (0.33)			3.47 (0.42)		
None	3.79 (0.15)			3.65 (0.16)		
Active members						
60-79	3.65 (0.21)	0.29	0.59	3.65 (0.21)	0.29	0.59
80-100	3.61 (0.18)			3.61 (0.18)		

Note: the figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

been compared with the mid-value of the scale (μ=3) and found to be significant. The results further revealed that improving profits for ember farmers was a key objective guiding FPO activities. Regular reviews and meetings were conducted on the probable consequences of market trends and shifts. Combating competition is an important focus area of discussion in the meeting. The CEO and BOD frequently get input from the members. FPOs frequently monitor costs in order to purchase inputs for its members. In addition, FPOs possessed the necessary knowledge and skills related to product labelling and branding. Member farmers were consulted at least once a year to obtain feedback on product quality. Training programmes had enhanced their understanding of product labelling requirements, while awareness of sanitary and hygienic practices was also evident. Furthermore, FPOs demonstrate adequate knowledge of packaging, labelling procedures and FASSI regulations required for effective business operations. Sawairam (2015) revealed that collective action can serve to enhance farmers' competitiveness in the market.

The organizational membership has a positive impact on net returns, return on investment, and profit margin of farmers (Gurung *et al.*, 2024). The economic benefit of participating in FPOs, farmer members' net income was increased by 30 per cent more than that of non-members (Singh and Vatta, 2019)

The reliability coefficient shows that the statements for market orientation are quite reliable, as the Cronbach alpha value was found to be 0.62. Standard Deviation measures the extent to which the values in a dataset deviate from the mean. Table 6 revealed that there was no significant difference in management practices with respect to supporting organization (p=0.06) and percentage of active members (p=0.59), but there was a significant difference in management practices like age of the FPOs (p= 0.03). It was found that there was no significant difference in market orientation and age (p=0.72), supporting organization (p=0.35), and percentage of active members (p =0.59) of the FPOs. These findings suggest that market-oriented practices were relatively consistent across FPOs regardless of these organizational characteristics.

Table 7 highlights the major challenges faced by the FPOs. The findings revealed that cumbersome registration procedure and compliance with statutory requirements were among the most significant constraints encountered by FPOs.

Table 7: Problems of FPOs (n=30)

Statement	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value
FPO does not have a structured distribution network	3.57	0.91	0.40	0.69
Cumbersome registrations and statutory processes compliances	3.50	0.94	2.92	<0.001
FPO is not able to undertake the required level of value addition	3.10	0.55	1.00	<0.33
There are implementation issues related to the business plan	3.10	0.80	0.68	0.50
FPO lacks financial prudence	2.90	0.96	-0.57	0.57
There is too much dependence on a limited number of directors/members	2.77	0.86	-1.49	0.15
FPO has not been able to create a viable business plan	2.70	0.88	-1.87	0.07
FPO has the required infrastructure and technology	2.70	1.06	-1.56	0.13
Problem in hiring and retaining staff	2.57	0.94	-2.54	0.002
Sales of products around the year are not a challenge for FPO	2.57	0.77	-3.07	<.001
FPO can reach consumer markets	2.47	0.82	-3.57	<.001
FPO products are not price-competitive	2.40	0.67	-4.87	<.001
FPO faces marketing-related problems	2.40	1.07	-3.07	<.001
Competition with rich middlemen and intermediaries in the agricultural supply chain	2.30	0.95	-4.03	<.001
FPO is not able to face competition in market place	2.17	0.79	-5.77	<.001
Very few active members are there	2.13	1.04	-4.56	<.001
There is a lack of professionalism	1.97	0.76	-7.40	<.001
Lack of adequate support from the funding agency	1.93	0.64	-9.13	<.001
Adequate skills to maintain business records	1.80	0.66	-9.89	<.001
The business plan of FPO has not been communicated to the members	1.77	0.43	-15.70	<.001
FPO products suffer from quality issues	1.73	0.45	-15.43	<.001

Source: Author computation from primary data

Another major challenge was the absence of a structured distribution network, limited their ability of effective marketing. Furthermore, FPOs were unable to undertake the desired level of value addition, restricting opportunities to enhance profit. In contrast, issues related to the price of the products with middlemen and intermediaries and competitors were perceived as comparatively less severe. Product quality was not considered the major challenge by most of the FPOs. Despite having the potential to access the consumer market, many FPOs have not developed a feasible business plan, resulting in marketing-related difficulties. Patel *et al*., (2025) revealed that key marketing constraints were limited awareness of market trends (55.66) and a lack of branding and value addition. Limited technology access and governance issues persist during FPO development (Parth *et al.*, 2025)

Conclusions and Policy Implications

This study analyzed the management and market orientation of FPOs in Maharashtra. The findings revealed that the majority of FPOs lacked a formal organizational structure. Nevertheless, most FPOs prepared written business plans, communicated them to the members and made efforts to translate these plans into actionable activities. The majority of FPOs did not engage in branding of their products. The study indicates that cumbersome registration and statutory process compliance, and a lack of a structured distribution network, were important problems faced by FPOs. Addressing these constraints is essential to achieving the intended objectives of FPOs. Management and market orientation are important for the success of FPOs and have contributed significantly to improving the incomes of small and marginal farmer members. Simplifying the registration process of the Farmer Producer Organization is essential to enhance its efficiency and growth. Overall, the findings provide valuable insights for stakeholders involved in the FPO, helping them understand management practices and market orientation to promote sustainable Farmer Producer Organizations. This study recommends that funding organizations should prioritise capacity building and focus on the branding and marketing of FPOs products. Policy intervention can further enhance the management capabilities and market focus of FPOs, thereby contributing to their sustainability, long-term growth, and overall viability. Strengthening management and marketing practices can further strengthen informed decision-making, enhance market trust, and ultimately contribute to long-term success.

References

Agarwal S and Goyal S K 2022. Progression of Farmer Producer Organisations in India. *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, **92**: 1490–95. https://doi.org/10.56093/ijas.v92i12.118068

Anonymous 2025. Impact evaluation study of Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs) promoted by NABARD in Telangana pp.1-152 https://naarm.org.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Ipmact-Evaluation-Study-of-FPOs-promoted-by-NABARD-TGRO.pdf

Bharti, N and Kumari S 2025. Determinants of financial performance of the farmer producer organization (FPOs). *Measuring Business Excellence*, 1-21. DOI 10.1108/MBE-02-2025-0013

Bishnoi R K and Kumari S 2020. Challenges faced by FPOs and strategies to overcome: A review. *International Journal of Advance Agricultural Science and Technology,* **7**: 25-33. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342344542_

Dey K 2018. Farmer Producer Companies in India determinants of performance and viability. *Economics and Political Weekly,* **53**: 44-52. https://www.epw.in/journal/2018/35/special-articles/farmer-producer-companies-india.html

Govil, R Neti, A and Rao M R 2020. *Farmer Producer Companies: past, present and future* Azim Premji University, Bengaluru, Karnataka. http://publications.azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/id/eprint/2268

Gurung R, Choubey, M and Rai R. 2024. Economic impact of farmer producer organisation (FPO) membership: empirical evidence from India. *International Journal of Social Economics*, **51**: 1015–28, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-06-2023-0451

Hellin, J, Lundy M and Meijer M 2009. Farmer organization, collective action and market access in Meso-America. *Food Policy,* **34**:16-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2008.10.003

Manaswi, B H, Kumar P, Prakash P, Anbukkani P, Kar A, Jha G K, Rao D U M. 2019. Progress and performance of states in promotion of Farmer Producer Organization in India. *Indian Journal of Extension Education,* **54**:108-13. https://epubs.icar.org.in/index.php/IJEE/article/view/143747

Navaneetham B, Mahendra K, Sivakumar S D and Senthikumar R. 2017. Status of farmer producer companies in India. *Agriculture Update,* **12**:888-92. DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AU/12.TECHSEAR(3)2017/888-892

Papnai G, Nautiyal P, Jethi R, Joshi N and Supyal V 2021. Farmer Producer Organizations: A boon for hill farmers. *Food and Scientific Reports,* **2**:58-61. https://foodandscientificreports.com/details/farmer-producer-organizations-a-boon-for-hill-farmers.html

Parth, B, Kumar, A Kumari, S, Pathak, S. and Ahmad, N. 2025. The role of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) in revamping Indian agriculture landscape. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports,* **31**:490-506. https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i32920

Patel, H R, Dilip R, Vahoniya, and Barvadiya DB 2025. Comprehensive Study on Farmer Producer Organization in Idar Taluka, Gujarat. *Archives of Current Research International,* **25**:47-55. https://doi.org/10.9734/acri/2025/v25i71311

Renuka and Singh, S. 2021. Economic impact of Farmer Producer Organizations on Punjab peasantry. *Journal of Agricultural Development and Policy*, **31**:56-64. https://isadp.in/publication/download-pdf/148

Salokhe S 2016. Farmer Producer Organization for effective linkage of small producers with market. *International Journal of Applied Research,* **2**:142-46. http://www.allresearchjournal.com/

Sarma P Roy A 2019. *Farmer Producer Company in India: A study on its history, geographical spread and financial challenges in*: Farmer Producer Companies in India: Issues and Challenges. Pp 3-21. Excel India Publishers, New Delhi, India. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337257600

Sawairam P 2015. Case study of Farmer Producer Organization in Maharashtra in the era of globalization. *IMBRDs Journal of Managerial Research,* **4**:55-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.17697/ibmrd%2F2015%2Fv4i2%2F76774

Sawairam P 2016. Training needs assessment of members of Farmer Producer Organization and Producer Companies in India with reference to Pune District. *We Ken International Journal of Basic and Applied Science,* **1**:124-36. https://doi.org/10.21904/weken/2016/v1/i3/103461

Singh G and Vatta K 2019. Assessing the economic impacts of farmer producer organizations: a case study in Gujarat, India. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, **32**:139-48. DOI: 10.5958/0974-0279.2019.00023.5

Tagat V and Tagat A 2016. *The potential of Farmer Producer Organizations in India.* Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2972488 on 31/01/2022

Trebbin A (2016). Linking small farmers to modern retail through Producer Organizations – experience with Producer Companies in India. *Food Policy,* **45**:35-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2013.12.007

Trebbin, A and Hassler M 2012. Farmers' Producer Companies in India: A new concept for collective action? *Environment and Planning A*, **44**: 411-27. https://doi.org/10.1068/a44143

Venkattakumar R and Sontakki B S 2012. Producer Companies in India: Experiences and implications. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education,* **1**:154-60. https://api.seea.org.in/uploads/pdf/v12431.pdf

Vedashri R and Mishra R K (2021) A study on impact of farmer producer organization on farmers' income in Andhra Pradesh. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology,* 39(8)7-18. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajaees/2021/v39i830619

Received: January 09, 2026 Accepted: March 18, 2026