Original Research Article

AN ANALYTICAL STUDY ON MARKETING BEHAVIOUR OF COCONUT GROWERS IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT

Abstract:

Coimbatore tops in area and production of coconuts in Tamil Nadu. Though production had been increased in the recent years. Farmers are facing difficulties in finding new marketing channels for their produce and also facing hardships in fetching fair and remunerative price for their nuts. Coconut copra, coconut oil price had also fallen drastically recently. The study was undertaken with the objective of analysing marketing behaviour of coconut growers in Coimbatore district.The study was taken-up in Coimbatore district of Tamil Nadu. Out of the twelve blocks in Coimbatore district,“Sulthanpet block”, “Pollachi (North)”, “Pollachi (South) block” were selected. A sample size of 120 coconut cultivating farmers was selected by using simple random sampling technique.The required data was collected by personal interview using a well-structured and pretested interview schedule. The result revealedthat nearly sixty percent of the respondents (58.33 per cent) had medium level of marketing behaviour, 21.67 per cent of the respondents had low level of marketing behaviour, only 20 per cent of the respondents possessed high level of marketing behaviour.

Comment [b1]: OUT OF HOW MANY RESPONDENTS,PLEASE LET THE ANALYTICAL TOOLS USED REFLECTED IN YOUR ABSTRACT

Comment [b2]: PLEASE LET YOUR CONCLUSION AND RECOMMEDATIONS BE MENTION IN YOUR ABSTRACT. RE WRIITE YOUR ABSTRACT TO REFLECT THE SUMMARY OF THE ARTICLE IN DETAILS

Keywords – Coconuts, Marketing Behaviour, Coimbatore, copra, coconut oil, Marketing Channels, remunerative price

Introduction:

Coconut is unique among horticulture crops grown in India as it is a source of food, drink, shelter, and a variety of raw materials for industries.Production of coconut in India stood at 21,207 million nuts during 2020-21, which is 34% of the global production. In recent years due to adequate rainfall the production of nuts had been increased to greater extent but, it had bought new challenges for the farmers to find new marketing channels and strategies to sell their produce. Prices of copra, dehusked nuts, oil had fallen drastically due to adequate supply.New Coconut products and industries are growing, due to which farmers are getting employment. Marketing of coconut is more complicated as majority of the farmers are illiterate, unorganized,not aware about value addition and having poor knowledge in post-harvest practices.Nandakumar (1995) stated that marketing of coconut, copra and coconut oil is in the hands of private traders in the country. They do not have ample knowledge and skill inmarketing their produce.

Comment [b3]: LOOK FOR RECENT REFRENCE

Rao (1995) reported that in coconut marketing all types of marketing channels viz., farmers, middlemen, wholesalers, and retail business exists. Mia and Huq (1990) found out that various intermediaries were involved in the marketing of coconut because small producers could not find any large buyers except a few petty consumers.

Comment [b4]: TOO OLD

Comment [b5]: TOO OLD

Furthermore, lack of storage facilities forced them to sell their produce immediately after the harvest at low prices in the village itself to the local traders. In addition, there are inadequate arrangements for grading, standardization, market information, credit availability, storage, and transport. There is a huge extent of middlemen in marketing of coconuts who exploit farmers to certain extent such as delay in payment, not procuring in remunerative prices etc.

Keeping the above problems in view, the present study was taken up with the specific objective to identify the marketing behaviour of coconut growers in Coimbatore district. Marketing behaviour referred to the capacity or tendency of an individual farmer to identify the market trend to sell the produce for greater return. In this study marketing behaviour was studied in eleven dimensions viz., mode of transport, mode of sale, distance of market, time of sale,grading behaviour, counting behaviour,storage of nuts,terms and conditions of sale,payment pattern, sources of knowing price trend,middleman involvement.

Comment [b6]: PLEASE LOOK FOR MORE REFRENCES ESPECIALLY RECENT REFRENCES

Methodology:

The study was undertaken with an objectiveof Analysing marketing behaviour of coconut growers in Coimbatore district of Tamil Nadu. There aretwelve blocks in Coimbatore district. Among which "Sulthanpet block", "Pollachi (North)", "Pollachi (South) block" had been chosen as the areas of research. From each block 4 villages were selected purposefully. The villages selected for the study are "Senjerimalai, Pachagoundampalyam, J.Krishnapuram, Malapalayam" from Sultanpet block. "A.Nagoor, Avalappampatti, Ayyampalayam, Puliampatti" from Pollachi (North) block. "Gomangalam, Ambarampalayam, Kanjampatti, Naickenpalayam" from Pollachi (South) block. It's been selected since the area has high production of coconuts, hub for "coir and copra industries", elaborate availability of respondents, diversified coconut growers in age, landholdings, educational status, farming experience etc., familiarity about the place by the researcher.With a sample size of 120, the coconut cultivating farmers weredrawn using random sampling technique in the above-mentioned blocks and villages. The required data were collected usinga well-structured and pretested interview schedule. The collected data were tabulated and analysed through percentage analysis and cumulative frequency method.

Chart 1 :Area, Production and Productivity status of coconuts in Coimbatore

Area	87749.20 ha
Production	14882 lakh nuts
Productivity	16960 nuts/ha

Source- www.coconutboard.gov.in (2019-2020)

15.3. Selection of respondents

An "Ex Post Facto" research design was used in this study. District was selected purposively since Coimbatore has the maximum area and production under Coconut cultivation. Block was selected using Purposive sampling based on area under coconut production. Villages were selected using Purposive sampling based on area under coconut production. Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents. With a sample size of 120,coconut cultivating farmers weredrawn using random sampling technique in the above-mentioned blocks and villages. The required data were collected usinga well-structured and pretested

Comment [b7]: THIS SAMPLING WAS WRONG,THIS IS MULTI STAGE SAMPLING BECAUSE IT INVOLVED FOUR STAGES.

Comment [b8]:

interview schedule. The collected data were tabulated and analysed using appropriate statistical tools.

Findings and Discussions:
An attempt has been made in this study to analyse the Marketing behaviour of coconut growers.Marketing behaviour of the respondents in the activities related to coconut crop has been analysed individually and discussed. Further, their dimensions of marketing behaviour viz., mode of transport, mode of sale, distance of market, time of sale, grading behaviour, counting behaviour,storage of nuts,terms and conditions of sale,payment pattern,sources of knowing price trend,middleman involvement was assessed, and results are presented in following Table-1-12

OVERALL MARKETING BEHAVIOR:

The data on overall marketing behaviour adopted by the respondents are presented in Table-1. The respondents were categorised into three levels viz., low, medium, and high based on the cumulative frequency method, the results are presented in Table-1.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their overall marketing behaviourn=120

S.No.	Category	Number	Percentage
1	Low(<15)	26	21.67
2	Medium (16-25)	70	58.33
3	High (26-36)	24	20.00
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from the Table -1, that nearly sixty percent of the respondents (58.33 per cent) had medium level of marketing behaviour, 21.67 per cent of the respondents had low level of marketing behaviour, only 20 per cent of the respondents possessed high level of marketing behaviour.

Hence, it could be concluded from the Table-1, that majority of the respondents had medium level of marketing behaviour. This may be becausemost of the coconut growers were finding new marketing channels and marketing strategies in increasing their income level manifold and contributing to the betterment of their family. In this process, most of the respondents reported that they were actively participated in time of sale, place of sale, mode of sale, mode of transport, selling pattern of farm produce, grading behaviour, counting behaviour, storage of nuts and source of knowing price trend etc. This would have resulted with majority of the coconut growers fall under medium level of marketing behaviour.

DIMENSION OF MARKETING BEHAVIOUR

1. **Mode of transport**

The data on mode of transport used by the respondents are presented in Table -2.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their mode of transport(n=120)

S.No	Mode of Transport	Number	Percentage
1.	Sale at village itself	87	72.50
2.	Bullock	-	-
3.	Tempo van/Tractor	33	27.50
4.	Lorry	-	
Total		**120**	**100**

Comment [b9]: Is it mode of transport,selling
Of product within thevillage should not be count as a means of transportation

It could be found from the Table-2, that majority of the respondents (72.50 percent) sold their produce in village itself, followed byTempo van/tractor27.50 percent as mode of transport. None of the respondents used lorry and bullock cart to transport their produce.

From the above findings it could be observed that majority of the respondents preferred selling their produce in their village itself as it would reduce the transportation cost to a greater extent and convenient for the local traders to procure their produce. Just more than one fourth of the respondents preferred Tempo van/ Tractor as the mode of transport since they need to transport bulk of their produce to nearby and distant wholesale merchants, retailers and institutional markets. It could be observed that none of the respondents preferred lorry since the transportation cost would be high and loading and unloading would be a difficult task. None of the respondents preferred bullock cart as it was outdated and not in use.

2.Mode of Sale:

The following table portraysabout the people to whom the farmers sell their produce. The data were collected and presented in table-3.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to their mode of sale (n=120)

S.No	Mode of Sale	Number	Percentage
1.	Local merchants	83	69.17
2.	Retailers	7	5.83
3.	Commission agents	-	
4.	Institutional Markets	6	5.00
5.	Brokers	-	
6.	Wholesale merchants	24	20.00
Total		**120**	**100**

A glance at the data in Table-3, shows that more than half (69.17) per cent of the respondents had sold their produce to the Local merchants, followed byWholesale merchant's20 percent. 5.83 percent respondents sold their produce through Retailers. Only 5 percent of the respondents sold their produce throughInstitutional Markets.

Thus, from the above table it may be concluded that majority of the respondents sold their produce to local traders because local traders would procure directly from their farm, transportation fair would be nil and would procure regularly. Wholesale Merchants were preferred by big farmers having large land holdings as they would procure their produce which are bulkyand pay the amount in short time than local merchants. Retailers were preferred by marginal farmers and those who had only small amount of their produce to sell. Through retailers like local shops, hotels etc., they could also fetch remunerative and higher prices than selling it through wholesalers. Last preference by the respondents were Institutional Markets since they were mostly in distant places,and they would only procure after grading according to their own standards. It could be observed that the respondents didn't prefer commission agents and brokers as they were not familiar in selling their produce through them.

3.Distance of Market

The data on Distance of market preferred by the respondents are presented in table 4**.**

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to Distance of Market (n=120)

S.No	Distance of Market	Number	Percentage
1	Village itself	83	69.17
2	5-10Km	15	12.50
3	10-15Km	13	10.83
4	15-20Km	7	5.83
5	20-25Km	-	-
6	More than 25 Km	2	1.67
Total		**120**	**100**

From Table-4, it could be observed that more than half (69.17) per cent of the respondents preferred to sell their produce in village itself, followed by 12.50 per cent of the respondents preferred to sell within 5-10 Kms and 10.83 per cent of the respondents sold their produce in 10-15Kms. Only 5.83 percent and 1.67 percent of the respondents preferred to sell within 15-20Kms and more than 25 Kms respectively.

Thus, from the above table it could be concluded that majority of the respondents sold their produce in village itself since it was convenient for the farmers to meet local merchants, retailers and close their sale, also they could reduce the transportation cost. Remaining respondents sold their produce in 5-10 Kms, 10-15Kms, 15-20 Kms and above 25Kms based on the different locations and availability of wholesalers, retailers, institutional markets where they preferred to sell their produce regularly.

4.Time of Sale

The data on Time of Saleby the respondents are presented in table 5.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents according to Time of Sale (n=120)

S.No	Time of Sale	Number	Percentage
1	Immediately after harvest	73	60.83
2	After initial storage	17	14.17

3	Whenever price is high	30	25.00
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from Table-5, that more than half of the respondents (60.83 per cent) preferred to sell their produce immediately after harvest, followed by 25.00 per cent of the respondents to sell their produce whenever price is high. Only 14.17 per cent of the respondents preferred to sell their produce after initial storage.

Thus, from the above table it could be analyzed that most of the respondents preferred to sell their produce immediately after harvest since they need money immediately to incur their family and other expenses. Remaining respondents sold their produce after initial storage and whenever price is high to fetch better prices when the produce is sold in future.

5.GradingBehaviour

The following data on Grading Behaviour preferred by the respondents is presented in table 6.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents according to Grading Behaviour (n=120)

S.No	Grading Behaviour	Number	Percentage
1	Grading	120	100
2	Not grading	-	-
Total		**120**	**100**

From Table- 6, it could be observed that 100 per cent of the respondents graded their produce either through themselves or through middlemen.

It could be interpreted from the above table that all the respondents graded their produce either themselves or through middlemen to segregate the nuts according to the grade and fetch better prices.

6.CountingBehaviour

The data onCounting Behaviour preferred by the respondents are presented in table 7.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents according to Counting Behaviour (n=120)

S.No	Counting Behaviour	Number	Percentage
1	Yes	120	100
2	No	-	-
Total		**120**	**100**

From Table -7, it could be interpreted that 100 per cent of the respondents counted their produce before selling either directly or through middlemen.

From the above table we could conclude that all the respondents counted their produce either directly or through middlemen before selling their produce to avoid exploitation and maintaining transparency in sale mutually.

7.Storage of Nuts

The data on Storage of Nutspreferred by the respondents are presented in table 8.

Table 8: Distribution of respondents according to Storage of Nuts (n=120)

S.No	Storage of Nuts	Number	Percentage

1	No	73	64.17
2	Yes	47	35.83
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from Table- 8 that majority of the respondents (64.17 per cent) of the farmers didn't store their nuts. Only 35.83 per cent of the respondents stored their nuts.

Hence, from the above table it can be concluded that majority of the respondents didn't store their produce as they sold immediately after harvest as they were expecting cash immediately. Some of the respondents stored their nuts either for domestic purpose or in a motive to fetch better price in future whenever price is high.

8.Terms and Conditions of Sale

The data onTerms and Conditions of Sale preferred by the respondents are presented in table 9.

Table 9: Distribution of respondents according to Terms and Conditions of Sale(n=120)

S.No	Terms and Conditions of Sale	Number	Percentage
1	Credit	30	25.00
2	Contract	3	2.50
3	Ready cash	87	72.50
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from Table-9, that majority of the respondents (72.50 per cent) preferred ready cash on selling their produce. Followed, by 25.00 per cent of the respondents giving credit for certain extent while selling their produce. Only 2.50 per cent of the respondent preferred contract basis.

It could be observed from the table that most of the farmers preferred to get ready cash as they were in need to incur family and other expenses. Some farmers were willing to give credit by getting an advance since their produce was in bulk quantity. Only very few entered in contract basis since there would be regular procurement from them.

9.PaymentPattern

The data on payment Pattern received by the respondents are presented in table 10.

Table 10: Distribution of respondents according to Payment Pattern (n=120)

S.No	Payment Pattern	Number	Percentage
1	Partially	41	34.17
2	Fully	79	65.83
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be interpreted from Table-10, that more than half of the respondents **(**65.83 per cent) received their payment fully in selling their produce. Followed, by 34.17 per cent of respondents who received their payment partially at the time when they sold their produce. It could be interpreted from the above table that majority of the respondents received full payment on sale their produce. Remaining respondents received only partial payment by giving advance since their produce sold was in bulk**.**

10.Source for knowing price trend:

To analyse the various sources utilized by the respondents for getting information about marketing of their produce data was collected and presented in the Table-11.

Table 11: Distribution of respondents according to their source for knowing price trend (n=120)

S.No	Source for knowing price trend	Number	Percentage
1.	Relatives, friends and Neighbor farmers in the village	67	55.83
2.	Traders	19	15.83
3.	ICT (mobileapps, WhatsApp groups)	22	18.33
4.	Newspapers	12	10.00
5.	Officials	-	-
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from the Table-11, that a more than half of the respondents (55.83percent) received market information from their relatives, friends,neighbor farmers in the village, followed by 18.33 percent of the respondents had received information from Information and communication technologies like WhatsApp groups and Mobile Apps.15.83 percent of the respondents had received information from Traders and 10.00 per cent of the respondent's received information through Newspapers respectively. It could be observed that none of the respondents received information from market officials.

The findings revealed that therespondentsmost commonly used personal- localite channels for knowing the price trendthroughfamily members, relatives and friends and neighbour farmers. This might be due toclose proximity, frequent interaction,communication between each other. Other respondents received information regarding price trend through WhatsApp groups and mobile apps like "moogambika, cocomart "etc and through traders when they procured their produce.Few others through newspapers in local news page.

11.Middlemen involvement

The data on Middlemen involvement as mentioned by the respondents are presented in table 12.

Table 12: Distribution of respondents according to Middlemen involvement (n=120)

S.No	Middlemen involvement	Number	Percentage
1	Only through middlemen	89	74.17
2	Partially through middlemen	24	20.00
3	Direct sale	7	5.83
Total		**120**	**100**

It could be observed from Table-12, that almost three-fourth of the respondents (74.17 per cent) sold their produce only through middlemen, followed by 20.00 per cent of the respondents who sold their produce partially through middlemen. Only 5.83 per cent of the respondents indulged in selling their produce through Direct sale.

It could be observed that most of the respondents sold their produce only through middleman as they were not aware and also faced hardships in selling through other marketing channels. Some of the respondents sold their produce partially through middleman like retailers etc., in order to find new marketing opportunities. Only very few respondents indulged in direct sale of their produce

Conclusions:

The coconut growers are found to possess **medium level of marketing behaviour**. Hence, it should be definitely noted down by planners and policy makers at state and district level to make arrangement for marketing the products for maximum price. It is also necessary to streamline all the marketing channels properly in order to reduce the constraints faces by the coconut growers in marketing and produce. An effective marketing strategy also needs to be framed by the state department of agriculture in co- ordination with the regulated markets, commission agents and other marketing organisations functioning at village level. There is a need to establish a separate co-operative society and regulated market exclusively for coconut growers.

REFERENCE:

Characteristics and marketing behaviour of coconut growers in Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu r. Dhara, m. Umamageswari and s. Porchezian - International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics-2015

Communicaation behaviour of coconut growers in Tirupur district of Tamil Nadu- JanusiaJ.U. and v. Balamurugan – 2020

Marketing behavior of green chilli growers in Amaravati district- Sontakke, Rohan ashok-2020

Marketing behavior of pea farmer in Jabalpur district- Nagar, Ashish kumar-2020

Marketing behavior of coffee growers in Kodagu district of Karnataka-Chengppa-2017

Mia, M. I.A. and A. F. M. F. 1990. Commercial viability of marketing coconut inselected coastal regions of Bangladesh. Agricultural University Researchreport, pp: 184-190.

Nanda, Kumar.T.B.1995. Crop of small holders. Coconut situation in India. Kochi

Rao, Kameswara. P.1995. Coconut marketing in AP: Problems and prospects. IndianJournal of Agricultural Marketing, 26 (1&2), Cochin. Coconut DevelopmentBoard, pp: 18-21.

Technology adoption and marketing behavior of cabbage growers in north Karnataka-2016

Marketing behaviour of coconut growers in Kanyakumari district - JenilaStephney&D. Vengatesan - International journal of applied and advanced scientific research -2018

https://www.indiatoday.in/india-today-insight/story/why-kerala-has-a-coconut-problem-1838024-2021-08-10

https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1751436

www.coconutboard.gov.in (2019-2

Comment [b10]: AUTHOR SHOULD TRY AND DISCUSS THE RESULT AND SHOULD TRY TOINCREASE THE NUMBER OF REFRENCES TO MINIMUM OF 30.