The Pharma Innovation

Anandi Radadiya
MBA (ABM), International Agri-Business Management Institute, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

Dr. Yogeshkumar A Lad
Associate Professor & Head, Department of HRD & Personnel Management, International Agri-Business Management Institute, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

Unveiling the key drivers of success of farmer producer company: Member farmer's experiences

Anandi Radadiya and Dr. Yogeshkumar A Lad

Abstract
This research paper aims to investigate and analyze the key success factors of Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs) and their role in transforming the agricultural landscape. FPCs have emerged as powerful institutions that empower farmers by enabling collective action, promoting sustainable agriculture practices, and enhancing market access. Understanding the factors contributing to their success is crucial for policymakers, researchers, and agricultural stakeholders to develop effective strategies and policies for fostering the growth and sustainability of FPCs. Through a systematic review of existing literature, this study identifies and synthesizes the critical success factors that have contributed to the growth and success of FPCs. The findings will provide valuable insights for stakeholders to enhance their understanding of FPCs and guide future endeavors in strengthening agricultural cooperatives.

Keywords: Success factors, farmer producer companies, farmers, effective strategies, sustainability

Introduction
Small and marginal farmers make up the bulk of the Indian agricultural economy by contributing 51 per cent of total agricultural output and 70 per cent of high-value crops with 46 per cent of operational land holdings (Agriculture Census 2015-16) [17]. However, this stratum of the agricultural community still faces many difficulties, including limited access to resources, markets and knowledge. Cooperative societies and farmer-producer organizations (FPOs) have emerged as powerful models for addressing these concerns and promoting inclusive agricultural development (Saxena).

In order to increase market participation and lower transaction costs through collective action, farmers' collectives like co-operatives and farmer-producer organizations have emerged (Markelova *et al*. 2009) [6]. Even though they were successful in the beginning, cooperatives failed to connect smallholder farmers to the globalized markets (Valentinov 2007) [15]. With a few notable exceptions, such as co-operatives dealing with high-value crops and the dairy industry (Roy & Thorat 2008) [12], co-operatives throughout India were unable to address the problem of smallholder farmers due to their inward focus, financial limitations, free-rider problem, etc. To increase revenue and profit for marginal and small farmers, Pani *et al* [10]. pointed out the importance of organizing farmer associations into farmer producers organizations (FPOs).

The success of farmer-producer organizations (FPOs) has dramatically increased in India in recent years, changing the agricultural environment in significant ways. FPOs—entities owned and run by farmers—were successful models for empowering farmers, raising their incomes and fostering sustainable agricultural growth (Vinayak *et al.* 2019) [16]. Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs), a new type of farmer's collective, were established in 2003 under the provisions of Part-IX-A Chapter-1 of the Companies Act (Singh 2008) [14]. A registered organization, the Small Farmer Agri-business Consortium (SFAC), was founded as a central agency for promoting FPOs in India. NABARD then began promoting FPOs through their Producers' Organization Development and Upliftment Corpus Fund. This new collective is supposed to combine the efficiency and efficient management of the corporation form with the cooperative ideals of producer ownership, involvement, and governance. (Mourya & Mehta 2021) [7]. PC is created with the members' equity contributions and has only been open to them. The PC's foremost objective is to unite small farmers and producers for forward linkages like collective marketing, processing, and market-driven agricultural output as well as backward linkages for inputs like seeds, fertilizers, credit, insurance, knowledge and extension services. At the heart of this effort is to gain collective bargaining power for small farmers/producers.

Corresponding Author:
Anandi Radadiya
MBA (ABM), International Agri-Business Management Institute, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

(Prabhakar *et al.* 2012) [11]. Farmers' active involvement, active role in governance, staff members' knowledge of and dedication to their jobs, cooperation, mutual trust, and goodwill among farmers, information sharing by farmers, and common goals among farmers were found to be highly significant factors for the success of the producer company (Pandian & Ganesan 2019) [9]. Producer organizations increase the political influence of smallholder producers, lower the cost of selling inputs and outputs and give members a platform for information sharing, activity coordination and decision-making. Commitment along with participation were the most important factors in determining the success of Farmers Producer Company (Pandian & Ganesan 2019) [9]. Other players including banks, retailers, and the corporate sector (Gorai & Panja) will also be important to FPC's success. PC can help smallholder farmers become more productive, earn greater profits and have more negotiating power when it comes to producing and selling their goods. They share technical expertise with their target audience, boost production efficiency, cut transaction costs, sell the final product and even engage in capacity building and creating social capital (Marbaniang *et al.* 2019) [5] Four categories—technical, organizational, economic and infrastructure—were developed to determine and classify the facilitating factors driving FPC's expansion. (Mukherjee *et al.* 2019) [8].

Literature review
Junior and Wander (2021) [4] examine the factors influencing the success of agricultural cooperatives in Brazil. Ten key success factors for agro-industrial cooperatives were found to exist, according to the findings. These include the ability to balance the dual agenda of social and economic goals, management professionalization, accommodating the needs of various stakeholders, transaction cost management, risk and volatility management, improved commercialization, competitiveness with traditional businesses, technology adoption, sustainable development, and social responsibility. Studies that look at the presence and advantages of the success characteristics mentioned for agricultural cooperatives, particularly those established in Brazil, are scarce, however.

Pandian and Ganesan (2019) [9] examined aspects driving Farmers Producer Company's success. The research was conducted with members of the Farmers Producer Company in Kancheepuram District, Tamil Nadu, India. A questionnaire was employed to interview 200 farmers at random, and the instrument's validity was verified by subject-matter experts. The acquired data were examined using SPSS software and a 0.774 Cronbach's alpha. The findings demonstrated that active participation in annual general meetings, active role in governance, staff members' knowledge and commitment to their jobs, cooperation, mutual trust, and goodwill among farmers, information sharing by farmers, and common goals among farmers were found to be highly influential factors for the producer company's success. According to the study's findings, the most significant variables for Farmers Producer Company's success are commitment and involvement.

Agahi and Karami (2012) [1] investigated the elements influencing social capital management and their impact on the success of production cooperatives. The goal of this study, which was done using a descriptive-correlation technique with members of out-of-season product production

cooperatives in Kermanshah, Iran, is to explore the role of social capital management in the success and development of production cooperatives. The statistical samples included 220 people who were chosen at random and studied using a questionnaire. The validity of the questionnaire was examined by a panel of specialists, and its reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha, which came out to be 0.83. SPSS software was used to analyze the data. According to the findings, the following factors are more likely to contribute to the success of production cooperatives: individual motivation (97%), members' active participation (96.4%), cooperation spirit (93.6%), goodwill (92.4%), willingness to upgrade occupational know-how (91%), attention to upgrading product quality (90.2%), relationship with other cooperative societies (89.6%), use of other cooperative societies' experiences (88.4%), disposal of own experiences to other cooperative societies 87.8%, a focus for new product 87%, a focus for new product creation 86.8%, concern for community and involvement of society 86.2%, mutual trust among cooperative members 85%, a common vision of future among members 84.4%. As a result, it is advised that nowadays more than ever, consideration be given to improving the efficiency of social capital management to boost the success and development of cooperatives.

Objective
To identify key factors for the success of farmer producer company

Methodology
An attempt was made to document the key drivers of a farmer-producer company during the period between 10th April to 10th June. To achieve the goal, Bhumiputra pulse crop producer firm limited, which was encouraged by Aga Khan rural support project (India), was documented. A semi-structured data collection tool was used to collect data from the farmer producer company's (120) producer members. Producer members' perceptions of FPO performance on prescribed social, economic, and overall performance metrics were documented using a five-point scale, with 5 representing strongly agree and 1 representing strongly disagree. Using SPSS software, the gathered data were coded and subjected to factor analysis.

Factor analysis will be employed to get a result of the success factor of the farmer-producer company. Mathematically, factor analysis is somewhat similar to multiple regression analysis, in that each variable is expressed as a linear combination of underlying factors. The amount of variance a variable shares with all other variables included in the analysis is referred to as communality. The co-variation among the variables is described in terms of a small number of common factors plus a unique factor for each variable. These factors are not overtly observed. If the variables are standardized, the factor model may be represented as.

$$X_i = A_{i1}F_1 + A_{i2}F_2 + A_{i3}F_3 + . + A_{im}F_m + V_iU_i$$

Where,
X_i = ith standardized variable
A_{ij} = standardized multiple regression coefficients of variable i on common factor j
F = common factor
V_i = standardized regression coefficient of variable I on unique factor i

U_i = the unique factor for variable i
m = number of common factors

The unique factors are uncorrelated with each other and with the common factors. The common factors themselves can be expressed as linear combinations of the observed variables.

$$F_i = W_{i1}X_1 + W_{i2}X_2 + W_{i3}X_3 + . + W_{ik}X_k$$

Where,
F_i = estimate of ith factor
W_i = weight or factor score coefficient
k = number of variables

Results and Discussions
Drivers for the success of Farmer Producer Company:
Different variables such as FPC has professional management, FPC has good knowledgeable staff, CEO has good experience in business, FPCs management interacts frequently with member, FPCs members share information with each other, FPC's knowledge person frequently contacts the all-member farmer, Members are allowed to express their feelings out loud without hesitation, FPCs all transaction is transparent, Information given by FPC is more accurate, FPC delivered timely and useful information, FPC gives all technical guidance to the member, FPC provides input at a reasonable price as compared to market, FPC provides quality input at a lower cost, FPC give better price for produce, Quick payment to farmer, FPC arrange the exposure visit to other farms, After joining FPC crop yield is increased, After joining FPC cost of cultivation decrease, FPC received good support from the supporting agency and FPC received good support from the government were used to find out the factors among them which make the analysis and interpretation of data easier.

Descriptive statistics help researchers understand the basic characteristics of their data before conducting factor analysis. They provide a summary of the variables' distribution, central tendency (e.g., mean, median), and variability (e.g., standard deviation, range). This information is useful for identifying any outliers, assessing the adequacy of the dataset, and making decisions regarding data cleaning or transformation if necessary. In factor analysis, researchers typically examine a large number of variables to identify underlying factors. Descriptive statistics aid in variable screening by providing insights into the distributional properties of each variable. Variables with low variability (e.g., almost constant) or limited range may not contribute much information to the factor analysis and can be excluded from further analysis.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the success of farmer producer company

Description	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N	Missing N
FPC has professional management	4.09	0.81	120	0
FPC has good knowledgeable staff	3.56	1.65	120	0
CEO has good experience in business	3.85	1.02	120	0
FPCs management interacts frequently with member	3.58	1.33	120	0
FPCs members share information with each other	3.86	1.05	120	0
FPC's knowledge person frequently contacts the all-member farmer	3.18	1.29	120	0
Members are allowed to express their feelings out loud without hesitation	3.78	1.24	120	0
FPCs all transaction is transparent	3.20	1.33	120	0
Information given by FPC is more accurate	3.92	1.22	120	0
FPC delivered timely and useful information	3.45	1.32	120	0
FPC gives all technical guidance to the member	3.66	1.36	120	0
FPC provides input at a reasonable price as compared to market	3.53	1.25	120	0
FPC provides quality input at a lower cost	3.41	1.01	120	0
FPC give better price for produce	3.58	1.12	120	0
Quick payment to the farmer	3.48	1.30	120	0
FPC arrange the exposure visit to other farms	2.71	1.17	120	0
After joining FPC crop yield is increased	4.13	1.11	120	0
After joining FPC cost of cultivation decreased	3.48	0.93	120	0
FPC received good support from the supporting agency	3.10	1.27	120	0
FPC received good support from the government	3.28	1.35	120	0

The above table 1, gives the descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation of the factors used in the KMO & Bartlett's test. The column 'Analysis N' shows the number of respondents who answered these particular variable questions. The column 'Missing N' is 0 for all the variables. This states that none of the respondents missed the questions

The responses were measured on a one to five scales; therefore, any mean value of greater than two indicates an agreement with the statement. It indicates that the respondents agree with the statement.

In this study, the objective of factor analysis was to reduce 20 variables to a smaller number of more identifiable groups of variables. The first step in this test is to see whether or not the data generated from the fieldwork is suitable for factor analysis.

KMO measure of sampling adequacy is a test to assess the appropriateness of using factor analysis on the data set. Bartlett's test of sphericity is used to test the null hypothesis that the variables in the population correlation matrix are uncorrelated.

The variance proportion can be interpreted as per the following table:

Table 2: KMO Value Interpretation Criteria

KMO Value	Interpretation of Sampling Adequacy
1 to 0.9	Very Good
0.8 to 0.9	Good
0.7 to 0.8	Medium
0.6 to 0.7	Reasonable
0.5 to 0.6	Acceptable
< 0.5	Unacceptable

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test for a success of farmer producer company

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.640
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1150.720
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

The above table 3 shows the KMO and Bartlett's test output. This test analyzes whether the responses given are adequate with the sample or not. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value obtained is 0.534. If we compare this value with the values in Table 2, it is clear that the value is 0.640 is an acceptable value. This means that the sum of partial correlations is not large in comparison to the sum of correlations. The sum of analysis variables is 58.7%. This indicates there is no diffusion in the correlation pattern. Hence, the factor analysis is appropriate in this case. Therefore, reliable and distinct factors would be obtained from the factor analysis of these data.

Table 3 also contains Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The Approx. The chi-Square value obtained is 1150.720. The significance value p of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 0.000 is less than 0.001. Thus, the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. This indicates relationship strength amongst the variables. Thus, factor analysis applies to this set of data.

The amount of variance a variable shares with all other variables is explained by communality. This is the proportion of variance explained by the common factors. Initial communalities are, for correlation analyses, the proportion of variance accounted for in each variable by the rest of the variables. Extraction communalities are estimates of the variance in each variable accounted for by the factors in the factor solution. If communality value was higher (closer to 1), the larger the amount of information that will be extracted and vice versa. Thus, the variable having low communality did not combine with other variables. The SPSS output for communalities is given in table 4.

Table 4: Communalities for a Success of Farmer Producer Company

Description	Initial	Extraction
FPC has professional management	1.00	0.71
FPC has good knowledgeable staff	1.00	0.74
CEO has good experience in business	1.00	0.73
FPCs management interacts frequently with member	1.00	0.51
FPCs members share information with each other	1.00	0.71
FPC's knowledge person frequently contacts the all-member farmer	1.00	0.65
Members are allowed to express their feelings out loud without hesitation	1.00	0.77
FPCs all transaction is transparent	1.00	0.71
Information given by FPC is more accurate	1.00	0.60
FPC delivered timely and useful information	1.00	0.51
FPC gives all technical guidance to the member	1.00	0.72
FPC provides input at a reasonable price as compared to market	1.00	0.80
FPC provides quality input at a lower cost	1.00	0.67
FPC give better price for produce	1.00	0.60
Quick payment to the farmer	1.00	0.71
FPC arrange the exposure visit to other farms	1.00	0.82
After joining FPC crop yield is increased	1.00	0.68
After joining FPC cost of cultivation decreased	1.00	0.61
FPC received good support from the supporting agency	1.00	0.68
FPC received good support from the government	1.00	0.60
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis		

From observing the above Table 4, the deductions of variable carry out if the value is less than 0.5 but here all the communalities value is above 0.5, so none of the above variables were discarded while making factors and all the variables will be considered for further analysis. The result of the above table observed as follows.

- The extracted factor has accounted for 71.5% of the variance for a variable (Professional management)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 74.5% of the variance for a variable (Knowledgeable staff)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 73.2% of the variance for a variable (CEO experience in business)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 51.4% of the variance for a variable (Management interaction)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 71.9% of the variance for a variable (Information sharing)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 65.9% of the variance for a variable (Frequent contact)

- The extracted factor has accounted for 77.4% of the variance for a variable (Express view)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 71.5% of the variance for a variable (Transparency in the transaction)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 78.0% of the variance for a variable (Accurate information)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 51.3% of the variance for a variable (Timely information)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 72.0% of the variance for variable (Technical guidance)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 80.0% of the variance for a variable (Reasonable price of input)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 67.9% of the variance for a variable (Quality input)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 60.4% of the variance for a variable (Better price)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 71.9% of the

variance for a variable (Quick payment)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 82.4% of the variance for a variable (Exposure visit)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 68.7% of the variance for a variable (Crop yield is increased)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 61.0% of the variance for a variable (Cost of cultivation decrease)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 68.3% of the variance for a variable (Support of supporting agency)
- The extracted factor has accounted for 60.9% of the variance for a variable (Support of government)

Factor loading represents the degree of correlation between the particular variable and the factor. Factor loadings represent the importance of the factor and rotation is performed to bring the light relationship that was not seen previously. The Varimax rotation method helps in maximizing the number of factors.

An Eigenvalue is the sum of squared factor loadings for a particular factor. A common criterion for selecting the number of factors to be extracted from the analysis is generally based on the strength of Eigenvalues. If the Eigenvalue (I) > or equal to 1, the factor was considered as being significant.

Table 5: Total Variance Explained for the success of farmer producer company

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative%
1.	2.28	13.79	11.44	2.28	13.79	11.44	1.86	9.29	9.29
2.	1.97	11.59	21.33	1.97	11.59	21.33	1.67	8.38	17.68
3.	1.75	9.18	30.08	1.75	9.18	30.08	1.59	7.96	25.65
4.	1.60	8.07	38.10	1.60	8.07	38.10	1.55	7.77	33.42
5.	1.45	7.89	45.35	1.45	7.89	45.35	1.54	7.70	41.13
6.	1.39	6.62	52.32	1.39	6.62	52.32	1.53	7.69	48.83
7.	1.20	5.44	58.36	1.20	5.44	58.36	1.38	6.94	55.78
8.	1.09	5.18	63.81	1.09	5.18	63.81	1.31	6.55	62.33
9.	1.00	4.81	68.83	1.00	4.81	68.83	1.29	6.49	68.83
10.	0.95	4.79	73.62						
11.	0.84	4.22	77.85						
12.	0.71	3.57	81.42						
13.	0.66	3.32	84.75						
14.	0.62	3.11	87.85						
15.	0.55	2.78	90.64						
16.	0.46	2.31	92.95						
17.	0.43	2.15	95.11						
18.	0.37	1.88	97.00						
19.	0.32	1.62	98.00						
20.	0.27	1.37	100.00						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

The percentage of variance explained is a summary metric that indicates how much of the total original variation of all the variables the factor represents. When all components are considered together, they provide a complete explanation for a specific phenomenon.

The eight factors extracted from the data using the principal component analysis approach explained approximately 68.83% of the variance in farmers' attitudes towards the success of FPC. The eigenvalues-greater-than-one rule developed by Kaiser (1960) is a widely used criterion for the number of elements to rotate. It indicates that the number of trustworthy factors is equal to the number of eigenvalues greater than one. This is because an eigenvalue of 1 represents as much as variance as a single variable and the logic holds that only those factors that explain at least the same amount of variance as a single variable are worthwhile.

The coefficient of the variable expressed in terms of factors is contained in the factor matrices. These coefficients sometimes referred to as factor loadings, show how factors and variables are correlated. The strong connection between the factor and the variable is indicated by a coefficient with a high absolute value. The factors are interpreted using the coefficient of the factor matrix.

The rotated component matrix is the most significant outcome of principal components analysis. It includes estimated correlations between each variable and the calculated components. After orthogonal rotation, the rotated factor matrix is interpreted in SPSS output; the rotated factor matrix represents both the loadings and the correlations between the variables and factors. To obtain the maximum variance of the training set, rotation (orthogonal) is required. If we do not rotate the components, the effect of PCA will be diminished, and we will need to select a larger number of components to explain the variation in the training set.

It gave both a positive and a negative value, and both values were taken into account while interpreting the data. If you are interested in a linear relationship, the correlation might be positive and negative, but keep in mind that the negative numbers just indicate the direction of the association.

Table 6: Rotated Component Matrix for the success of farmer producer company

Description	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
FPC provides input at a reasonable price as compared to market	.579								
FPC provides quality input at a lower cost	.659								
Quick payment to the farmer		.749							
FPC give better price for produce		-.623							
FPC has professional management			.763						
FPC has good knowledgeable staff			-.681						
CEO has good experience in business			.556						
After joining FPC crop yield is increased				-.793					
After joining FPC cost of cultivation decreased				.613					
FPC received good support from the supporting agency					.694				
FPC received good support from the government					.712				
FPCs management interacts frequently with member						.819			
FPCs members share information with each other						.646			
FPC's knowledge person frequently contacts the all-member farmer						.457			
Members are allowed to express their feelings out loud without hesitation							.797		
FPCs all transaction is transparent							-.549		
Information given by FPC is more accurate								.791	
FPC delivered timely and useful information								.563	
FPC gives all technical guidance to the member									.891
FPC arrange the exposure visit to other farms									.476

Input perspective (9.29%)
Monetary value (8.38%)
Management team efficiency (7.96%)
Production efficiency (7.77%)
Institutional support (7.70%)
Information sharing (7.69%)
Openness (6.94%)
Reliable data (6.55%)
Training & visit (6.49%)

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

From the above table 6, we noticed there are 9 factors extracted. The first factor is loaded on two variables, including FPC providing input at a reasonable price as compared to the market (.579) and FPC providing quality input at a lower cost (.659). These variables may club together into one factor as "Input perspective". This first factor represents a 9.29% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The second factor is loaded on two variables, including quick payment to the farmer (.749) and FPC giving a better price for produce (-.623). These variables may club together into one factor as "Monetary value". This second factor represents 8.38% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The third factor is loaded on three variables, including FPC has professional management (.763), FPC has good knowledgeable staff (-.681) and the CEO has good experience in business (.556). These variables may club together into one factor as "Management team efficiency". This third factor represents a 7.96% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The fourth factor is loaded on two variables, including after joining FPC crop yield is increased (-.793) and after joining FPC cost of cultivation decrease (.613). These variables may club together into one factor as "Production efficiency". This fourth factor represents a 7.77% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The fifth factor is loaded on two variables, including FPC receiving good support from the supporting agency (.694) and FPC receiving good support from the government (.712). These variables may club together into one factor as "Institutional support". This fifth factor represents a 7.70% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The sixth factor is loaded on three variables, FPCs management interacts frequently with members (.819), FPCs members share information with each other (.646) and FPC's knowledge person frequently contact the all-member farmer (.457). These variables may club together into one factor as "Information sharing". This sixth factor represents a 7.69% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The seventh factor is loaded on two variable, including members being allowed to express their feelings out loud without hesitation (.797) and FPCs all transaction is transparent (-.549). These variables may club together into one factor as "Openness". This seventh factor represents a 6.94% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The eighth factor is loaded on two variables, including information given by FPC is more accurate (.791) and FPC delivered timely and useful information (.563). These variables may club together into one factor as "Reliable data". This eighth factor represents a 6.55% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

The ninth factor is loaded on two variables, including FPC giving all technical guidance to the member (.891) and FPC arranging the exposure visit to other farms (.476). These variables may club together into one factor as "Training & visit". This ninth factor represents a 6.49% variance in factors contributing to the success of FPC among farmer members.

Conclusion
Farmers Producers Organization offers comprehensive assistance and services to farmers, including technical support, processing, marketing and other agricultural input components. FPCs engaged in business expansion and the introduction of various initiatives for the welfare of the farmers. Overall, our findings tend to show that FPC functions fairly well from the view of member farmers and provides a variety of services to farmers. Farmers' opinions about the Farmer Producer Company were quite favorable, which demonstrates how farmers can gain profit from FPC in a variety of ways, from purchasing agri-inputs to selling finished goods. Several success factors were discovered, including input perspective, monetary value, management team efficiency, efficiency in production, institutional support, sharing of information, openness, and reliable data.

References
1. Agahi H, Karami S. Study of factors effecting social capital management and its impact on success of production cooperatives. Annals of Biological Research. 2012;3(8):4179-4188.
2. Fischer E, Qaim M. Smallholder farmers and collective action: what determines the intensity of participation? Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2014;65(3):683-702.
3. Gorai SK, Panja A. Increasing Farmers' Income through Collective Action and Value Addition: Success Story of Srijoni Green Producer Company Limited. 2021;2(3):33-36
4. Junior ODPO, Wander AE. Factors for the success of agricultural cooperatives in Brazil. Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics (JARTS). 2021;122(1):27-42.
5. Marbaniang EK, Chauhan JK, Kharumnuid P. Farmer Producer Organization (FPO): the need of the hour. AGRICULTURE & FOOD: e-Newsletter; c2019. e-ISSN: 2581-8317.
6. Markelova H, Meinzen-Dick R, Hellin J, Dohrn S. Collective action for smallholder market access. Food policy. 2009;34(1):1-7.
7. Mourya M, Mehta M. Farmer producer company: India's magic bullet to realise select SDGs? International Journal of Rural Management. 2021;17(1):115S-147S.
8. Mukherjee A, Singh P, Shubha K, Burman RR. Facilitating and hindering factors affecting growth and functioning of farmers producer companies in India. Indian Journal of Extension Education. 2019;55(4):14-20.
9. Pandian VJ, Ganesan M. A study of factors influencing the success of farmers' producer company in Kancheepuram District, Tamil Nadu State in India. Anthropologist. 2019;35(1-3):57-64.
10. Pani SK, Jena D, Parida NR. Farmer producers company in India: Status and policy implications on marginal and small farmers. 2020;9(4):801-810.
11. Prabhakar I, Manjunatha BL, Nithyashree ML, Hajong D. Farmers Producer Company--An Innovative Farmers' Institution. Environment and Ecology. 2012;30(2):427-430.
12. Roy D, Thorat A. Success in high value horticultural export markets for the small farmers: The case of Mahagrapes in India. World development. 2008;36(10):1874-1890.
13. Saxena A. Management and Governance of Farmer Producer Organisations: A Stakeholder Theory Lens.
14. Singh S. Producer companies as new generation cooperatives. Economic and Political Weekly. 2008;43:22-24.
15. Valentinov V. Why are cooperatives important in agriculture? An organizational economics perspective. Journal of institutional Economics. 2007;3(1):55-69.
16. Vinayak N, Premlata S, Arathy A, Shiv K. Farmer producer organisations: innovative institutions for upliftment of small farmers. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2019;89(9):1383-1392.
17. Agriculture Census; c2015-16. Retrieved from https://agcensus.nic.in/