**CHAPTER – I**

**INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY**

**1. 1 INTRODUCTION**

The agriculture product market has grown continuously over the past decade, but, the total share of agriculture product is still small compared with the total food market. There is no common definition of “organic” due to the fact that different countries have different standard for products to be certified “organic” . In simplest words agriculture products are minimally processed to maintain the integrity of the food without artificial ingredients, preservatives or irradiation. Agriculture products are obtained by processes friendly to the environment, by cultivation techniques that consider both the attributes of the final product and the production methods. A wide range of consumers of agriculture product and non agriculture product were addressed and scrutinized to obtain their observations and visions towards agriculture product. All agriculture product consumers are not having the same method of approach towards agriculture product. Subsequently the statistical process guides us to comprehend the relation and the model of the consumer behavior trends in agriculture product in India.

The approach and outlook towards agriculture and marketing of food has seen a quantum change worldwide over the last few decades. Whereas earlier the seasons and the climate of an area determined what would be grown and when, today it is the "market" that determines what it wants and what should be grown. The focus is now more on quantity and "outer" quality (appearance) rather than intrinsic or nutritional quality, also called "vitality". Pesticide and other chemical residues in food and an overall reduced quality of food have led to a marked increase in various diseases, mainly various forms of cancer and reduced bodily immunity. This immense commercialization of agriculture has also had a very negative effect on the environment. The use of pesticides has led to enormous levels of chemical buildup in our environment, in soil, water, air, in animals and even in our own bodies. Fertilizers have a short-term effect on productivity but a longer-term negative effect on the environment where they remain for years after leaching and running off, contaminating ground water and water bodies. The use of hybrid seeds and the practice of monoculture have led to a severe threat to local and indigenous varieties, whose germplasm can be lost forever. All of this is for "productivity". In the name of growing more to feed the earth, we have taken the wrong road of unsustainability. The effects already show - farmers committing suicide in growing numbers with every passing year; the horrendous effects of pesticide sprays by a government-owned plantation in Kerala some years ago the pesticide contaminated bottled water and aerated beverages are only some instances. The bigger picture that rarely makes news however is that millions of people are still underfed and where they do get enough to eat, the food they eat has the capability to eventually kill them. Yet, the picture painted for the future by agro-chemical and seed companies and governments is rosy and bright. Another negative effect of this trend has been on the fortunes of the farming communitiesworldwide.

**1. 2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The green concept and the developing of agriculture product are still in the infant stage in Nambiyur. Therefore, there is a need to gain knowledge about the consumer’s behavior towards agriculture products. Specifically, this study attempts to examine consumer’s perception, purchase intentions and actual purchase behavior and the interrelationship between them in the context of agriculture products.

The Agriculture product has been grown without the use of toxic chemicals, pesticides or fertilizers. The food is as natural as can be, safer for the environment and usually tastes better too. Agriculture product has plenty of advantages when compared to the non-agriculture product that have been processed with artificial preservatives and chemicals. But still people are not aware quietly.

**1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

* To know the awareness of the respondents on agriculture products
* To analyze the opinion of the respondents towards the agriculture product
* To identify factors that might influence to purchase of agriculture product among consumers
* To find the reasons for not to purchase agriculture products.
* To offer suggestions based on the findings of the study.

**1. 4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

* With rising concern of health issues and food safety, many consumers have turned their site to agriculture products.
* The increased consumers' interest in agriculture product has been attributed among others to the growing demand for food free from pesticides and chemical residues.
* Agriculture product promotes a balance of human, other living organisms and the nature.
* It also promotes no artificial preservatives and best maintain the originality of food.

**1. 5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The validity of any research depends on the systematic method of collecting the data and analyzing the same in a logical and sequential order. In the present study, an extensive use of both primary and secondary data was made.

**1.5. 1 RESEARCH DESIGN**

A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure.

**1.5. 2 SAMPLING METHOD**

The sampling used for the study is convenient sampling. This sampling is selected by the researcher for the purpose of convenience to access. A pilot study is conducted to validate the questionnaire and to confirm the feasibility of the study. Based on the pilot study, the questionnaire is modified suitably to elicit response from the sample group.

**1.5.3 SAMPLING SIZE**

A sample of 50 respondents from the different locations from in and around of Nambiyur. Samples for the purpose of the study are selected systematically.

**1.5. 4 SAMPLING DESIGN**

Both primary and secondary data were used in the study for analysis purpose. For collecting primary data, field survey technique was employed in Nambiyur. A well framed questionnaire was also used to collect the primary data.

**1.6 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION**

The data for this study are of two types:

* Primary data
* Secondary data

**1.6. 1 PRIMARY DATA**

Primary data is the data is collected from the respondent for the first time, it is original in character they are collected for the particular purpose.

**1.6. 2 SECONDARY DATA**

Secondary data are collected from books, magazines, web sites etc

**1.7 STATISTICAL TOOLS**

The following statistical tools are used in the study Percentage Analysis.

**1.7. 1 SIMPLE PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS**

Percentage refers to a special kind of ratio in making comparison between two or more data and to describe relationships. Percentage can also be used to compare the relative terms in the distribution of two or more sources of data.

Number of Respondents

Percentage of Respondents = ----------------------------------- X100

Total Respondents

**1. 8 AREA OF THE STUDY**

The sample area chosen for conducting the study in Nambiyur.

**1.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Every research study is bound to suffer certain limitation some of them are inherent in the research design while some other become part of the study during various stage of research process . The present study is subject to the following limitation.

* The present study is limited to Agriculture products only .
* The sample size is restricted to 50 respondents.
* The study was conducted within a limited time period.
* The finding of the study may be generalized to Nambiyur only.
* The conclusions are based on the opinion expressed by the customer
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**CHAPTER – II**

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Dr.K.Subramaniam and S.Sathya (2020),** in their study entitled “A study on the consumers attitude and intentions towards agriculture products – with special reference to Coimbatore” , to know the respondents awareness on the agriculture products. The data have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 200 respondents have been contacted by adopting convenience sampling technique. The data collected have been analyzed by using tools like simple percentage analysis, chi-square test, weighted average rank analysis, T-Test and Anova. They find that the Creation of awareness of agriculture products is necessary among consumers. Sustained improvement in product features would lead to increase in consumption of agriculture products.

**Abhinav Gupta ( 2020),** his study on “Exploring Indian Consumer Agriculture product Purchase Bhaviour” , to find the reasons of consumers to buy Agriculture products. In this study, convenient random sampling technique has been used and 500 consumers were selected on random basis. The primary data had collected from selected consumers on judgmental sampling techniques. The data collected was analyzed through Percentages, frequencies and chi - square tests are applied for the analysis of data. She find that the educated population tries to buy agriculture product for its health reasons.

**1Dr.K.Subramaniam and S.Sathya (2020),** in their study entitled “A study on the consumers attitude and intentions towards agriculture products – with special reference to Coimbatore”.

**2 Abhinav Gupta ( 2020),** his study on “Exploring Indian Consumer Agriculture product Purchase Bhaviour”.

**Dr.Gunasundari.K and Sathiya Bama.P ( 2018),** in their study entitled “A study on customer awareness and knowledge towards Agriculture products with special reference to Coimbatore District” , to investigate the factors that influences the intention of buying agriculture product.. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. The sample size was 150 respondents. Simple percentage analysis , Chi-Square analysis, Correlation and ANOVA have been used to analyze the data. She find that environmental sustainability, importance is shifted towards Agriculture products rather than conventional farming. The respondent without doubt attracted towards Agriculture products.

**Pittawat Ueasangkomate and Salinee Santiteerakul (2016),** “ A study of Consumers Attitude and Intention to buy agriculture products for sustainability” . The aim of the study is to study the relationship between Thai consumers attitudes and intention to buy agriculture product. A sample of 316 respondents have been collected by adopting convenience sampling technique. The statistical techniques likes correlation analysis have been used for the analysis. The results of the study showed that consumers attitudes about agriculture products are related to health at the 1st rank. Consequently, consumers attitudes with local origin, environment and food safety are at the 2nd, 2rd and 4th respectively.

**3Dr.Gunasundari.K and Sathiya Bama.P ( 2018),** in their study entitled “A study on customer awareness and knowledge towards Agriculture products with special reference to Coimbatore District”.

**4Pittawat Ueasangkomate and Salinee Santiteerakul (2016),** “ A study of Consumers Attitude and Intention to buy agriculture products for sustainability”.

**B.Arunkumar and D.Elangovan ( 2016),** his study on “Consumer Attitude and Preference for Agriculture products in Coimbatore City” , to examine the attitude influenced the consumers to prefer agriculture products in Coimbatore City. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 200 respondents have been collected by adopting random sampling technique. Tools like Frequency and Percentage Analysis, Chi-square test and Garrett ranking method are used to analyse the data. He find that most of the consumers preferred agriculture products by any categories for its high nutritional values and health conscious for their self and their family that needs to be considered by the policy makers to promote the product and make it available in all the retail outlets for easy purchase of the consumers.

**Padmavathy and R.Saraswathy (2016),** in their study entitled “A Study on the consumers buying behaviour towards agriculture products in Thanjavur District” , to examine the factors that affect consumers buying behaviors for agriculture products. The required data for the study have been collected in primary data through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 138 respondents have been collected by adopting convenient sampling technique. Tools like Simple percentage analysis and Chi-Square test are employed to analyse the data. She find that there is significant relationship between the variables which affects consumers buying behaviour for agriculture products. Similarly, the factors affecting the consumers buying behaviour have major implications on purchasing decisions. Green marketers can therefore understand, identify and design marketing mix strategies to appeal to the preferences of the market segments for green products.

**5B.Arunkumar and D.Elangovan ( 2016),** his study on “Consumer Attitude and Preference for Agriculture products in Coimbatore City”.

**6Padmavathy and R.Saraswathy (2016),** in their study entitled “A Study on the consumers buying behaviour towards agriculture products in Thanjavur District”.

**Sathyendra Kumar AD and Dr.H.M.Chandrashekar (2015),** in their study entitled “A study on Consumer behaviour towards Agriculture products in Mysore City” . This study attempted to gain knowledge about consumer attitude towards agriculture products consumption and market potential of agriculture product. The required data for the study have been collected in primary through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 50 consumers have been collected by adopting convenient sampling techniques. Tools like Percentage analysis are used to analyze the data. He find that cost of the organic product is very high so it is all so effected to consumer to buy the commodity. Because Price of the product should not meet the normal people.

**Vaishali Sethi and Dr. Manvinder Singh Tandon ( 2015),** in their study entitled “A study of University students awareness, perception and green purchase intention of Eco – Friendly products in Delhi NCR” , to analyze the extent of awareness level of students towards green products. The required data for the study have been collected in primary through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 75 students have been collected by adopting convenient sampling techniques. Tools like Percentage analysis and ANOVA are used to analyse the data. They find that though majority respondents claim to be aware of green products, but the awareness seems superficial and over-claimed.

**7Sathyendra Kumar AD and Dr.H.M.Chandrashekar (2015),** in their study entitled “A study on Consumer behaviour towards Agriculture products in Mysore City” .

**8Vaishali Sethi and Dr. Manvinder Singh Tandon ( 2015),** in their study entitled “A study of University students awareness, perception and green purchase intention of Eco – Friendly products in Delhi NCR”

**S.V.Ramesh and M.Divya ( 2015),** in their study on “A study on Consumer awareness attitude and satisfaction towards select agriculture products with reference to Coimbatore” , to study the respondents awareness towards the agriculture products products. The data have been collected through primary in nature through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 120 respondents have been collected by adopting convenience sampling technique. Tools like Chi-Square and average ranking analysis have been used to analysis the data. The study recommended that the Creation of awareness of agriculture products is necessary among consumers.

**Brijesh Shivathanu ( 2015),** his study on “Factors affecting consumer preference towards the Agriculture product Purchase” , to understand the consumer preference towards agriculture product purchase. The required data for the study have been collected in primary data through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 150 respondents have been contacted by adopting random sampling technique. Statistical techniques like percentage and multiple regression analysis are used. He find that females have more preference for agriculture products as compared to male respondents and consumers prefer to buy agriculture products because of their perception that the agriculture products are healthy, safe, nutritious and environment friendly.

**9S.V.Ramesh and M.Divya ( 2015),** in their study on “A study on Consumer awareness attitude and satisfaction towards select agriculture products with reference to Coimbatore”

**10Brijesh Shivathanu ( 2015),** his study on “Factors affecting consumer preference towards the Agriculture product Purchase”

**Tina Vukasovic ( 2015),** carried out their study on “Attitudes towards Organic Fruits and Vegetables” . The main objectives of the study is to gain knowledge about attitudes towards organic fruits and vegetables among European Union Consumers. The data have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 520 customers have been contacted by adopting convenience sampling technique. The data collected have been analyzed by using tools like Factor Analysis and ANOVA. He find that consumer perceive organic fruits and vegetables as very healthy, tasty and of good quality. Among the purchase motives quality, freshness, nutritional value, organically grown and safety products were indicated as the most important reasons of purchasing organic fruits.

**Mohamed Bilal Basha and K.Ramesh (2014),** in their study entitled “Consumer Attitude towards Agriculture product in Trichy, South India” . The study aims to examine the impact of demographic variables on the buying intention of consumers of agriculture products. The data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 300 consumers have been collected by adapting convenient sampling technique. Tools like Correlation and ANOVA have been used to analyse the data. The results of the study show that the sample of the study was more concerned with health and safety factors in their decision to consume agriculture products.

**11Tina Vukasovic ( 2015),** carried out their study on “Attitudes towards Organic Fruits and Vegetables” .

**12Mohamed Bilal Basha and K.Ramesh (2014),** in their study entitled “Consumer Attitude towards Agriculture product in Trichy, South India” .

**C.Gan, C.Zhiyou, M.C.Tran, D.A.Cohen and W.Xiangxiang (2014),** in their study entitled “Consumer Attitudes towards the Purchase of Agriculture products in China” , to examines the underlying factors influencing organic product purchase decisions. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 700 respondent have been collected by adopting convenient sampling technique. Factor Analysis are used to analyze the data. They study recommended that female and households with children are more likely to consume agriculture products.

**M.Gomathi and S.Kalyani ( 2014),** in their study on “A study on Consumer opinion of agriculture products with reference to Erode town” , to find out the consumer opinion and attitude of agriculture products in Erode town. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 300 respondent have been collected by adopting convenient sampling technique. Tools like to percentage analysis, Chi-Square, Factor Analysis, Hendry Garrett ranking and weighted average method are used to analyze the data. She find that consumers are still unaware of organic certificates. So, retailers may take steps to overcome the issue.

**13C.Gan, C.Zhiyou, M.C.Tran, D.A.Cohen and W.Xiangxiang (2014),** in their study entitled “Consumer Attitudes towards the Purchase of Agriculture products in China”

**14M.Gomathi and S.Kalyani ( 2014),** in their study on “A study on Consumer opinion of agriculture products with reference to Erode town”

**Dr.H.M.Chandrashekar ( 2013),** carried out a study entitled “Consumers Perception towards Agriculture products – A study in Mysore City” , to examine the consumers perception towards agriculture products. The primary data have been collected from 100 respondents through convenience sampling technique. Statistical tools like Multivariate analysis, ANOVA are used to analysis and interpret the data. He find that most of the consumers expressed their opinion towards price as expensive for agriculture products.

**Nihan Ozguven ( 2012),** in their study on “Agriculture products Motivations Factors for Consumers” . The study aims to understand the consumer motivations with regards to agriculture product. The data have been collected through primary in nature through issue of questionnaire. A sample consist of 410 respondents by adopted purposive sampling technique. Tools like factor analysis, chi-square and correlation have been employed to analyse the data. The study recommended that most consumers associate organic at first with milk, fruits and vegetables with agriculture products. The decision making process is complex and the motives factors may affect vegatables.

**15Dr.H.M.Chandrashekar ( 2013),** carried out a study entitled “Consumers Perception towards Agriculture products – A study in Mysore City”

**16Nihan Ozguven ( 2012),** in their study on “Agriculture products Motivations Factors for Consumers” .

**Padmashree Dr. D.Y Patil (2012),** in her study on “Impact of Consumer Behaviour on Agriculture product consumption in select cities in Maharashtra” , to examine if users and non users are equally aware of agriculture products. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 400 agriculture product users and 100 non agriculture product users have been collected by adopting convenient sampling technique. Tools like to Percentage analysis, cross tabulation, percentages, cross tabulations, simple correlation, regression, Chi-Square test, F test, factor analysis, discriminate analysis are used to analyze the data. She find that the awareness levels between the users and non users were not significantly different and the users were influenced by professional recommendation for usage of agriculture product.

**Miguel Lorens Maria Puelles and Roberto Manzano ( 2011),** in their study entitled “Consumer behavior and brand preferences in organic grocery products. Store brands vs manufacturer brands ” , to uncover the reasons for buying organic brands and the reasons that may trigger positive or negative consumer attitudes towards agriculture product branding. The required data for the study have been collected in primary in nature through issue a structured questionnaire. A sample consists of 350 respondents. Simple percentage test and Chi-Square analysis alone used to analyze the data. They find that store brands make agriculture products more affordable for those buyers who are more price sensitive, enabling more choice.

**17Padmashree Dr. D.Y Patil (2012),** in her study on “Impact of Consumer Behaviour on Agriculture product consumption in select cities in Maharashtra”

**18Miguel Lorens Maria Puelles and Roberto Manzano ( 2011),** in their study entitled “Consumer behavior and brand preferences in organic grocery products. Store brands vs manufacturer brands ”

**Parichard Sangkumchaliang and Wen-Chi Huang ( 2010),** in their study entitled “Consumers Perceptions and Attitudes of Agriculture products in Northern Thailand” , to analyze the consumers organic knowledge, attitude and purchase behaviour. The required data for the study have been collected in primary data through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 390 respondents of student are collected by adopted convenient sampling techniques. Tools like Cross Tabulation tables and Chi-Square test have been used to analyse the data. The study recommended that the main reasons for purchasing agriculture products are an expectation of a healthier and environmentally friendly means of production.

**Susanne Padel and Carolyn Foster (2005),** carried out their study on “Exploring the Gap between Attitudes and behaviour understanding why consumer buy or do not buy agriculture product” , to explore the values that underlie consumers purchasing decision of agriculture product. The required data for the study have been collected through issue of questionnaire. A sample of 181 respondents are collected by adopted convenient sampling techniques. Tools like Percentage Analysis and Chi-square test have been used to analyse the data. He find that most consumers associate organic at first with vegetables, fruit and a healthy diet with agriculture products. Fruit and vegetables are also the first and in many cases only experience with buying organic product. The decision making process is complex and the importance of motives and barriers may vary between product categories.

**19Parichard Sangkumchaliang and Wen-Chi Huang ( 2010),** in their study entitled “Consumers Perceptions and Attitudes of Agriculture products in Northern Thailand”

**20Susanne Padel and Carolyn Foster (2005),** carried out their study on “Exploring the Gap between Attitudes and behaviour understanding why consumer buy or do not buy agriculture product”

**CHAPTER – III**

**CONCEPT AND THEORIES**

**3. 1 INTRODUCTION**

Now a days the food products which are produced by farmers are pesticides mixed products due to get more productivity. It caused to cancer, reproductive dysfunction, diabetes, autism, asthma, birth defects, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases and more. To free from those harmful diseases, agriculture products are grown up. Agriculture products are grown without the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, plant growth regulators(hormones), and genetically modified organisms. Organic agriculture relies on natural products and processes to grow crops, improve soil quality, control pests and promote bio-diversity.

As far as possible, organic farmers rely on crop rotation, green manure, compost, and biological pest control to maintain soil productivity and control pests. A well-balanced and biologically active soil will provide the crop with sufficient nutrients for optimum growth and yields, with a minimum of pest and disease problems. Agriculture products are foods that are produced using methods of organic farming – that do not involve modern synthetic inputs such as synthetic pesticides and chemical fertilizers. Agriculture products are also not processed using irradiation, industrial solvents, or chemical food additives.

**3. 2 ORGANIC CERTIFICATION**

Certified Organic is a term given to food products produced according to a set of standards. Organic standards define a set of practices for production and handling which must be followed for the farmer’s products to be labeled and sold as Organic. Before a product can be labeled Organic, a Government approved certifier inspects the farm where the food is grown to make sure the farmer is following all the rules necessary to meet the national organic standards.

Companies that handle or process agriculture product before it goes to market must also be certified. As part of complying with the standards, an audit trail, or recordkeeping system, is kept by the farmer, handlers and processors by which a crop may be traced from field to storage to sale. All certification bodies require an accurate audit trail as proof that acceptable organic management practices have been followed.

**3.3 NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR ORGANIC PRODUCTION (NPOP)**

Agriculture products are grown under a system of agriculture without the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides with an environmentally and socially responsible approach. This is a method of farming that works at grass root level preserving the reproductive and regenerative capacity of the soil, good plant nutrition, and sound soil management, produces nutritious food rich in vitality which has resistance to diseases.

India is bestowed with lot of potential to produce all varieties of agriculture products due to its various agro climatic regions. In several parts of the country, the inherited tradition of organic farming is an added advantage. This holds promise for the organic producers to tap the market which is growing steadily in the domestic market related to the export market. Currently, India ranks 10th among the top ten countries in terms of cultivable land under organic certification. The certified area includes 15% cultivable area with 0.72 million Hectare and rest 85% (3.99 million Hectare) is forest and wild area for collection of minor forest produces. The total area under organic certification is 4.72 million Hectare (2015- 16).

The Government of India has implemented the National Programme for Organic Production (NPOP). The national programme involves the accreditation programme for Certification Bodies, standards for organic production, promotion of organic farming etc. The NPOP standards for production and accreditation system have been recognized by European Commission and Switzerland as equivalent to their country standards. Similarly, USDA has recognized NPOP conformity assessment procedures of accreditation as equivalent to that of US. With these recognitions, Indian agriculture products duly certified by the accredited Certification Bodies of India are accepted by the importing countries.

**3. 4 ORGANIC FARMING IN INDIA**

The approach and outlook towards agriculture and marketing of food has seen a quantum change worldwide over the last few decades. Whereas earlier the seasons and the climate of an area determined what would be grown and when, today it is the "market" that determines what it wants and what should be grown. The focus is now more on quantity and "outer" quality (appearance) rather than intrinsic or nutritional quality, also called "vitality". Pesticide and other chemical residues in food and an overall reduced quality of food have led to a marked

increase in various diseases, mainly various forms of cancer and reduced bodily immunity.

This immense commercialization of agriculture has also had a very negative effect on the environment. The use of pesticides has led to enormous levels of chemical buildup in our environment, in soil, water, air, in animals and even in our own bodies. Fertilizers have a short-term effect on productivity but a longer-term negative effect on the environment where they remain for years after leaching and running off, contaminating ground water and water bodies. The use of hybrid seeds and the practice of monoculture have led to a severe threat to local and indigenous varieties, whose germplasm can be lost forever. All of this is for "productivity". In the name of growing more to feed the earth, we have taken the wrong road of unsustainability.

The effects already show - farmers committing suicide in growing numbers with every passing year; the horrendous effects of pesticide sprays by a government-owned plantation in Kerala some years ago; the pesticide contaminated bottled water and aerated beverages are only some instances. Organic farming was practiced in India since thousands of years. The great Indian civilization thrived on organic farming and was one of the most prosperous countries in the world, till the British ruled it. In traditional India, the entire agriculture was practiced using organic techniques, where the fertilizers, pesticides, etc., were obtained from plant and animal products.

**3. 5 REASONS FOR BUYING AGRICULTURE PRODUCT**

From further analysis of the literature it has been seen that many surveys were carried out to understand the mental framework of customers to understand their views on agriculture product. The main focus of the surveys that were carried out revolves around the issues such as the attitudes of the customers when they are buying agriculture products, what type of agriculture products they prefer more, the reasons behind their interest in the agriculture product and reasons why they are not interested in buying them etc. The reasons that were provided by the customers had quite a lot of variations. According to certain scholars (Fotopoulos and Krystallis, 2002; Wier and Calverly, 2002; Larue et al., 2004) agriculture products are considered to be healthier than the conventional foods.

They are also nutritious and have a better taste. In addition they are environmental friendly. Customers did not have only positive views about the agriculture products. According to certain authors/scholars (Fotopoulos and Krystallis, 2002; Wier and Calverly, 2002; Larue et al., 2004; Verdurme et al., 2002; Worner and Meier-Ploeger, 1999), from a negative perspective, the reasons that prevent the customers from buying agriculture products are:

* The price of the agriculture products are higher compared to others.
* Small range of products are availble.
* Qualities are not always satisfactory.
* Some customers are unble to understand the difference between conventional food and agriculture product.
* Lack of knowledge about the advantages of using or consuming agriculture products(e.g. food).

**3.6 NEED FOR CONTRACT FARMING IN AGRICULTURE**

Production of the Commerce Ministry and the State Governments are actively promoting investment in support of promising ventures in organic agriculture. Considering the present socio-economic status of Indian farmers, contract farming seems to be an ideal option because this system would have certain advantages over the present crop production and marketing systems, such as:

* Profit in produce sale is possible by capitalizing the scientific research in post-harvest technologies.
* Indian agriculture per se is becoming commercial due to global demand for a variety of foods and fibre, and food products.
* Any crop can be cultivated on a large area to obtain produce of uniform quality by adopting appropriate technology. Crop production is also possible on small land-holdings through cooperative/ corporate farming to enhance productivity and avoid admixture or inferior quality produce.
* Technology transfer becomes easier due to large-scale adoption.
* Risk involved due to fluctuation in market price is minimized. This point is relevant to the present strategy of farm economics as the Minimum Support Price is generally declared at the end of crop season and it often remains ambiguous.
* Commercial and nationalized banks are coming forward to finance contract farming through soft loans and are revising prime lending rates.

**3. 7 CHALLENGES FOR CONTRACT ORGANIC FARMING**

Organic farming on contract basis requires a long-term approach as it is based on the trust of farmers, for which grass root intervention is critical for its success.

* If it is not profitable to both parties, the written agreement becomes a useless effort. Thus, responsibilities of both parties should be fulfilled. The agreements differ according to the commodity produced by contracting farmers. Generally, farmers may not take cognizance at the time of signing of the clauses that might be exploitative in short or long term such agreements can jeopardize investments and interest.
* Although 44% of the country’s GDP comes from retailing, retail marketing of agriculture product is limited compared to other countries, e.g. 85% in USA, 40% in Thailand, 35% in Brazil, 20% in China and only 2% in India.
* Convincing farmers about the economic benefits of contract farming through field demonstrations should be taken up urgently. This may consist of educating farmers about new farming techniques, marketing skills for agriculture product and fibre, seeking cooperation from business communities and firms, informing consumers about the ill-effects of chemicals, etc.
* Certification cost for organic produce is comparatively high and needs to be reduced drastically.
* Facilities for storing and verification of quality of agricultural commodities at village level are lacking.

**3. 8 CONCLUSION**

Consumers have high positive attitude toward agriculture products and they exhibit an increase willingness to pay higher prices for these products. For such reason, marketing strategies for agriculture product must be targeted towards those segments of consumers almost appreciative of the positive attributes of agriculture product. Although consumers preferring to buy agriculture products and willing to pay the additional cost, they often want some reassurance of the organic status of the products. Therefore, marketing agriculture products with standard packaging and a logo or statement confirming the organic status adds to the value of the products in terms of quality and social benefits, etc. Building consumer trust in other ways is also essential.

**CHAPTER – IV**

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**4. 1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the study. For the analysis following statistical tools have been applied.

Percentage Analysis

**4. 2 PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS**

Percentage refers to a special kind of ratio in making comparison between two or more data and to describe relationships. Percentage can also be used to compare the relation terms in the distribution of two or more sources of data.

Simple percentage = Number of Respondents X 100

Total Respondents

**Table – 4. 1**

**AGE WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Below 20 years | 15 | 30 |
| 21-30 years | 22 | 44 |
| 31- 50 years | 10 | 20 |
| Above 50 years | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the table 4. 1 it is known that, among the respondent under this study, 15 (30%) of the respondent are belong to the age group of below 20 years, 22 ( 44%) of the respondents are belong to the age group between 21-30 years, 10 (20%) of the respondents are belong to the age group between 31-50 years and remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents are blong to the age group of above 50 years. Most 22(44%) of respondents are blong to the age group between 21-30 years.

**Table – 4.2**

**GENDER WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Male | 22 | 44 |
| Female | 28 | 56 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

Among the 50 respondents, 22 ( 44%) of the respondents are male and remaining 28 (56%) of the respondents are female.

The majority 28 (56%) of the respondents are female.

**Table – 4.3**

**MARITAL STATUS WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Marital Status** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Married | 34 | 68 |
| Unmarried | 16 | 32 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that out of 50 respondents, 34 (68%) of the respondents are married and remaining 16 (32%) of the respondents are unmarried.

The majority 34 (68%) of the respondents are married.

**Table – 4.4**

**AREA OF RESIDENCE WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of Residence** | **No of**  **respondent**  **s** | **Percentag e** |
| Rural | 40 | 80 |
| Urban | 10 | 20 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

Out of 50 respondents, 40 (80%) of the respondents are residing in rural area and remaining 10 (20%) of the respondents are residing in urban area.

The majority 40 (80%) of the respondents are residing in rural area.

**Table – 4.5**

**EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Educational**  **Qualification** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Upto School level | 12 | 24 |
| Graduate | 21 | 42 |
| Post Graduate | 13 | 26 |
| Professional | 4 | 8 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It can be inferred that, out of the total 50 respondents, 12 (24%) of the respondents are educated upto school level, 21 (42%) of the respondents are graduate holders, 13 (26%) of the respondents are post graduate holders and the remaining 4 (8%) of the respondents are professionals.

Thus, it is observed that majority 21 ( 42%) of the respondents are graduate holders.

**Table – 4.6**

**OCCUPATION WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Occupation** | **No of respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Employed | 11 | 22 |
| Business | 3 | 6 |
| Profession | 29 | 58 |
| Housewife | 7 | 14 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 11 (22%) of the respondents are employed, 3 (6%) of the respondents are doing a business, 29 (58%) of the respondents are professionals and the remaining 7 ( 14%) of the respondents are housewife ’s.

The majority 29 (58%) of the respondents are professionals.

**Table – 4.7**

**MONTHLY INCOME OF THE FAMILY WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Monthly income of the Family** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentag**  **E** |
| Upto Rs. 10,000 | 29 | 58 |
| Rs. 10,001 - Rs.20,000 | 10 | 20 |
| Rs.20,001 - Rs.30,000 | 7 | 14 |
| Above Rs.30,001 | 4 | 8 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

Out of 50 respondents, 29 (58%) respondents family income per month is up to Rs. 10,000, 10 (20%) respondents family income per month

between Rs. 10,001 - Rs.20,000, 7 ( 14%) of the respondents family income per month between Rs.20,001 - Rs.30,000 and the rest 4 (8%) of the respondents family income per month is above Rs.30,001.

Thus, it is concluded that the majority 29 (58%) respondents family income per month is up to Rs. 10,000.

**Table – 4.8**

**TYPE OF THE FAMILY WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of the Family** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Joint | 32 | 64 |
| Nuclear | 18 | 36 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

The above table reveals that, out of the total 50 respondents, 32 (64%) of the respondents belonging to joint family and the remaining 18 (36%) of the respondents belonging to nuclear family.

Thus, it can be concluded that the majority 32 (64%) of the respondents belonging to joint family.

**Table – 4.9**

**SIZE OF THE FAMILY WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Size of the Family** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Less than 3 members | 5 | 10 |
| 3- 4 members | 18 | 36 |
| 5-6 members | 16 | 32 |
| More than 6 members | 11 | 22 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It is observed from the above table that out of the total 50 respondents, 5 ( 10%) of the respondent had less than 3 members in their family, 18 (36%) of the respondents had between 3- 4 members in their family, 16 (32%) of the respondents had between 5-6 members in their family and remaining 11 (22%) of the respondents had more than 6 members in their family.

Thus, it can be said that majority 18 (36%) of the respondents had between 3- 4 members in their family.

**Table – 4. 10**

**HEARD ABOUT AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Heard about Agriculture products** | **No of respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 40 | 80 |
| No | 10 | 20 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It is evident from the above table that out of 50 respondents, 40 (80%) of the respondents have heard about agriculture products and remaining 10 (20%) respondents have un heard about agriculture products.

Hence, it could be inferred that 40 (80%) of the respondents have heard about agriculture products.

**Table – 4. 11**

**SOURCE OF INFORMATION WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Information** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Friends and Relatives | 15 | 30 |
| Neighbors | 2 | 4 |
| Social Media | 3 | 6 |
| Television / Radio | 21 | 42 |
| Word of Mouth | 9 | 18 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that out of 50 respondents, 15 (30%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through their friends and relatives, 2 (4%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through their neighbors, 3 (6%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through social media, 21 (42%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through television and radio and remaining 9 ( 18%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through word of mouth.

It could be inferred that most of 21 (42%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through television and radio.

**Table – 4. 12**

**DURATION OF USAGE WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Duration of usage** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| One year | 13 | 26 |
| Two years | 9 | 18 |
| Three years | 21 | 42 |
| More than three years | 7 | 14 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

Out of 50 respondents, 13 (26%) of the respondents have one year consuming agriculture products, 9 ( 18%) respondents have two years consuming agriculture products, 21 ( 42%) respondents have three years consuming agriculture products and remaining 7 ( 14%) respondents have more than three years using agriculture products.

Thus, it is concluded that the majority 21 (42%) respondents have three years consuming agriculture products.

**Table – 4. 13**

**USUALLY BUY AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Usually buy Agriculture products** | **No of**  **respondent**  **s** | **Percentage** |
| Generic Supermarket | 8 | 16 |
| Local Market | 15 | 30 |
| Organic Shops | 7 | 14 |
| Producer / farmers market | 17 | 34 |
| Online Shopping | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It is observed from the above table that out of the total 50 respondents, 8 ( 16%) of the respondents are usually buy agriculture products in generic super market, 15 (30%) of the respondents have buying agriculture products in local market, 7 ( 14%) of the respondents have buying agriculture products in organic shops, 17 (34%) respondents have buying agriculture products from producers or farmers and remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents had buying agriculture products for online shopping.

The most 17 (34%) respondents have buying agriculture products from producers or farmers.

**Table – 4. 14**

**MOST BUYING AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Most Buying Agriculture products** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentag**  **e** |
| Fresh fruits and vegetable | 13 | 26 |
| Milk Products | 21 | 42 |
| Oil | 5 | 10 |
| Spinach | 4 | 8 |
| Cereals | 1 | 2 |
| Honey | 1 | 2 |
| Meat | 3 | 6 |
| Herbs | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that out of 50 respondents, 13 (26%) of the respondents have buying most fresh fruits and vegetable products, 21 (42%) of the respondents have buying milk products, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents have buying oil items, 4 (8%) of the respondents have buying spinach products, 1 (2%) respondents have buying cereals products, 1 (2%) of the respondents have buying honey items, 3 (6%) of the respondents have buying meat products and the remaining 2 ( 4%) of the respondents have buying herbs items.

Hence, it could be observed that most 21 (42%) of the respondents have buying milk products, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents have buying oil items.

**Table – 4. 15**

**FREQUENCY OF CONSUME AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Frequency of Consume Agriculture products** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Every day | 10 | 20 |
| Several times a week | 14 | 28 |
| Once a Week | 2 | 4 |
| Once in a month | 7 | 14 |
| Few times a year | 17 | 34 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It can be inferred that, out of the total 50 respondents, 10 (20%) of the respondents are every day using agriculture products, 14 (28%) of the respondents are several times a week using agriculture products, 2 (4%) of the respondents are once in a week consuming agriculture products, 7 ( 14%) respondents are once in a month consuming agriculture products and remaining 17 (34%) respondents are few times a year consuming agriculture products.

The most 17 (34%) respondents are few times a year consuming agriculture products.

**Table – 4. 16**

**FACTOR INFLUENCED TO PURCHASE AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor influenced to purchase agriculture products** | **No of**  **responden**  **ts** | **Percentage** |
| Health | 30 | 60 |
| Taste | 17 | 34 |
| Environment safety | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 30 (60%) respondents said health factor influenced to purchase the most to agriculture products, 17 (34%) respondents said taste factor influence to purchase the agriculture products and remaining 3 (6%) respondents said environment safety factor influence to purchase the agriculture products.

Hence, it could be inferred that most 30 (60%) respondents said health factor influenced to purchase the most to agriculture products.

**Table – 4. 17**

**RECOMMENDED TO AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS TO OTHERS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommended to**  **Agriculture products to**  **Others** | **No of**  **responden**  **ts** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 38 | 76 |
| No | 12 | 24 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that out of 50 respondents, 38 ( 76%) of the respondents are agriculture products to others and remaining 12 (24%) respondents are not recommended to others.

Hence, it could be inferred that 38 (76%) of the respondents are agriculture products to others.

**Table – 4. 18**

**EXAMINE THE EXPIRY DATE OF FOOD ITEMS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Examine the Expiry date of food items** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 28 | 56 |
| No | 22 | 44 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It is observed from the above table that out of the total 50 respondents, 28 (56%) of the respondents had buying examine the expiry date of food items and remaining 22 (44%) of the respondents are not examine the expiry date.

The most 28 (56%) of the respondents had buying examine the expiry date of food items.

**Table – 4. 19**

**AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS ARE TASTIER THAN CONVENTIONAL FOOD**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agriculture products are**  **tastier than Conventional**  **Food** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 19 | 38 |
| No | 31 | 62 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It can be inferred that, out of the total 50 respondents, 19 (38%) of the respondents said agriculture products are tastier than conventional food and remaining 31 (62%) of the respondents said agriculture products are not better than conventional food.

The most 31 (62%) of the respondents said agriculture products are not better than conventional food.

**Table – 4.20**

**RELIABILITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reliability** | **No of**  **respondent**  **s** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 23 | 46 |
| Satisfied | 16 | 32 |
| Neutral | 5 | 10 |
| Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 23 (46%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with reliability of the product, 16 (32%) of the respondents are satisfied with reliability of the product, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents are neutral with reliability of the product, 3 (6%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with reliability of the product and the remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with reliability of the product.

The majority 23 (46%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with reliability of the product.

**Table – 4.21**

**QUALITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 18 | 36 |
| Satisfied | 20 | 40 |
| Neutral | 9 | 18 |
| Dissatisfied | 1 | 2 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 18 (36%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with quality of the product, 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are satisfied with quality of the product, 9 ( 18%) of the respondents are neutral with quality of the product, 1 (2%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with quality of the product and the remaining 2 ( 4%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with quality of the product.

The majority 20 (40%) of the respondents are satisfied with quality of the product.

**Table – 4.22**

**QUANTITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quantity** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 20 | 40 |
| Satisfied | 12 | 24 |
| Neutral | 13 | 26 |
| Dissatisfied | 1 | 24 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 4 | 40 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 20 (40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with quantity of the product, 12 (24%) of the respondents are satisfied with quantity of the product, 13 (26%) of the respondents are neutral with quantity of the product, 1 (24%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with quantity of the product and the remaining 4 ( 40%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with quantity of the product.

The majority 20 (40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with quantity of the product.

**Table – 4.23**

**FRESHNESS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Freshness** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 15 | 30 |
| Satisfied | 19 | 38 |
| Neutral | 11 | 22 |
| Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 15 (30%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with freshness of the product, 19 (38%) of the respondents are satisfied with freshness of the product, 11 (22%) of the respondents are neutral with freshness of the product, 3 (6%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with freshness of the product and the remaining 2 ( 4%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with freshness of the product.

The majority 19 (38%) of the respondents are satisfied with freshness of the product.

**Table – 4.24**

**TASTE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Taste** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 13 | 26 |
| Satisfied | 20 | 40 |
| Neutral | 5 | 10 |
| Dissatisfied | 9 | 18 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 13 (26%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with taste of the product, 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are satisfied with taste of the product, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents are neutral with taste of the product, 9 ( 18%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with taste of the product and the remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with taste of the product.

The majority 20 (40%) of the respondents are satisfied with taste of the product.

**Table – 4.25**

**AVAILABILITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Availability** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 10 | 20 |
| Satisfied | 23 | 46 |
| Neutral | 9 | 18 |
| Dissatisfied | 6 | 12 |
| Highly  Dissatisfied | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 10 (20%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with availability of the product, 23 ( 46%) of the respondents are satisfied with availability of the product, 9 ( 18%) of the respondents are neutral with availability of the product, 6 ( 12%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with availability of the product and the remaining 2 (4%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with availability of the product.

The majority 23 (46%) of the respondents are satisfied with availability of the product.

**Table – 4.26**

**NUTRITIONAL VALUE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Nutritional Value** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 7 | 14 |
| Satisfied | 22 | 44 |
| Neutral | 10 | 20 |
| Dissatisfied | 9 | 18 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 7 ( 14%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with nutritional value of the product, 22 (44%) of the respondents are satisfied with nutritional value of the product, 10 (20%) of the respondents are neutral with nutritional value of the product, 9 ( 18%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with nutritional value of the product and the remaining 2 ( 4%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with nutritional value of the product.

The majority 22 (44%) of the respondents are satisfied with nutritional value of the product.

**Table – 4.27**

**LOW CALORIES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Low Calories** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 9 | 18 |
| Satisfied | 22 | 44 |
| Neutral | 11 | 22 |
| Dissatisfied | 5 | 10 |
| Highly  Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 9 ( 18%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with low calories of the product, 22 (44%) of the respondents are satisfied with low calories of the product, 11 (22%) of the respondents are neutral with low calories of the product, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with low calories of the product and the remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with low calories of the product.

The majority 22 (44%) of the respondents are satisfied with low calories of the product.

**Table – 4.28**

**PURITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Purity** | **No of**  **Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 13 | 26 |
| Satisfied | 17 | 34 |
| Neutral | 4 | 8 |
| Dissatisfied | 13 | 26 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 3 | 6 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 13 (26%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with purity of the product, 17 (34%) of the respondents are satisfied with purity of the product, 4 (8%) of the respondents are neutral with purity of the product, 13 (26%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with purity of the product and the remaining 3 (6%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with purity of the product.

The majority 17 (34%) of the respondents are satisfied with purity of the product.

**Table – 4.29**

**COST OF AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost of Agriculture products** | **No of**  **respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Highly Satisfied | 20 | 40 |
| Satisfied | 13 | 26 |
| Neutral | 11 | 22 |
| Dissatisfied | 1 | 2 |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 5 | 10 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, out of 50 respondents, 20 (40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with cost of agriculture product, 13 (26%) of the respondents are satisfied with cost of agriculture product, 11 (22%) of the respondents are neutral with cost of agriculture product, 1 (2%) of the respondents are dissatisfied with cost of agriculture product and the remaining 5 ( 10%) of the respondents are highly dissatisfied with cost of agriculture product.

The majority 20 (40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with cost of agriculture product.

**Table – 4.30**

**FACED ANY PROBLEMS WHILE USING AGRICULTURE PRODUCT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Faced any problems**  **while using Agriculture**  **product** | **No of**  **responden**  **ts** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 22 | 44 |
| No | 28 | 56 |
| **Total** | **50** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table shows that, 22 ( 44%) of the respondents faced problems while using agriculture products and remaining 28 (56%) of the respondents have no problems while using agriculture products.

The majority 28 (56%) of the respondents have no problems while using agriculture products.

**Table – 4.31**

**TYPE OF PROBLEM FACED BY THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Problem** | **No of respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Digestion | 11 | 50 |
| Allergy | 8 | 36 |
| More fat content | 3 | 14 |
| **Total** | **22** | **100** |

**(Source: Primary data)**

**INTERPRETATION**

It is evident from the above table that out of 22 respondents, 11 (50%) of the respondents faced digestion problems while using agriculture products, 8 (36%) of the respondents faced allergy problems while using agriculture products and remaining 3 ( 14%) of the respondents face more fat content problems while using agriculture products.

It could be seen from the table that the most 11 (50%) of the respondents faced digestion problems while using agriculture products.

**CHAPTER – V**

**FINDINGS, SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION**

**5. 1 FINDINGS**

**5. 1. 1 Percentage Analysis**

* Most 22 ( 44%) of the respondents are belong to the age group between 21-30 years.
* Majority 28 (56%) of the respondents are female.
* Majority 34 (68%) of the respondents are married.
* Majority 40 (80%) of the respondents are residing in rural area.
* Majority 21 ( 42%) of the respondents are graduate holders.
* Majority 29 (58%) of the respondents are professionals.
* Majority 29 (58%) respondents family income per month is up to Rs.10,000.
* Majority 32 (64%) of the respondents belonging to joint family.
* Majority 18 (36%) of the respondents had between 3- 4 members in their family.
* Most 40 (80%) of the respondents have heard about agriculture products.
* Most of 21 (42%) respondents came to know about agriculture products through television and radio.
* Majority 21 ( 42%) respondents have three years consuming agriculture products.
* Most 17 (34%) respondents have buying agriculture products from producers or farmers.
* Most 21 ( 42%) of the respondents have buying milk products, 5 ( 10%) of the respondents have buying oil items.
* Most 30 (60%) respondents said health factor influenced to purchase the most to agriculture products.
* Most 38 ( 76%) of the respondents are agriculture products to others.
* Most 28 (56%) of the respondents had buying examine the expiry date of food items.
* Most 31 (62%) of the respondents said agriculture products are not better than conventional food.
* Majority 23 ( 46%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with reliability of the product.
* Majority 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are satisfied with quality of the product.
* Majority 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with quantity of the product.
* Majority 19 (38%) of the respondents are satisfied with freshness of the product.
* Majority 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are satisfied with taste of the product.
* Majority 23 ( 46%) of the respondents are satisfied with availability of the product.
* Majority 22 ( 44%) of the respondents are satisfied with nutritional value of the product.
* Majority 22 ( 44%) of the respondents are satisfied with low calories of the product.
* Majority 17 (34%) of the respondents are satisfied with purity of the product.
* Majority 20 ( 40%) of the respondents are highly satisfied with cost of agriculture product.
* Majority 28 (56%) of the respondents have no problems while using agriculture products.
* Most 11 (50%) of the respondents faced digestion problems while using agriculture products.

**5. 2 SUGGESTION**

The following are the suggestion made based on the results of the study.

* The creation of awareness of agriculture products is necessary among consumers. Sustained improvement in product features would lead to increase in consumption of agriculture products.
* The increase frequency of viewing the advertisement of agriculture products and better taste would influence the purchase agriculture products.
* The familiarity of the agriculture products among customers depends on the promotional efforts of the marketers. The availability agriculture products need wider advertisement.
* Positioning agriculture products should be by their specific attributes. Positioning agriculture products by influencing consumer beliefs about the benefits they derive on consuming. Positioning by reputation for quality is “only organic” .
* The products initially should be made available in prominent market places and also gradually, in all the shops. The agriculture marketing and co-operative departments to help farmers get a good price for organic produce.
* Most of the respondents quality of agriculture products by farmers through certification by the Organic Certification Department, which help them to get a good price.
* Demand creation large-scale production and availability of agriculture products should go hand in hand. According a more responsible advertisement can play a positive and beneficial role in bringing out a desirable among homemakers in Agriculture products market.

**5.3 CONCLUSION**

Consumer behavior plays a major role in Agriculture products segment. The marketers of agriculture products need to be innovative and dynamic in order to complete with the changing purchase behavior in the Agriculture products market among urban residents. The study brought out the fact that the people were well aware of images and availability, but not loyal entirely to agriculture products. The respondent without doubt attracted towards Agriculture products. So the marketers must create promotions which are both realistic and moral and the product availability in terms of volume and variety are required to become successful in marketing agriculture products.
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