

ISSN-0976-6847

Marketing behaviour of vegetable growers

M.V. SRINIVAS, B. S. LAKSHMAN REDDY AND Y.B. VENKATA REDDY

ARTICLE CHRONICLE:

Received: 07.09.2016; Revised: 05.10.2016; Accepted: 21.10.2016

SUMMARY: Production of vegetables is very good source of income and employment. Vegetable production was dominant in the economy of the Kolar district. For the study 120 vegetable growers were selected from the four taluks of the Kolar district by simple random sampling technique. The findings reveal that, 48.33 per cent used tempo to transport their produce, 46.67 per cent used plastic crates as packing material, majority of the farmers sold their produce immediately after harvest in the nearby markets. Where as 71.67 per cent farmers opinioned that, they receive full payment on the spot after sale. Commission agents (95.83%) and neighbours/relatives (66.67%) were the important source of market information. Major problems in marketing were price fluctuation (97.50%), followed by high hamli charges (66.67%) and high transport charges (64.17%).

How to cite this article: Srinivas, M.V., Reddy, B.S. Lakshman and Reddy, Y.B. Venkata, (2016). Marketing behaviour of vegetable growers. Agric. Update, 11(4): 434-437; DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AU/11.4/434-437.

KEY WORDS:

Marketing behaviour, Vegetable growers

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Vegetable is an edible plant or its part, intended for cooking or eating raw. Vegetables are most often consumed as salads or cooked in savory or salty dishes, vegetables form an Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and important part of our daily diet, the market is crammed with varieties of vegetables. They help in protecting our body against cancers, diabetes and heart diseases. Almost all the vegetables are low in fat and calories, none have cholesterol and many of them are great sources of fibre. The high levels of fibre in vegetables keep the digestive system healthier. There are numerous types and varieties of vegetables, all of them being the powerhouse of nutrients, minerals and vitamins apart from the health improvements, the production of vegetables improves the economy of country

as these are very good source of income and employment, voluminous increase in vegetable production over the last few years in the country. Leading vegetable producing states are West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka.

In Karnataka, Kolar district has made considerable progress in vegetable production and dominant in the economy of the district. Among cultivable area, vegetable crops grown in an area of 36084 hectares and production 993487 M.tons (Source Dept. of Horticulture). Agro climatic condition of the district is highly suitable for cultivation of most of the vegetable crops in all seasons. An efficient marketing of vegetables plays an important role to increase the producer share in the consumer rupee. Presently, the vegetable marketing is

Author for correspondence:

M.V. SRINIVAS

Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, G.K.V.K., BENGALURU, KARNATAKA INDIA Email: patraseena@ rediffmail.com

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

mainly in the hands of middlemen like village traders, commission agents etc. The farmer is only a price receiver. Therefore, many times vegetable growers have resort to distress sale due to uncertain situation in market. With this background, the present study was taken keeping in view of importance given to vegetable production and marketing in the study area, an attempt has been made to study the following objectives:

- To know marketing behavior of vegetable growers
- To identify the source of marketing information
- To ascertain constraints perceived by the farmers in marketing.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

This research study was conducted in Kolar district, which is one of the largest producers of vegetable in Karnataka. Farmers cultivating vegetables extensively as a major crop. Out of five taluks in Kolar district, Malur, Srinivaspura, Kolar and Mulbagal taluks were purposively selected as these four taluks had highest area and production under vegetables in Kolar district. From each taluk, three villages were selected on highest area under vegetable cultivation. Thus, 12 villages were selected for the study. From each village, 10 respondents were selected by simple random sampling technique. Thus, a total of 120 vegetable growers constituted as sample for the study.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present study as well as discussions have been summarized under following heads:

Marketing behaviour:

Mode of transport:

From the Table 1 it is inferred that, 48.33 per cent of farmers transported their produce through tempo, followed by tractor (28.33%). About 11.67 per cent and 6.67 per cent of the respondents transported through lorry and moped. Only 5.00 per cent respondents used bus for transportation. The selection of mode of transport depends on quantity of the produce and distance of market, some farmers have their own tractor for transportation and some of the respondents hire tempo for transportation, since it is available at their door step. If quantity is large and to sell their produce in far away

Table 1: Category wise distribution of respondents based on their marketing behaviour (n=120)				
Category	No	%		
Mode of transport	•			
Head load	4	3.33		
Moped	8	6.67		
Tractor	34	28.33		
By bus	6	5.00		
Tempo	58	48.33		
Lorry	14	11.67		
Total	120	100		
Mode of packing				
Plastic crates	56	46.67		
Gunny bags	18	15.00		
Net/Mesh bags	27	22.50		
Plastic bags	19	15.83		
Total	120	100		
Place of sale				
Village itself	11	9.17		
Nearby market	92	76.66		
Faraway market	17	14.17		
Total	120	100		
Time of sale				
Immediately after harvest	98	81.67		
After initial storage	22	18.33		
Total	120	100		
Grading behaviour				
Grading	77	64.17		
No grading	43	35.83		
Total	120	100		
Payment pattern				
Advance payment	30	25.00		
Spot payment	86	71.67		
Delayed payment	4	3.33		
Total	120	100		

markets they used lorry as a mode of transport. Small land holding farmers near to market they use moped for transportation of vegetables (Balappa, 2000 and Bhupal, 2000).

Mode of packing:

The Table 1 further indicates that 46.67 per cent of farmers used plastic crates. Whereas 22.50 per cent of the used net/mesh bags for packing. Fifteen per cent and 15.83 per cent used gunny and plastic bags. Packing

of vegetables is one of the more important step in the long and complicated journey from grower to market. Vegetables like tomato and brinjal, they use plastic crates for packing in order to avoid damage during handling of vegetables. For beans, cabbage, chilli and onion they used net/mesh type bags, as these provide good aeration and keep vegetables fresh.

Place of sale:

Majority of farmers (76.66%) sold their produce nearby market. Whereas 14.17 per cent of respondents sold in far away markets, 9.17 per cent of them sold in village it self. Farmers prefer near by markets for sale, due to competitive prices and credit facility. If large quantity of marketable surplus they prefer to sell in for away markets, usually farmers are not interested in selling produce in village. Because they perceive that they realize less price for their produce.

Time of sale:

It is observed that 81.67 per cent of farmers sold their produce immediately after harvest. Whereas 18.33 per cent of them sold after initial storage. Some vegetables are very perishable by nature. Hence, farmers sold vegetables immediately after harvest, in order reduce the damage and to gain immediate monetary benefit. Vegetables like potato and onion, were sold after initial storage, expecting good price in future.

Grading:

Table 1 indicates that, 64.17 per cent of respondents graded their produce after harvest, and remaining 35.83 per cent of respondents do not graded their produce. If produce is graded they may able to receive high price for their produce in the market.

Payment pattern:

It observed that 71.67 per cent of respondents received full payment after sale. Whereas 25.00 per cent and 3.33 per cent of them received payment in advance and delayed, respectively. Farmers receive money in advance from commission agents or traders, for purchasing inputs and for making payment to labours. Mutual understanding between farmers and commission agents, payment to the farmers may be delayed. Similar work was also done by Sushila (2013) and Devika *et al.* (2012).

Source of marketing information:

It was evident form Table 2 the most important source in seeking marketing information were, commission agents (95.83%), neighbours/relatives (66.67%), input dealers (35.83%), TV (27.50%) and news paper (21.67%). Whereas least important source were radio (14.17%), internet (10.83%), direct vist to APMC (5.83%) and exporters (3.33%). It is clear that for expected price and arrival in the market, always they consult commission agent. Farmers also collect information from neighbours/relatives who already sold their produce, since they are easily accessible and faith in them. The accessibility of exporters was limited and tendency of exporters not disclose all the information (Dambazau *et al.*, 2015 and Shivamurthy and Girja, (2002).

Table 2 : Source of marketin	(n=120)	
Information source	No.	%
Neighbours/relatives	80	66.67
Commission agents	115	95.83
Input dealers	43	35.83
News paper	26	21.67
TV	33	27.50
Internet	13	10.83
Local traders	28	23.33
Radio	17	14.17
Direct vist to APMC	7	5.83
Exporters	4	3.33

Constraints:

It is noticed from the Table 3, that most important problems faced by the vegetable growers were, price fluctuation (97.50%), high hamli charges (66.17%), high transport charges (64.17%), timely availability of

Table 3 : Constraints in marketing	(n=120)	
Constraints	No	%
Price fluctuation	117	97.50
High hamli charges	80	66.67
High commission charges	63	52.50
High transport charges	77	64.17
Space for keeping the produce is not enough	54	45.00
Prolonged transaction	17	14.17
Timely availability of transportation	67	55.83
Illegal deduction in the weight	58	48.33
Inadequate physical facility in the market	33	27.50
Absence of storage facility	44	36.67

transport facility (55.83%), high commission charges (52.50%), illegal deduction in weight (48.33%), space for keeping the produce is not enough (45.00%), absence of storage facility (36.67%), inadequate physical facility in the market (27.50%) and prolonged transaction (14.17%). The main aim of farmers was to produce more and get better price for their produce. But unfortunately if the supply of produce increase, the demand and price of the produce decreases and vice versa, as a result of which high fluctuation in the prices will prevail. Due to fluctuation in market price the farmers get less price and even they are not able to pay transportation charges. As per APMC act commission charges should be collected from the buyer not from the farmer, but commission agents illegally collect commission charges from the farmers (Shivalingaih and Ramesh, 2002 and Vinayak and Patil, 2013).

Conclusion:

It can be concluded form the above discussion that, to make vegetable production more profitable and sustainable in the context of globalization. Government should give fair deal in establishing markets at the village level and dissemination of latest market information to the farmers in the right time. Establishing cold storage and processing units at the village level in order avoid price fluctuation. Arrange adequate and timely transport facilities for the smooth moment of vegetables from the palace of production to market. These measures which may help not only to improve efficiency of marketing vegetables but also increase the producer share in the consumer rupee.

Authors' affiliations:

B.S. LAKSHMAN REDDY, Directorate of Extension, College of Horticulture, University of Horticultural Sciences, BAGALKOT (KARNATAKA) INDIA Email: bslreddyextn@yhaoo.com

Y.B. VENKATA REDDY, Coffee Board, BENGALURU (KARNATAKA) INDIA Email: venkatcoffee@gmail.com

REFERENCES

Balappa, Shivaraya (2000). Economic performance of production, marketing and export of vegetables in North Karnataka. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, KARNATAKA (INDIA).

Bhupal, D S. (2000). Impact of mechanized and non mechanized modes of Transport on agricultural marketing in Haryana. Encyclopedia Agric. Mktg., 5: 205-220.

Dambazau, S.A., Srivastav, J.P and Tajudeen, A. (2015). Comunication behaviour of potato growers. J. Comn. Stud., **33**: 48-56.

Devika, S., Balasubramaniam, P. and Suganthi, N. (2012). Marketing behaviour of tribal women of NWFPs. J. Extn. Edu., **24** (3): 4897-4902.

Sharma, R. K., Sharma, S. K. and Thakur, R. K. (1995). Marketing of vegetables in Himachal Pradesh. Indian. J. Agril. Mktg., 9 (1):45-49.

Shivalingaih, Y.N. and Ramesh, Y. S. (2002). Constraints in production and marketing of horticultural crops. Curr. Res., 31(3-4):39-41.

Shivamurthy, M. and Girja, P.R. (2002). Information seeking behaviour and opinion leadership of fruits and vegetable growers marketing through HOPCOMS and other channels, Mys. J. Agric. Sci., 36 (2): 175-180.

Singh, Surabhi (2013). Organic products: Marketing practices and problems in the plains and hilly regions of Uttarakhand. Indian J. Mktg., 43 (2): 37-49.

Sushila, Meena (2013). Marketing behaviour of onion growers in flood prone eastern plain zone of Rajsathan. J. Comn. Stud., **31**: 164-171.

Vinayak, N. Jalikatti and Patil, B. L. (2013). Constraints in production and marketing of onion in northern Karnataka. Karnataka J. Agric. Sci., 26 (3): 436-438.