

Published on: 1st March 2012



SUCCESS –FAILURE OF CASHEW NUT PROCESSOR OF KONKAN REGION

S.S.SHINDE-DESAI¹, R.R.KAWALE¹, P.A.SAWANT¹ AND J.S.DHEKALE²

¹ DEPT. OF EXTENSION EDUCATION,

Dr.B.S.KONKAN KRISHI VIDYAPEETH DAPOLI.

² DEPT OF AGRIL.ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS,

Dr.B.S.KONKAN KRISHI VIDYAPEETH DAPOLI.

kawale.rakesh@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Due to increased area and production of cashew in the Konkan region, cashew nut processing industry has gained much importance. Looking to the employment and income generation potential of the industry, many cashew nut processing units of different capacities have been established in the region. Some of them are functioning successfully, while some are sick. The reasons thereof need to be understood. Besides, there are few questions that need to be answered, What is socio-economic condition of the cashew nut processors?, What are the factors contributing to the success or failure of cashew processing enterprise?, Keeping these issues and questions in mind, the present study was conducted.

KEY WORDS: Success, Failure, Cashew Nut, Processor, Konkan region.

INTRODUCTION:

The present study was conducted in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg districts of the Konkan region of the Maharashtra state, since those are the major cashew producing districts and also have good number of cashew nut processing industries.

The specific objectives of the study were as under

- 1) To study the personal, socio-economic and psychological profile of the cashew nut processors.
- 2) To identify the factors associated with the success-failure of cashew nut processing enterprise.

METHODOLOGY

The large numbers of cashew nut processing units are in operation in the two selected districts. The list of the micro and small cashew nut processing units was collected from the District Industry Centre and office of the Department of Agriculture at district level. From the list, total 100 units (50 micro and 50 small) were selected by random sampling method. Personal interview technique was used for data collection. An interview schedule was prepared in Marathi, so as to collect the information in line with the objectives of the study. It was developed into two parts. Part first included the questions about selected personal and socio-economic characteristics of the cashew nut processors. Part second of the schedule was designed to know the, factors contributing to success-failure of an enterprise.

FINDINGS:

The findings of the present study, in line with the objectives of the study, are given hereunder. The findings of the present study, in line with the objectives of the study, are given hereunder.

14.1 Profile of the cashew nut processors

The data in this regard are presented in Table 1

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents according to their personal, socio- economic and psychological profile.

psychological profile.				
Sl. No.	Characteristic(s) and categories	Respondents		
		Micro (n=50)	Small (n=50)	Overall (N=100)
1. Age (years)				
1.	Young (up to 41)	8 (16.00)	4 (8.00)	12 (12.00)
2.	Middle (42 to 55 years)	38 (76.00)	32(64.00)	70 (70.00)
3.	Old (56 yrs. and above)	4 (8.00)	14(28.00)	18(18.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average age (Yrs.)	46.3	49.62	47.96
't' = 2.45 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
2. Education				
1.	Pre-primary	-	-	-
2.	Primary	-	-	-
3.	Secondary	15(30.00)	9(18.00)	24(24.00)
4.	Higher secondary	16(32.00)	22(44.00)	38(38.00)
5.	College	19(38.00)	19 (38.00)	38(38.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average (std.)	12.16	12.46	12.31
't' = 0.81 Non- significant d.f.= 98				
3. Major occupation				
1.	Wage earner	-	-	-
2.	Farming	11 (22.00)	-	11(11.00)
3.	Business	39 (78.00)	50(100.00)	89(89.00)
4.	Service	-	-	-
5.	Fishing	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	5.78	6	5.89
't' = 3.71 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
4. Family size (No.)				
1.	Small (upto 3)	3 (6.00)	-	3(3.00)
2.	Medium (4 to 5)	47 (94.00)	32 (64.00)	79 (79.00)
3.	Large (6 and above)	-	18 (36.00)	18 (18.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	4.08	4.98	4.53
't' = 5.71 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
5. Annual Income (Rs.)				
1.	Low (upto 2.46.881)	20 (40.00)	-	20 (20.00)

2.	Medium (2,46,882 to 6,54,598)	30 (60.00)	38 (76.00)	68 (68.00)
3.	High (6,54,599 and above)	-	12 (24.00)	12 (12.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	2,91,480	6,10,000	4,50,740
't' = 12.55 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
6. Land Holding (ha)				
1.	Marginal (Up to 1.00 ha)	14 (28.00)	-	14 (14.00)
2.	Small (1.01 to 2.00)	15 (30.00)	-	15(15.00)
3.	Semi-medium (2.01 to 4.00)	19 (38.00)	21 (40.00)	40 (40.00)
4.	Medium (4.01 to 10.00)	2 (4.00)	29 (58.00)	31 (31.00)
5.	Large (10.01 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average (ha.)	2.38	4.83	3.60
't' = 10.19 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
7. Mass media exposure (Score)				
1.	Low (upto 6)	24 (48.00)	15 (30.00)	39 (39.00)
2.	Medium (7 to 8)	26 (52.00)	35 (70.00)	61(61.00)
3.	High (9 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	6.26	7.18	6.72
't' = 4.17 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
8. Cosmopoliteness (Score)				
1.	Low (upto 11)	17 (34.00)	5 (10.00)	22 (22.00)
2.	Medium (12 to 15)	32 (64.00)	36 (72.00)	68 (68.00)
3.	High (16 and above)	1 (2.00)	9 (18.00)	10 (10.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	12.00	14.16	13.8
't' = 5.49 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
9.Size of cashew orchard (ha)				
1	Small (up to 1)	25 (50.00)	3(6.00)	28 (28.00)
2	Medium (2 to 4)	24 (48.00)	43 (86.00)	67 (67.00)
3	Large (5 and above)	1 (2.00)	4 (8.00)	5 (5.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	1.73	3.31	2.52
't' =7.42 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
10.Yield of cashew nut (Kg)				
1	Low (up to 794)	7 (14.00)	-	7 (7.00)
2	Medium (795 to 1057)	38 (76.00)	45 (90.00)	83 (83.00)
3	High (1058 and above)	5 (10.00)	5 (10.00)	10 (10.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	909	949	926
't' = 1.46 Non-Significant d.f.= 98				
11.Availability of raw material (Kg)				
1	Low (up to 15333)	25 (50.00)	-	25 (25.00)

2	Medium (15334 to 55450)	25 (50.00)	33 (66.00)	58 (58.00)
3	High (55451 and above)	-	17 (34.00)	17 (17.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average (std.)	19179.8	51603	35391
't' = 13.78		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98

12.Availability of cash credit (Rs.)				
1	Low (up to 8,72,032)	25 (50.00)	-	25 (25.00)
2	Medium (87,20,33 to 38,54,168)	23 (46.00)	25 (50.00)	48 (48.00)
3	High (38,54,169 and above)	2 (4.00)	25 (50.00)	27 (27.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	10,51,200	36,75,000	23,63,100
‘t’ = 18.74		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
13.Availability of storage space (Sq.foot)				
1	Less than sufficient (up to 258)	27 (54.00)	-	27 (27.00)
2	Sufficient (259 to 625)	23 (46.00)	43 (86.00)	66 (66.00)
3	More than sufficient (626 and above)	-	7 (14.00)	7 (7.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	294	588	441.2
‘t’ =13.53		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
14.Location of the unit (Km.)				
1	Nearest (up to 6)	15 (30.00)	15 (30.00)	30 (30.00)
2	Somewhat near (7 to 17)	24 (48.00)	23 (46.00)	47 (47.00)
3	Far away (18 and above)	11 (22.00)	12 (24.00)	23 (23.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	11.32	11.32	11.32
‘t’ =0.001		Non-significant		d.f.= 98
15.Availability of Infrastructure.				
1	Road	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
2	Electricity	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
3	Water	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
4	Labour	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages)

15.3. Success -failure of cashew nut enterprise

The findings pertaining to success-failure of the cashew nut processing enterprise and factors influencing it are presented in this part.

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents according to their success –failure in enterprise

Sl. No	Components of success-failure	Respondents (N=100)		
		Micro	Small	Overall
1.	Gross return gained (%)			
1	Total loss of investment	-	-	-
2	Upto 119	11 (22.00)	2 (4.00)	13 (13.00)
3	120 to 121	16 (32.00)	11 (22.00)	27 (27.00)
4	122 to 123	6 (12.00)	25 (50.00)	31 (31.00)
5	124 to 125	9 (18.00)	12 (24.00)	21 (21.00)
6	126 and above	8 (16.00)	-	8 (8.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	120.89	122.1	121.5
‘t’=2.57		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
	Gross return gained (score)			
1	Low (up to 14)	7 (14.00)	12 (24.00)	19 (19.00)
2	Medium (15 to 28)	32 (64.00)	26 (52.00)	58 (58.00)
3	High (29 and above)	11 (22.00)	12 (24.00)	23 (23.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	20.52	22.2	21.36
‘t’ =1.21		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
2.	Net income in enterprise (Rs.)			
1	Nil	-	-	-
2	Upto Rs. 2,25,729	26 (52.00)	-	26 (26.00)
3	Rs. 2,25,730 to 3,52,267	14 (28.00)	-	14 (14.00)
4	Rs. 3,52,268 to 4,78,805	-	-	-
5	Rs. 4,78,806 to 6,05,343	4 (8.00)	1 (2.00)	5 (5.00)
6	Rs. 6,05,344 and above	6 (12.00)	49 (98.00)	55 (55.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	285013.3	799130	5,42,072
‘t’ =14.00		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
	Net income in enterprise (Score)			
1	Low (up to 4)	28 (56.00)	6 (12.00)	34 (34.00)
2	Medium (5 to 13)	16 (32.00)	40 (80.00)	56 (56.00)
3	High (14 and above)	6 (12.00)	4 (8.00)	10 (10.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	7.2	9.76	8.48
‘t’ =3.16		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
3.	Per cent reinvestment of profit in enterprise (%)			
1	No	-	-	-
2	Up to 9.71	5 (10.00)	-	5 (5.00)

3	9.72 to 10.97	21 (42.00)	12 (24.00)	33 (33.00)
4	10.98 to 12.23	4 (8.00)	5 (10.00)	9 (9.00)
5	12.24 to 13.50	-	-	-
6	13.51 and above	20 (40.00)	33 (66.00)	53 (53.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	12.04	13.64	12.84
‘t’ =2.63		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
Per cent reinvestment of profit in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 4)	26 (52.00)	11 (22.00)	37 (37.00)
2	Medium (5 to 10)	24 (48.00)	39 (78.00)	63 (63.00)
3	High (11 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	6.36	8.20	7.28
‘t’ = 3.20		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
4. Employment level in enterprise (persons)				
1	No	-	-	
2	Up to 8	28 (56.00)	-	28 (28.00)
3	9 to 13	12 (24.00)	-	12 (12.00)
4	14 to 18	4 (8.00)	-	4 (4.00)
5	19 to 23	4 (8.00)	26 (52.00)	30 (30.00)
6	24 and above	2 (4.00)	24 (48.00)	26 (26.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	9.94	25.02	17.48
‘t’ =13.32		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
Employment level in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 3)	24 (48.00)	-	24 (24.00)
2	Medium (4 to 10)	26 (52.00)	50 (100.00)	76 (76.00)
3	High (11 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	3.76	8.96	6.36
‘t’ = 13.01		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
5. Growth in clients in enterprise (%)				
1	No growth	-	-	
2	Up to 5 per cent	19 (38.00)	-	19 (19.00)
3	10 per cent	31 (62.00)	31 (62.00)	62 (62.00)
4	15 per cent	-	15 (30.00)	15 (15.00)
5	20 per cent	-	4 (8.00)	4 (4.00)
6	25 per cent	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
	Average	8.1	12.3	10.2

‘t’ =7.32		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
Growth in clients in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 3)	19 (38.00)	-	19 (19.00)
2	Medium (4 to 5)	31 (62.00)	31 (62.00)	62 (62.00)
3	High (6 and above)	-	19 (38.00)	19 (19.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average (std.)	3.24	4.92	4.08
‘t’ =7.32		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98
6. Adaptability in enterprise				
1	Adapted very well to the demands of the day	16 (32.00)	34 (68.00)	50 (50.00)
2	Adapted well to some situations only	7 (14.00)	10 (20.00)	17 (17.00)
3	Could survive barely and now adjusting	27 (54.00)	6 (12.00)	33 (33.00)
4	Could not foresee the impending crisis and unable to adjust well	-	-	-
5	Could not adjust at all and thinking of quitting or changing	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
Adaptability in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 6)	26 (52.00)	6 (12.00)	32 (32.00)
2	Medium (7 to 10)	24 (48.00)	44 (88.00)	68 (68.00)
3	High (11 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	6.92	8.8	7.86
‘t’ = 4.56		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98

7. Sustainability in enterprise				
1	I am enjoying this experience of running the enterprise	17 (34.00)	28 (56.00)	45 (45.00)
2	I feel quite comfortable with sustaining the enterprise	12 (24.00)	6 (12.00)	18 (18.00)
3	I am able to survive the crisis and now growing slowly	21 (42.00)	16 (32.00)	37 (37.00)
4	I may not be able to continue for long in this enterprise	-	-	-
5	I wish I had started another enterprise; I do not see any future in this enterprise	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
Sustainability in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 5)	21 (42.00)	16 (32.00)	37 (37.00)

2	Medium (6 to 10)	29 (58.00)	34 (68.00)	63 (63.00)
3	High (11 and above)	-	-	-
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	7.18	8.04	7.61
't' = 1.90 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
8. Degree of satisfaction in enterprise				
1	Highly dissatisfied	-	-	-
2	Dissatisfied	5 (10.00)	-	5 (5.00)
3	So-So (Neutral)	14 (28.00)	-	14 (14.00)
4	Satisfied	29 (58.00)	28 (56.00)	57 (57.00)
5	Highly satisfied	2 (4.00)	22 (44.00)	24 (24.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
Degree of satisfaction in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 5)	19 (38.00)	-	19 (19.00)
2	Medium (6 to 9)	29 (58.00)	28 (56.00)	57 (57.00)
3	High (10 and above)	2 (4.00)	22 (44.00)	24 (24.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	6.16	8.32	7.24
't' = 7.05 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				
9. Prestige earned in enterprise				
1	None at all	-	-	-
2	Moderate name earned	8 (16.00)	-	8 (8.00)
3	Earned a good name in sales	14 (28.00)	11 (22.00)	25 (25.00)
4	Became quite popular in the vicinity	14 (28.00)	18 (36.00)	32 (32.00)
5	Much sought after by every farmer for apt advice	5 (10.00)	11 (22.00)	16 (16.00)
6	Won awards and enjoyed good press coverage in local and national dailies.	9 (18.00)	10 (20.00)	19 (19.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100(100.00)
Prestige earned in enterprise (score)				
1	Low (up to 4)	22 (44.00)	11 (22.00)	33 (33.00)
2	Medium (5 to 9)	20 (40.00)	29 (58.00)	49 (49.00)
3	High (10 and above)	8 (16.00)	10 (20.00)	18 (18.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	5.72	6.8	6.26
't' = 2.25 Significant at 0.05 level d.f.= 98				

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages)

Majority of the micro cashew nut processors (76.00 per cent) and small cashew nut processors (64.00 per cent) belonged to 'middle' age category. The average age of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 46 and 50 years, respectively.

Majority of the micro cashew nut processors (38.00 per cent) had studied upto 'college level', whereas 44.00 per cent small cashew nut processors had studied upto 'higher secondary'. The average education of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 12th standard.

Vast majority (78.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors and all (100.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors, had 'business' as their major occupation.

Majority of the micro cashew nut processors (94.00 per cent) and small cashew nut processors (64.00 per cent) belonged to 'middle' family size category. On an average, the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors had four and five members, respectively in their family.

Majority of the micro cashew nut processors (60.00 per cent) and small cashew nut processors (76.00 per cent) belonged to 'medium' annual income category. The average annual income of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was Rs. 2,91,480/- and Rs. 6,10,000/-, respectively.

Less than two fifth (38.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'semi medium' land holding and less than three fifth (58.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' land holding. The average land holding of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 2.38 ha. and 4.83 ha, respectively.

More than one half (52.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' mass media exposure and more than three fifth (70.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' mass media exposure. The average mass media exposure of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 6.26 and 7.18, respectively.

Less than two third (64.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' cosmopolitaness and less than three fourth (72.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' cosmopolitans. The average cosmopolitans score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 12.00 and 14.16, respectively.

One half (50.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' size of cashew orchard, whereas more than four fifth (86.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' size of cashew orchard. The average size of cashew orchard of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 1.73 ha. and 3.31 ha., respectively..

More than three fourth (76.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' yield of cashew nut, whereas nine out of every ten (90.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' yield of cashew nut. The average cashew nut yield of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 909 kg and 948 kg per year, respectively.

One half each (50.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' and 'medium' availability of raw material and two third (66.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' availability of raw material . The average availability of raw material with the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 19179 kg and 51603 kg, respectively.

It was found that one half (50.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' availability of cash credit and the same number (50.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' and 'low' availability of cash credit . The average availability of cash credit to the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was Rs.10,51,200/- and Rs.36,75,000/- respectively.

It was found that majority (54.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'less than sufficient' storage space and more than four fifth (86.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'sufficient' storage space available with them. The average storage space with the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 294 Sq.feet and 588 Sq.feet respectively.

The data indicated that majority (48.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'somewhat near' location of the processing unit and almost same number (46.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'somewhat near' location of the processing unit. The average distance of location of the processing unit of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors from the city was 11.32 Km.

The data indicated that all (100.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors had all the infrastructural facilities namely, road, electricity, water and labour.

Success-Failure of cashew nut processor

About gross return gained, majority (64.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' gross return gained, whereas 52.00 per cent of small cashew nut processors had 'medium' gross return gained. The average gross return gained score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 20.52 and 22.2, respectively.

About net income, majority (56.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' net income, whereas 80.00 per cent of small cashew nut processors had 'medium' net income. The average net income score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 7.2 and 9.76, respectively.

About per cent reinvestment of profit, majority (52.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' per cent reinvestment of profit, whereas 78.00 per cent of small cashew nut processors had 'medium' per cent reinvestment of profit. The average per cent reinvestment of profit score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 6.36 and 8.20, respectively.

More than one half (52.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'medium' employment level, whereas 100.00 per cent of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' employment level. The average employment level score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 3.76 and 8.96, respectively.

More than three fifth (62.00 per cent) each of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors had 'medium' growth in clients. The average growth in clients score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 3.24 and 4.92, respectively.

About adaptability, more than one half (52.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' adaptability, whereas 88.00 per cent of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' adaptability. The average adaptability score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 6.92 and 8.8, respectively.

Less than three fifth (58.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors and 68.00 per cent of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' sustainability. The average sustainability score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 7.18 and 8.04, respectively.

About degree of satisfaction, less than three fifth (58.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors and 56.00 per cent of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' degree of satisfaction. The average degree of satisfaction score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 6.16 and 8.32, respectively.

More than two fifth (44.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors had 'low' prestige earned, whereas 58.00 per cent of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' prestige earned. The average prestige earned score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 5.72 and 6.80, respectively.

15.3.1. Overall success-failure of cashew nut enterprise.

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents according to their overall success-failure in enterprise

Sl. No	Overall success-failure	Respondents		
		Micro (n=50)	Small (n=50)	Overall (N=100)
1	Low (up to 56)	13 (26.00)	1 (2.00)	14 (14.00)
2	Medium (57 to 88)	29 (58.00)	42 (84.00)	71 (61.00)
3	High (89 and above)	8 (16.00)	7 (14.00)	15 (15.00)
	Total	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Average	66.34	77.88	72.11
't' = 3.92		Significant at 0.05 level		d.f.= 98

(Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentages)

It is seen from Table 6 that less than three fifth (58.00 per cent) of the micro cashew nut processors and four fifth (84.00 per cent) of the small cashew nut processors had 'medium' success-failure. The average success-failure score of the micro cashew nut processors and small cashew nut processors was 66.34 and 77.88, respectively. Calculated 't' value (3.92) was statistically significant at 0.05 level of probability.

15.3.2. Factors influencing success-failure of the cashew processing enterprise.**Table: 7. Association between socio-economic characteristics of the cashew nut processors and success-failure in enterprise.**

Sl. No.	Characteristics	Variable code	Chi-square value(X^2)			
			Micro (n=50)	Small (n=50)	Overall (N=100)	Degrees of freedom
1	Age	X ₁	9.74*	1.33	11.09*	4
2	Major occupation	X ₂	7.05	7.05	17.50*	2
3	Education	X ₃	0.81	15.89*	1.94	4
4	Size of land holding	X ₄	13.50*	1.42	15.91*	6
5	Annual income	X ₅	2.31	0.72	33.12*	4
6	Family size	X ₆	14.05*	0.73	2.14	4
7	Size of cashew orchard	X ₇	7.94	1.75	15.66*	4
8	Yield of cashew nut	X ₈	13.17*	9.78*	27.96*	4
9	Mass media use	X ₉	2.15	1.47	6.06	4
10	Cosmopolitaness	X ₁₀	8.85	1.03	7.36	4
11	Availability of raw material	X ₁₁	11.80*	0.80	19.52*	2
12	Availability of cash credit	X ₁₂	22.80*	4.95	37.05*	4
13	Storage space	X ₁₃	15.57*	3.12	56.52*	4
14	Location of processing unit	X ₁₄	2.64	0.65	7.95	4
* Significant at 0.05 level						

Among the fourteen variables studied, only six variables namely age, size of land holding, family size, yield of cashew nut, availability of raw material, availability of cash credit, and storage space were significantly associated with success – failure of the micro cashew nut processors, whereas, education and yield of cashew nut showed significant association with success-failure of small cashew nut processors.

At overall level, age, major occupation, size of land holding, annual income, size of cashew orchard, yield of cashew nut, availability of raw material, availability of cash credit and storage space showed significant association between success-failure of cashew nut processors.

CONCLUSIONS:

The research revealed that, It was observed that the average age of the cashew nut processors was 48 years. They had average 12th standard education. Their average land holding was 3.60 ha. Majority of them had business as a major occupation and the average 5 members in family. Their average annual income was Rs. 4,50,740/-. They had put up average 2.52 ha area under cashew cultivation with average 926 Kg/ha yield. The average scores regarding mass media exposure (6.72), cosmopolitans (13.80), indicated medium level. Average availability of raw material was 35391 kg, while that of cash credit was Rs.23,63,100 /-. The cashew processors had average 441 sq. feet storage space, their processing units were 11 km. away from the city and all of them had all infrastructural facilities. The micro and small cashew nut processors differed remarkably with each other in respect of 16 personal, socio-economic and psychological characteristics namely, age, major occupation, size of land holding, annual income, family size, mass media exposure, cosmopolitans, size of cashew orchard, availability of raw material, availability of cash credit and storage space. While they did not differ much with regard to four

characteristics namely education, yield of cashew nut, location of the processing unit and infrastructure facilities.

About success-failure, the study concluded that the cashew nut processors had average 21.36 per cent gross return gained, net income in enterprise (Rs.5.42,072), 7.28 per cent reinvestment of profit, 4.08 per cent growth in clients, employment level of 6 persons, adaptability score (7.86), sustainability score (7.61), degree of satisfaction score (7.24) and prestige earned score (6.26). The micro and small cashew nut processors recorded noteworthy difference in respect of all the components of success-failure, except 'sustainability'. Overall success-failure score of cashew nut enterprise was 72.11. The micro and small cashew nut processors had significant difference in the overall success-failure of cashew nut enterprise.

Age, size of land holding, family size, yield of cashew nut, availability of raw material, availability of cash credit and storage space were significantly associated with success-failure of the micro cashew nut processors, whereas, education and yield of cashew nut showed significant association with success-failure of small cashew nut processors. At overall level, age, major occupation, size of land holding, annual income, size of cashew orchard, yield of cashew nut, availability of raw material, availability of cash credit and storage space showed significant association with success-failure of cashew nut processors.

REFERENCES:

- Haredero, J.M. (1981). "Agricultural entrepreneurship: Identification and selection of small scale entrepreneurs" (Ed. Rao, T.V. and Moulik, T.K.), Indian Institute of Management, Ahamadabad. Pp. 151-159.
- Hisrich, R.C. (1981). "The women entrepreneurs from a business and sociological perspective". In K.H. Vespa (ed.) *Frontier of entrepreneurship research*. Welesbey, M.A. Batson Collage: 29-39.
- Hosalitz, B. F. (1971). "The early history of entrepreneurial theory, Explanation in entrepreneurial history", 3.
- Hossain, M.M. and Mishra, S.N. (2002). "Studies on involvement of women in agriculture and allied activities in Kalahandi district of Orissa". *Manage Extension Research Review*. 3(1): 88-89.
- Hundal, P. S. (1971). "A study of entrepreneurial motivation : Comparison of fast and slow progressing small scale industrial entrepreneurs in Punjab". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55 (2) : 20.
- Jadhav, V.M. (1999). "A study of entrepreneurial behaviour of floriculturists in Thane district". M.Sc.(Agri.) Thesis, Kokan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Dist. Ratnagiri (M.S.).
- Jadhav, D.B. (2003). "A study of the entrepreneurial behaviour of the watermelon growers in Raigad district". M.Sc.(Agri.) Thesis, Dr. Balasaheb Sawant Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Dist. Ratnagiri (M.S.).
- Jadhav, M.S., Kaware, S.S., Nawale, S.K., and Tilekar, S.N., (2009). "Supply chain of orange in western Maharashtra". *Ind. J. Agril. Mktg., (Conf. Spl.)* 23(1): 41-42.