FARMER'S PERCEPTION TOWARDS FDI IN RETAIL IN INDIA

Khujan Singh*

ABSTRACT

After battling stiff opposition, on 14 Sep 2012 Government of India allowed 51 percent foreign investment in multi-brand retail.. This move was backed by the corporate as well as the large farm lobbies by saying that FDI will be helpful for the required growth in the retail industry, farmers and consumers. Today, Small Indian farmers realize only 1/3rd of the total price paid by the final Indian consumer. According to the Farmer leaders biggest problem of farmers is marketing. The FDI in retail can open alternative avenues for the farm product of farmers. Therefore, this study is an attempt to know the farmer's thinking towards FDI in retail. This study is based on primary data collected through a questionnaire consist of 10 statement on 5 point likert scale. The farmers who are linked with Mother dairy, WalMart and reliance freash of Haryana and Himachal Pardesh constitute the size of the population. The data has been analysed with the help of one way – ANOVA for testing equality on the basis of farmer's area, company, age, education and agricultural land of respondent. No significant difference has been found among the 05 area's of respondent with regard to the MNC retail sourcing supply of farm goods direct from fields, FDI in retail should be implemented immediately. No significant difference has been found among the 03 groups on the basis of respondent retail company at any level with regards to Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits. No significant difference has been found on the basis of age in the perception of famers with respects to the statement like -Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsony power to keep farm produce price low and no significant difference has been found on the basis of education of respondent in the perception of farmers towards- Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low, MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade and MNC buy quality vegetable and fruits. Hence , in all these cases null hypothesis is acknowledged.

***Key words**: Single brand, Multi brand, Organized retail, Foreign direct investment.*

*Assistant Professor, Haryana School Of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University Of Science & Technology,Hisar

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the liberalization of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policy of the Indian Economy in 1991 the multinational corporations have been keenly waiting for the opening of the Indian retail sector for the FDI, because in a recent survey by UNCTAD India has been projected as the second most attractive destination for FDI (only after China) for multinational corporations during the years 2010-2012. Although, the Indian retail market is presently more unorganized and extremely fragmented, with an estimated 13-15 million outlets countrywide. The overall retail market is expected to grow at a CAGR of about 11-13 per cent by 2020-21, with the organized retail market expanding at 21-24 percent. According to Global Retail Development Index (GRDI) 2012, Brazil is the most alluring market for investment in the retail sector, followed by Chile (second), China (third), Uruguay (fourth) and India (fifth).

The FDI inflows in single-brand retail trading during April 2000 to December 2012 stood at US$ 42.70 million, as per the data released by Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion (DIPP). Between 2000 to 2010, Indian retail was able to attract about $1.8 billion FDI, representing a very small 1.5% of total investment flow into India. India has only 5386 stand-alone cold storages, having a total capacity of 23.6 million metric tons. However, 80 percent of this storage capacity is being used only for potatoes. The remaining infrastructure capacity is less than 1% of the annual farm output of India and which is not enough during peak harvest seasons. Due to a number of intermediaries involved in the traditional Indian retail chain, norms are flouted and pricing lacks transparency. Small Indian farmers realize only 1/3rd of the total price paid by the final Indian consumer.

1.1 Indian Retail Industrial Policy

The wholesale trading sector was opened for FDI in 1997 under the approval route allowed with prior Government approval. In 2000, the policy incorporated the supplement of “cash and carry trading” to the wholesale trading sector. On 10 February 2006, the wholesale trading or cash-and-carry trading sector was put under the automatic route. On the same day in February 2006, the Government also announced its unique proposition of allowing 51 per cent FDI in single brand retail trading under the approval route. The FDI inflows in Single-Brand product retail amounts to a very negligible percentage of the total FDI inflow into the Indian Economy. In 2008, the Government contemplated opening up the retail sector and allowing 100 per cent FDI in single-brand retail trading and 51 per cent FDI in multi-brand retailing. However, it could not succeed due to fierce opposition from its allies and the Left parties as well as the local trade associations.

After battling stiff opposition, on 14 Sep 2012 government allowed 51 percent foreign investment in multi-brand retail but left it to the states to permit global retailers open stores. FDI will be helpful for the required growth in the retail industry, farmers and consumers. The important features of this FDI policy are the following:

- The minimum investment in multi-brand segment would be of USD 100 million with 50 percent of it in rural areas.
- The firms will also have to source 30 percent of their products from Micro and Small & Medium Enterprises where FDI is 51 percent and above.
- It has also tweaked the sourcing norms for FDI exceeding 50 percent in single brand retail, requiring foreign firms, which want a relaxation of the 30 percent procurement norms, to set up manufacturing facilities in the country.
- Under the norms, 50 percent of total investment will have to be invested in 'backend infrastructure' within three years of the induction of FDI.
- As far as the urban areas are concerned, they will be allowed to open stores only in cities with a population of more than one million, while in the case of hilly states, it will be up to the respective state governments,.

FDI in multi brand retail trading, in all products, will be permitted, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Fresh agricultural produce, including fruits, vegetables, flowers, grains, pulses, fresh poultry, fishery and meat products, may be unbranded.

(ii) Minimum amount to be brought in, as FDI by the foreign investor, would be US $ 100 million.

(iii) At least 50% of total FDI brought in shall be invested in 'backend infrastructure' within three years of the first tranche of FDI, where back-end infrastructure. Expenditure on land cost and rentals, if any, will not be counted for purposes of backend infrastructure.

(iv) At least 30% of the value of procurement of manufactured/ processed products purchased shall be sourced from Indian 'small industries' which have a total investment in plant & machinery not exceeding US $ 1.00 million.

(v) Self-certification by the company, to ensure compliance of the conditions at serial nos. (ii), (iii) and (iv) above, which could be cross-checked, as and when required. Accordingly, the investors shall maintain accounts, duly certified by statutory auditors.

(vi) Retail sales outlets may be set up only in cities with a population of more than 10 lakh as per 2011 Census and may also cover an area of 10 kms around the municipal/urban agglomeration limits of such cities. In States/ Union Territories not having cities with population of more than 10 lakh as per 2011 Census, retail sales outlets may be set up in the cities of their choice, preferably the largest city and may also cover an area of 10 kms around the municipal/urban agglomeration limits of such cities

1.2 Farmer’s opinion regarding FDI in retail sector in India

The corporate as well as the large farm lobbies backed the government's decision to allow foreign supermarkets to set up shop in the country, saying that it will shorten the supply chain and get growers a larger share of the final selling price. Most farmers, however, want the government to go a step further and make it mandatory for retailers to buy 75% of their produce directly from farmers, bypassing the restrictive 'mandi' auction system. The big farmers are in favour of FDI in retail sector. Bharat Krishak Samaj, a farm lobby with more than 75,000 members, supports this on the condition that direct procurement from farmers should be made mandatory. Farmers' body CIFA has thanked the government for allowing 51 per cent FDI in multi brand retail and has also written to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, saying that farm sector growth was hampered due to lack of modern technologies, inadequate investments and restricted market policies. The FDI, which will enable investments in technology, will help 5 lakhs villages in having infrastructure, trained manpower and other facilities. This will enable contract farming, which provides assured price and also price discovery mechanism.

Farmer leaders say that the strong hold of middlemen and traders is at the root of rural poverty and India's food inflation and farmers' biggest problem is marketing. The thumb rule of price rise from a farmer to a consumer in perishables such as fruits and vegetables is 1:2:3:4, said S Baskar Reddy, joint director (agriculture & rural development) at FICCI. Whatever a farmer sells for

Rs1 is sold at the mandi of Rs 2, which becomes of Rs.3 at the mandi at the consumption centre and Rs 4 when it reaches the consumer through a retailer.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Palmade, Vincent and Anayiotas, Andrea(2004) studied the FDI trends in developing countries and specify that the fall in foreign direct investment (FDI) since 1999, and China‘s growing share, worry most developing countries. But an in-depth look reveals new and promising trends. Mukherjee and Patel (2005) found that foreign retailers are working with small manufacturers for in-house labels and are providing them technologies like packaging technologies and bar coding. Popli & Singh(2010) concluded that he perception of consumers, industrialists, academicians and policy makers in respect of the organized and unorganized retailers keep on changing because the unorganized retailers play a dominant role by offering products or services to the consumers at the convenient locations. Singh Jitender (2011) studied the impact of organized retail chains on revenue of farmers of Haryana and terms and conditions of the procurement contracts of Mother Dairy and Reliance Fresh. It has been found that bylaws, Reliance Fresh is much better than the Mother Dairy procurement contract in terms of price information, quality monitoring, mode of payments. The relatively simple contract of Reliance Fresh provides an edge to the Company to attract better quality of the product. However it does not mean that the Mother Dairy does not put up an incentive to grow more and better quality to the farmer. In short the direct procurement of the MD has also enhanced the farmer s revenue. Rajput el at (2012) analyzed the impact of the present retail FDI policy on Indian consumers and economy using SWOT analysis and found a positive impact on the growth of Indian economy as a whole. This extraordinary rise in multiple brands has given Indian consumers a wider choice of products. According to Roy & Kumar (2012) foreign direct investment in Indian retail business reveals that though the impact is likely affect self employment of the people like small businessmen and middlemen but the farmers are likely to be benefited in absence of public sector marketing infrastructure. Bisaria Gaurav (2012) studied the people choice towards Foreign Direct Investment in Retail in India by collecting the primary data from 100 respondents of Lucknow society by using random sampling. The finding shows that majority of people are supporting the FDI in retail. Pawar & Kodag (2012) stressed upon the need of basic capital investment in the area of Agricultural as well as Retail Sector and the FDI will gives a boost to our Agricultural and Retail Sector. Ultimately consumers will be benefited in next 4-5 years.

Only necessity is that Government should implement strict policies about FDI as well interest of the retailers in India should be protected by controlling FDI and it can be done through positive political willpower.

3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVE

After reviewing the literature it has been found that FDI in retail is helpful for the economic development of any country. Therefore, the Govt. and Farmer's organizations are expecting that the FDI in retail will be helpful in the upliftment of the farmers and their economic conditions, as India is country of 600 million farmers, 1,200 million consumers and only 5 million traders. According to the Farmer leaders biggest problem of farmers is marketing. The strong hold of middlemen and traders is at the root of marketing problem of farmer's procurement, rural poverty and India's food inflation. The FDI in retail can open alternative avenues for the farm product of farmers. Now important question is that, whether the direct purchase by large retailers will solve the problem of farmers or not? It is said that the ultimate beneficiaries of FDI in retail may be the farmers and for that reason farmers viewpoint is important regarding FDI in retail. Therefore, an Endeavour has been made to study the "**Farmer's Perception Towards FDI in Retail in India".**

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

To achieved the above objective the following methodology has been applied:

- Ho1: There is no significant difference on the basis of **Area** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.
- Ho2: There is no significant difference on the basis of retail **Company** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.
- Ho3: There is no significant difference on the basis of **Age** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.
- Ho4: There is no significant difference on the basis of level of **Education** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.
- Ho5: There is no significant difference on the basis of **Agricultural Land** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.

This is primary data based study financed by my University, for which a questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire consist of 10 statement on 5 point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The farmers who are linked with Mother dairy, WalMart and Reliance Freash of Haryana and Himachal Pardesh constitute the size of the population. The sample for the study has been taken by using random sampling method. A sample of 300 farmers has been taken for collection of data, out of which only 258 completely filled questionnaires have been selected for analysis i.e. 30 from Pataudi (Gurgoan), 44 from Kundli (Sonipat), 17 from Ugra kheri (Panipat), 33 from Shahbad (Kurukshetra) and 134 from around Shimla. The data has been analysed with the help of one way – ANOVA for testing equality on the basis of farmer's area, company, age, education and agricultural land of respondent. The data has been analysed with the help of IBM SPSS statistics 20.0.

5. FARMER'S PERCEPTION TOWARDS FDI IN RETAIL IN INDIA

The table no 1 of Annexure makes a comparison between 05 groups on the basis of Area of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. The Null Hypothesis is that, there is no significant difference on the basis of **Area** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. Significant differences among these 05 groups has been noticed at 01 percent level (F=3.733; p- value=.006) with regards to FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income, therefore null hypothesis is rejected. Significant differences among these 05 groups has also been found at 01 percent level (F=5.033; p- value=.001) with regards to FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers, Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low (F=5.649; p-value=.000), MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade (F=9.546; p-value=.000), FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=6.199; p-value=.000) and FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=5.576; p-value=.000). Significant differences among these 05 groups has been establish at 05 percent level with regards to Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits (F=3.136; p- value=.015.No significant difference has been found among the 05 areas of respondent at any level with relation to that the MNC retail sourcing supply of farm goods direct from fields(F=1.956; p-value=..102), FDI in retail should be implemented immediately (F=.717; p-value=.581).Therefore null hypothesis is accepted in case of these statements.

The table no 2 of annexure makes a comparison between 03 groups on the basis of retail company of the respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. The Null hypothesis is that, there is no significant difference on the basis of company of the respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. Significant differences among these 05 groups has been established at 01 percent level (F=7.966; p- value=.000) with regards toFDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income. On the basis of mean value of Mother dairy it can be understood that farmers perception is very indifferent towards Mother Dairy. Significant differences among these 03 groups has also been found at 01 percent level (F=6.744; p- value=.001) with regards to FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers(F=13.957; p-value=.000), Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low (F=20.446; p-value=.000), MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade (F=27.172; p-value=.000), the MNC retail sourcing supply of farm goods direct from fields(F=14.111; p-value=.000), FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=17.205; p-value=.000), FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=15.380; p-value=.000), FDI in retail should be implemented immediately (F=7.477; p-value=.001). In all the above statements null hypothesis is rejected.

No significant difference has been found among the 03 groups on the basis of respondent retail company at any level with regards to Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits(F=.678; p- value=.509, In view of these result, it is now established that null hypothesis is true and accepted.

The table no 3 of annexure makes a comparison between 05 groups on the basis of Age of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. Null hypothesis is that, there is no significant difference on the basis of **Age** of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI. Significant differences among these 05 groups has been noticed at 01 percent level (F=7.576; p- value=.000) with regards to FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income because old people group's mean score is more in comparison to the younger group. Significant differences among these 05 groups has also been found at 01 percent level (F=8.852; p- value=.000) with regards to FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers. It is significant differently, because age-wise mean score is very different. FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=3.912; p-value=.004) and FDI in retail should be implemented immediately (F=4.901; p-value=.001), consequently in all of the above statements the null hypothesis is redundant and it can be concluded that as the people are becoming older and older their perception towards FDI in retail is keep on changing.

Significant differences among the 05 Age groups has been ascertain at 05 percent level in relation to FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=2.442; p-value=.047) as a result null hypothesis is discarded.

There is no significant difference on the basis of age in the perception of famers with respects to the statement like -Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low, As a result here null hypothesis is acknowledged.

The table no 4 of annexure explain a comparison between 05 groups on the basis of Education of respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India. Null hypothesis is that, there is no significant difference on the basis of Education of respondent. Significant differences among these 05 groups has been noticed at 01 percent level (F=6.370; p- value=.000) with regards to FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income, here it is different because as the education level goes up mean score trend is found downward. Once again there is significant differences among these 05 groups at 01 percent level (F=9.298; p- value=.000) with regards to FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers. The reason be that as the education increases awareness level also increases. The MNC retail sourcing supply of farm goods direct from fields(F=8.852; p-value=.000), FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing (F=5.645; p-value=.000) and FDI in retail should be implemented immediately (F=6.481; p-value=.001), accordingly in all of the above statements the null hypothesis is disused and it can be concluded that as the education level of the people increases they become more cautious, it is also reflected from their mean score i.e as the education level of the people increases their mean score found decreasing. Majority of the farmer's stage of education is up to 10+2, Graduates and post graduate are account only less than 20% of the sample. Otherwise it could be concluded that there is no significant difference.

There is no significant difference on the basis of education of respondent in the perception of farmers towards these statement like - Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low, MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade and MNC buy quality vegetable and fruits. Here null hypothesis is acknowledged. Majority of the farmer's stage of education is up to 10+2, therefore it can be concluded that they are afraid of consequences of FDI in retail, therefore they are extra cautious.

The table no 1.5 of annexure elaborate a comparison between 05 groups on the basis of agricultural land of the respondent regarding farmer's perception towards FDI in retail in India.

There is significant difference on the basis of agricultural land at 05 percent level with regards to FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers (F=2.510; p- value=.042), in this case highest mean score has been found i.e. 4.13 of the group of 2.5 acres to 5 acres and than marginal farmer's group i.e. less than 2.5acres land. The mean score of these groups are not reflecting any trend or not able to explain the difference between the groups.

There is no significant difference on the basis of agricultural land of respondent in the perception of farmers towards these statement like - FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income, Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years, Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low, MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade, MNC buy quality vegetable and fruits, FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing and FDI in retail should be implemented immediately Here null hypothesis is acknowledged

CONCLUSION

It is now established that the MNC retail company will source procurement of farm goods direct from fields, Retail MNCs always buy the quality vegetables and fruits. But farmers are in doubt that Wall mart like MNC will use their monopsonic power to keep farm produce price low. The good thing for farmers may be that MNC will disrupt long and tested time based channels of trade. Therefore, it can be said the Government has taken the right step and FDI in retail should be implemented immediately.

REFERENCES

1. Palmade., Vincent and Anayiotas, Andrea.,(2004). FDI Trends - Looking Beyond the Current Gloom in Developing Countries, The World Bank group private sector development vice presidency, September 2004, note number 273
2. Mukherjee A., and Patel N., (2005). FDI in Retail Sector: India, Academic Foundation, New Delhi.
3. Popli G.S., & Singh.S.,(2010). Impact of Multi Brand Foreign Direct Investment in Retail Sector in India
4. Ghosal S. & Srinivas N. N.,(2011). FDI in India: Farmer bodies throw their weight behind retail FDI", ET Bureau Dec 1, 2011, 01.19pm IST

5 Bisaria G., (2012). Foreign Direct Investment in Retail in India: International Journal of Engineering and Management Research, Vol. 2, Issue-1, 2250-0758 Pages: 31-36

6 Kearney A.T., (2012). Global Retail Development Index, the 11th annual edition

7 Pawar S. R. and Kodag V. B.(2012). Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) And Indian Retail Market Tactful Management Research Journal Vol. 1(1) ,

8 Rajput .N., Kesharwani. S. & Khanna .A., (2012) FDI and Indian Retail Sector: An Analysis Vol. 1(1) .Journal of Business Administration Research.

9 Roy M., and Kumar S., (2012). Foreign Direct Investment in Agricultural Retailing in India International Conference on Humanities, Economics and Geography (ICHEG'2012) March 17-18, 2012 Bangkok.

Reports and Circulations

1. Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion (2010). Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in Multi-Brand Retail Trading," Discussion paper. Available at http://www.dipp.nic.in. 06July2010.pdf
2. Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion Ministry of Commerce and Industry Government of India, CIRCULAR 1 OF 2013
3. Jitender Singh*(2011),* "Impact Of Organized Retail Chains On Revenue Of Farmer (A Case Study Of Mother Dairy Centre S In Haryana)", *Assistant Director*, Research Studies, Office Of The Economic Adviser,Department Of Industrial Policy And Promotion Ministry Of Commerce & Industry Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi India 2011

ANNEXURE 1

TABLE NO. 1.1 : ANOVA ANALYSIS ON THE BASIS OF RESPONDENT AREA (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE)

Statements (Dependent)	**Mean score**					**ANOVA**	
	Pataudi 30	Kundli 44	Panipat 17	Shahbad 33	Shimla 134	F	Sig.
FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income.	3.6333	3.8636	4.2353	3.9394	4.2313	3.733	.006*
Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years	3.2000	2.8864	3.9412	3.1818	3.1642	3.387	.010**

FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers.	4.0667	3.5682	3.6471	3.5758	4.1940	5.033	.001*
MNCs like Walmart will use their monopsonic power to keep the farm produce at low price.	3.7333	2.7955	2.9412	3.0000	3.3657	5.649	.000*
MNCs will disrupt long and time tested channels of trade.	3.0000	2.6818	3.7059	1.7879	2.9627	9.546	.000*
Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits	3.9667	4.6364	4.5882	4.2424	4.5000	3.136	.015**
The best thing about the MNC retail sourcing is that the supply of farm goods is direct from fields.	4.1667	3.8864	4.4118	3.6364	4.0522	1.956	.102
FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing	4.2000	4.0000	3.6471	4.6364	4.1567	6.199	.000*
FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing	2.5000	3.3409	3.5294	2.7879	2.6119	5.576	.000*
FDI in retail should be implemented immediately	4.3668	4.2500	4.6471	4.3030	4.3582	.717	.581

*Significant at 01 percent, ** Significant at 05 percent and *** Significant at 10 percent

Table no. 1.2 : ANOVA Analysis on the basis of Respondent Retail Company (Independent Variable)

Statements (Dependent)	**Mean Score**		**ANOVA**		
	Reliance Fresh 161	Walmart 58	MotherDairy 39	F	Sig.
FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income.	4.1739	4.1034	3.5385	7.996	.000*
Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years	3.2422	3.3448	2.6410	6.744	.001*
FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers.	3.9255	4.4483	3.3590	13.975	.000*
MNCs like Walmart will use their monopsonic power to keep the farm produce at low price.	3.1118	3.8966	2.7692	20.446	.000*

MNCs will disrupt long and time tested channels of trade.	2.4472	3.7241	3.0000	27.172	.000*
Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits	4.4472	4.5000	4.2821	.678	.509
The best thing about the MNC retail sourcing is that the supply of farm goods is direct from fields.	4.0062	4.4655	3.3333	14.111	.000*
FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing	4.3106	4.1552	3.5641	17.205	.000*
FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing	3.0311	2.0862	2.9487	15.380	.000*
FDI in retail should be implemented immediately	4.3789	4.5690	3.9231	7.477	.001*

*Significant at 01 percent,

Table no. 1.3: ANOVA Analysis on the basis of Respondent AGE (Independent Variable)

Statements (Dependent)	**Mean score**					**ANOVA**	
	20-30 years (53)	30 -40 years (55)	40-50 years (93)	50-60 years (36)	60-above years (21)	F	Sig.
FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income.	3.5660	3.9636	4.2258	4.1944	4.6190	7.576	.000*
Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years	3.0755	3.1636	3.2473	3.2778	2.9524	.578	.678
FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers.	3.2453	4.0909	4.2151	4.0278	4.1429	8.852	.000*
MNCs like Walmart will use their monopsonic power to keep the farm produce at low price.	3.0566	3.2727	3.2473	3.3333	3.3810	.626	.644
MNCs will disrupt long and time tested channels of trade.	2.8679	2.6364	2.7957	3.0556	2.8571	.641	.634
Retail MNCs buy the quality	4.2830	4.4545	4.4946	4.6667	4.0952	1.72	.145

vegetables and fruits						5	
The best thing about the MNC retail sourcing is that the supply of farm goods is direct from fields.	3.4151	4.2000	4.1505	4.1944	4.0476	5.45 9	.000*
FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing	3.8679	4.1636	4.3548	4.0556	4.2381	3.91 2	.004*
FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing	3.0000	2.8545	2.5161	3.0278	3.0952	2.44 2	.047**
FDI in retail should be implemented immediately	3.9623	4.3455	4.5054	4.3333	4.7143	4.90 1	.001*

*Significant at 01 percent, ** Significant at 05 percent

Table no. 1.4: ANOVA Analysis on the basis of Respondent EDUCATION level (Independent Variable)

Statements (Dependent)	Mean score					ANOVA	
	8th&< 8th (79)	**Metric (83)**	**10+2 (51)**	**Graduation (24)**	**PG (21)**	**F**	**Sig.**
FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income.	4.2658	4.0241	4.2745	3.7083	3.3333	6.370	.000*
Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years	3.2658	3.2289	3.2353	3.0000	2.6667	1.748	.140
FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers.	4.1519	4.0482	4.2157	3.2500	3.0476	9.298	.000*
MNCs like Walmart will use their monopsonic power to keep the farm produce at low price.	3.3418	3.1807	3.2353	3.2500	3.0476	.458	.767
MNCs will disrupt long and time tested channels of trade.	2.5949	3.0120	2.9412	2.7083	2.7143	1.332	.258
Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits	4.3924	4.4940	4.5490	4.5000	4.0000	1.499	.203
The best thing about the MNC retail sourcing is that the supply of farm	4.1139	4.1446	4.2353	3.7500	2.8095	8.852	.000*

goods is direct from fields.							
FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing	4.3418	4.2892	4.0196	3.8750	3.6667	5.645	.000*
FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing	2.8734	2.8554	2.5882	2.5833	3.1429	1.165	.327
FDI in retail should be implemented immediately	4.4557	4.4217	4.5490	3.9583	3.6667	6.481	.000*

*Significant at 01 percent, ** Significant at 05 percent and *** Significant at 10 percent

Table no. 1.5: ANOVA Analysis on the basis of Respondent AGRICULTURAL LAND (Independent Variable)

Statements (Dependent)	Mean score					ANOVA	
	<2.5 Acres (52)	2.5-5 Acres (116)	5-10 Acres (39)	10-20 Acres (24)	Above 20 Acres (27)	F	Sig.
FDI in retail will have positive effect on farmer's income.	4.1346	4.1121	4.0000	3.8750	3.9630	.535	.710
Exploitation of farmers by retail MNCs increase after 3-4 years	3.0000	3.2155	3.1795	3.2083	3.2963	.523	.719
FDI will be beneficial for the small farmers.	3.9038	4.1293	3.8974	3.4167	3.8889	2.510	.042**
MNCs like Walmart will use their monopsonic power to keep the farm produce at low price.	3.0192	3.4138	3.0513	3.0417	3.3333	2.143	.076

MNCs will disrupt long and time tested channels of trade.	2.5962	2.8190	2.9487	2.6250	3.2222	1.363	.247
Retail MNCs buy the quality vegetables and fruits	4.4423	4.3448	4.4872	4.5833	4.5926	.644	.632
The best thing about the MNC retail sourcing is that the supply of farm goods is direct from fields.	3.7308	4.1293	4.0513	4.2083	3.7778	1.771	.135
FDI in retail will broke the monopoly of the specific business classes having the license of market committee	3.4231	3.7069	3.5128	4.1667	3.8519	2.837	.025**
Today farmers and farming are suffering much more from marketing imperfection and inefficiencies than anything else.	3.4808	3.5603	3.8718	4.1250	4.2963	4.520	.002**
FDI in retail will overcome some deficiencies of agricultural marketing	4.1346	4.2759	3.9744	4.2083	3.9630	1.784	.132
FDI in retail will overcome all deficiencies of agricultural marketing	2.7308	2.6897	3.1026	3.0833	2.7778	1.276	.280
FDI in retail should be implemented immediately	4.2500	4.2586	4.5128	4.4583	4.6296	1.766	.136

*Significant at 01 percent, ** Significant at 05 perce and *** Significant at 10 percent