International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science 2025; 7(3): 06-11

ISSN Print: 2664-844X
ISSN Online: 2664-8458
IJAFS 2025; 7(3): 06-11
www.agriculturaljournals.com
Received: 06-12-2024
Accepted: 12-01-2025

Devika Mehrotra
Senior Manager, Deepak Fertilizers and Petrochemicals Corporation Ltd., Pune, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author:
Devika Mehrotra
Senior Manager, Deepak Fertilizers and Petrochemicals Corporation Ltd., Pune, Maharashtra, India

Mitigating marketing risks in the Indian context

Devika Mehrotra

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2025.v7.i3a.307

Abstract
Mitigating marketing risks in agriculture requires a holistic approach that integrates financial tools, market intelligence, and policy support. By leveraging futures and options markets, improving access to credit, strengthening market linkages, and employing effective branding and consumer assurance strategies, Indian farmers and agribusinesses can navigate volatile markets with greater confidence. Marketing tools significantly influence consumer perception, risk reduction, and purchasing behavior. Advertising informs and persuades consumers, branding builds long-term trust and equity, and pricing signals product quality. As digital platforms evolve, these tools continue to shape the consumer decision-making process, reducing uncertainty and enhancing product adoption. Future research should focus on refining risk management frameworks tailored to the unique challenges and opportunities within India's agricultural sector.

Keywords: Marketing risks, agriculture, financial tools, futures and options, branding

Introduction

Strategic Marketing for Risk Mitigation

Reducing marketing risks for farmers requires a comprehensive approach that integrates futures and options hedging, insurance products, and structured forward contracts. While market-based strategies provide essential tools for managing price volatility, their effectiveness depends on accurate forecasting, a stable regulatory environment, and accessible financial education. Continued research on optimal marketing strategies and risk management frameworks is crucial for enhancing agricultural resilience in volatile markets.

Effective marketing strategies extend beyond promoting product benefits—they mitigate perceived risks and strengthen consumer trust. By employing a combination of informational tools (advertising, branding, and sales interactions) and assurance mechanisms (warranties, money-back guarantees, and trade-in options), businesses can increase adoption rates, improve customer satisfaction, and accelerate product diffusion. Addressing consumer risk through strategic marketing interventions ultimately fosters confidence in purchasing decisions, driving long-term brand loyalty and market success.

Role of Marketing Tools

Marketing tools such as advertising, branding, and pricing strategies play a crucial role in reducing perceived risk and encouraging product adoption. Advertising provides information and trust signals, branding establishes quality perception and loyalty, and pricing serves as an indicator of value and reliability. Together, these elements enhance consumer confidence, increase market penetration, and build enduring customer relationships.

Additionally, product demonstrations, sampling, money-back guarantees (MBGs), and warranties play key roles in reducing consumer risk—while demonstrations and samples boost pre-purchase confidence, MBGs and warranties provide post-purchase assurance. Retailers must strategically balance consumer expectations, return policies, and financial risks to optimize sales and profitability in competitive markets.

Challenges and Opportunities in the Indian Agricultural Market

While globalization presents challenges such as climate change, urbanization, and supply chain inefficiencies, it also creates opportunities through technological advancements, digital marketing platforms, and market reforms. Expanding institutional credit access, strengthening direct market linkages, implementing advanced market information systems, investing in storage and processing infrastructure, and leveraging digital tools for improved price transparency will empower farmers, ensure fair pricing, and build a globally competitive agricultural sector. By implementing these structural reforms, India can establish a resilient agricultural economy that benefits both farmers and consumers.

Mitigating Farmers' Marketing Risks

Managing Price and Yield Risks in Agricultural Markets

Farmers, like other businesses, face numerous risks and must choose among various strategies to manage them effectively. Identifying practical risk management options and evaluating their benefits and costs is a complex process, given the different analytical approaches to risk assessment (Boehlje & Lins, 1998) [1].

Price Behavior and Market Risks

One of the primary risks farmers face is price volatility in cash markets. Understanding price fluctuations is crucial for developing effective risk management strategies. While commodity price trends have been extensively studied, managing these risks remains challenging.

Cash price behavior is characterized by significant variability, positive autocorrelation, and occasional price spikes—sudden increases that push prices well above their long-term averages. These price distributions are often skewed and exhibit high kurtosis (Tomek and Peterson, 2001) [2]. Moreover, price changes show nonlinear dependencies, where higher moments are correlated (Yang & Brorsen, 1992) [3]. Given these complex patterns, modeling commodity prices remains difficult, with no consensus on the optimal approach due to variations in research objectives and the commodities being analyzed.

Risk Management Strategies in Commodity Markets

Since extreme price movements can be financially damaging, farmers must employ risk management strategies beyond simple price forecasting. Conventional risk measures consider both upward and downward price deviations, but farmers often focus primarily on downside risks. Measuring risk relative to production costs, rather than price averages, offers a more practical approach.

Futures and Options Markets

Futures and options contracts serve as key risk management tools for farmers. Futures contracts allow producers to lock in prices for their crops before harvest, reducing exposure to price fluctuations. Theoretical models suggest that futures prices should equal expected spot prices at maturity, adjusted for risk premiums (Carter, 1999) [4].

The price of storage theory plays a crucial role in futures pricing, particularly for seasonally produced crops. Futures contracts create incentives (or disincentives) for storage depending on expected supply and demand conditions. When inventories are low, short-term futures prices tend to be high, and vice versa (Tomek and Peterson, 2001) [2].

Options markets provide additional flexibility by allowing farmers to hedge against adverse price movements while retaining upside potential. The Black-Scholes model (Kaur and Natesan, 2025) [5] remains the standard framework for pricing options, though alternative models incorporating stochastic volatility or jump diffusion processes have been proposed.

Yield Risks and Insurance Mechanisms

Crop yield variability is influenced by location-specific factors such as soil quality and climate conditions. Unlike price risks, yield risks tend to have skewed distributions, where adverse weather events cause more significant losses than favorable conditions provide gains.

Empirical studies on yield distributions suggest that farm-level data often exhibit normal distributions. However, aggregation bias can distort broader analyses. Since yield risks are highly location-specific, effective risk management requires tailored farm-level insurance solutions.

Yield and revenue insurance programs, provide effective risk mitigation by reducing farmers' reliance on futures hedging. However, government-subsidized crop insurance programs face challenges related to moral hazard and adverse selection.

Optimizing Marketing Portfolios

Farmers can mitigate risk through diversified marketing portfolios incorporating futures, options, forward contracts, and storage decisions. Traditional portfolio theory (Markowitz, 1952) [15] advocates for maximizing expected utility while minimizing risk exposure.

Early models assumed farmers hedge only price risk. Later frameworks included yield risks (Lapan & Moschini, 1994) [16], demonstrating that optimal hedging strategies depend on production uncertainty. Some studies suggest forward pricing reduces income variability (Patrick *et al*., 1998), while others argue farmers primarily use marketing tools for profit maximization rather than risk reduction.

Despite access to advanced hedging tools, research indicates most farmers avoid futures and options markets, favoring forward contracts due to lower costs and simplicity. The low adoption of hedging strategies underscores the need for enhanced financial literacy and structured marketing education programs.

Key Insights and Research Priorities

A central question in marketing strategy research is whether its primary goal is to enhance average net returns or mitigate risk. If risk reduction is the primary objective, it is crucial to determine whether risk should be measured by price, revenue, or overall income. Defining these objectives is essential for evaluating marketing strategies effectively.

The financial context in which agricultural firms operate also plays a critical role. Factors such as farm equity, nonfarm income, and risk tolerance significantly influence marketing decisions. Objective functions in both theoretical and empirical studies must incorporate these elements, despite the increased analytical complexity.

Accurate risk measurement is crucial for understanding risk-return dynamics. Farmers face both overall income risk and variability within specific enterprises. Collins (1997) [7] noted that risk measurement methods—whether analyzing return variance from a single crop or assessing the probability of an income shortfall leading to financial distress—greatly impact hedging decisions. Additionally, Value at Risk (VaR), widely used in nonfarm sectors to quantify financial losses within a probability range, may have broader applications in agricultural risk management (Manfredo & Leuthold, 1999) [6].

Despite extensive empirical modeling efforts, accurately forecasting prices and yields remains challenging. Reliable conditional price distribution estimates are essential for decision-making. For instance, farmers planning postharvest sales require insights into anticipated changes in the mean, variance, and skewness of price distributions over time, influenced by inventory levels and other dynamic factors.

Modeling price fluctuations for livestock and tree crops is even more complex due to life-cycle effects. The persistence of long-term cycles, such as the hog cycle, highlights the difficulty of precise forecasting and the risks of counter-cyclical adjustments (Sarmiento & Allen, 2000) [8].

Similar challenges exist in yield risk estimation. Just and Weninger (1999) [9] emphasize that technological and managerial advancements significantly influence yield trends, requiring continuous adjustments in risk estimates. With increasing crop variety diversity—each with distinct yield trends and risk profiles—research must refine yield risk assessment methodologies.

Finally, debates continue on the efficiency of commodity derivative markets. While academic research largely supports market efficiency, some farmers and marketing advisors argue that hedging strategies can enhance returns. Evidence suggests futures markets primarily serve risk management rather than profit-maximization purposes. This gap between academic findings and practitioner perceptions warrants further investigation into the practical applications of hedging strategies in agricultural markets.

Risk and Consumer Buying Behavior in Marketing

Risk plays a significant role in consumer purchasing decisions yet remains underexplored in contemporary marketing research. Perceived risk can hinder innovation adoption (Dowling & Staelin, 1994) [11], slow product penetration (Bearden & Shimp, 1982) [10], delay adoption timing (Mowery & Rosenberg, 1979) [13], and obstruct product diffusion (Tellis *et al*., 2003) [12]. Information and learning are crucial in reducing risk and uncertainty during innovation diffusion.

Categories of Consumer Risk in Marketing

Consumer risk can be categorized based on its sources, buying conditions, and product types:

- **Sources of Risk:** Includes durability, performance, social acceptance, health hazards, financial loss, and price uncertainty.
- **Buying Conditions:** Consumers perceive higher risk when purchasing from an unfamiliar product category than when selecting a new brand from a familiar category.
- **Product Type:** Risk varies based on whether a product is an experience good (assessable after use), a search good (evaluated before purchase), or a credential good (uncertain quality even after consumption).

Types of Perceived Risk

1. **Durability and Performance Risk:** Concerns lifespan, breakdown likelihood, maintenance costs, and performance consistency under varying conditions (e.g., seed yield or pest resistance).
2. **Fit Uncertainty:** Arises when a product does not align with a consumer's unique needs, lifestyle, or image. It is best understood after use. Three models explain fit uncertainty:
    - **Expectation-based:** Consumers avoid unfamiliar products without demonstrations or return options.
    - **Probability-based:** Consumers derive benefit B if the product fits, with q representing fit probability.
    - **Distance-based:** Mismatch between product features and consumer needs reduces perceived benefit.
3. **Health Hazard Risks:** Stem from uncertainty about product safety, particularly for baby food, toys, fresh produce, meat, and processed foods. Regulatory agencies mitigate these risks through branding, certifications, and labeling.
4. **Financial and Price Risk:** Includes potential financial loss due to product failure, time lost, and income reduction. Price risk is divided into:
    - **Retail price variance:** Consumers may overpay due to lack of price awareness.
    - **Time-based price fluctuation:** Consumers delay purchases anticipating price drops.

Marketing Tools for Reducing Consumer Perceived Risk

Marketing tools help mitigate perceived risk through direct and indirect strategies

- **Prepurchase Risk Reduction:** Advertising, branding, promotions, salespeople, trade shows, low-price guarantees, and tailored production inform consumers and enhance trust.
- **Postsale Risk Reduction:** Demonstrations, samples, money-back guarantees, product guidance, warranties, and trade-in options provide firsthand experience and assurance.

Understanding consumer risk perception and implementing targeted risk-reduction strategies can enhance product adoption and market penetration, ultimately fostering consumer confidence in new and unfamiliar products.

Effectiveness of Marketing Tools in Risk Reduction

Providing clear information about product attributes, quality, and pricing reduces uncertainty and accelerates adoption. Consumers mitigate risk by seeking information from customer reviews, expert opinions, online referrals, and social media discussions. Marketing tools facilitate this process by generating word-of-mouth (WOM) communication, reviews, and recommendations, which act as quality signals.

Marketing tools such as advertising, branding, and pricing naturally convey information and influence perceptions of product quality. The intensity of these efforts further reinforces consumer trust. Promotions, rebates, and trade-in options encourage product trials and stimulate WOM, helping to reduce uncertainty.

At the early stages of decision-making, a company's reputation plays a crucial role in establishing trust and minimizing perceived risk. A brand's strength and unique selling points reinforce quality perception and enhance consumer confidence. The following sections discuss three widely used marketing tools that provide indirect consumer experience and help mitigate perceived risk.

Advertising

Beyond its informative role, advertising persuades consumers, creates positive emotional associations, and builds brand loyalty. It provides details about product functionality, establishes expectations, and strengthens brand positioning. By linking a brand to consumer needs, advertising stimulates demand while reducing price elasticity. Furthermore, advertising accelerates product diffusion.

Emotional advertising is particularly effective in persuasion. It creates perceived need and activates neural processes associated with decision-making. Advertising also reduces uncertainty by providing details about expected quality, performance, and consumer experiences.

Despite its advantages, advertising alone cannot eliminate risk. However, testimonials from early adopters can build confidence and encourage broader adoption. WOM plays a significant role in product diffusion.

The rise of digital and social media platforms has enhanced advertising effectiveness. Consumers can instantly share experiences via platforms like Facebook and Google Reviews, increasing accessibility and reliability of information. Mobile technologies further support this by enabling virtual product testing and real-time feedback, reducing reliance on costly traditional advertising.

Branding

A strong brand represents all marketing investments. Without branding, products lack a cohesive identity that consumers associate with quality, reliability, and familiarity. Brand perception is shaped by consumer expectations, past experiences, and stored associations.

For companies, brand strength influences market value and brand equity. A strong brand fosters consumer loyalty, supports premium pricing, and enhances successful brand extensions.

Three theoretical frameworks explain consumer brand preference

1. **Psychological Models:** Focus on brand image and symbolic associations, emphasizing how brands influence self-perception.
2. **Sociological Models:** Explore the role of brands in social identity and group belonging.
3. **Economic Signaling Models:** Suggest branding functions as an information signal, conveying expected product quality and reliability.

Consumers equate strong brands with high quality, as branding serves as a proxy for intrinsic product attributes. Umbrella branding extends parent brand credibility to new product lines.

For frequently purchased products, brand familiarity and repeat purchases reinforce preference and loyalty. Experience with a brand builds habit-driven purchasing behavior, reduces perceived risk, and increases switching costs, creating barriers to competition.

In agricultural markets, branded fresh produce commands higher willingness to pay due to increased trust and quality assurance. Locally branded food products are perceived as fresher, more sustainable, and environmentally friendly, strengthening their market appeal.

Pricing as a Quality Signal

Pricing serves as a powerful indirect signal of product quality. Consumers often associate higher prices with superior quality. This perception incentivizes firms to invest in quality improvements to justify premium pricing (Oczkowski & Doucouliagos, 2015) [14].

For luxury goods, high prices reinforce brand prestige and exclusivity. Consumers also use pricing as a status indicator, making premium pricing a strategic tool for brand uniqueness. Conversely, low pricing in early adoption phases reduces financial risk and encourages trial.

However, price reductions may introduce uncertainty. Consumers may delay purchases if they anticipate future price drops. End-of-season discounts or rebates may signal product weakness, leading to hesitation. In some cases, price reductions act as a substitute for money-back guarantees, lowering financial risk but increasing product misfit risk.

Retailers use low-price guarantees (LPGs) to mitigate consumer concerns about overpaying. LPGs assure customers that if they find a lower price elsewhere, the difference will be refunded. These guarantees are perceived as credible signals of stable pricing and competitive value.

The impact of LPGs on competition is debated. Some argue they reduce price competition, as competitors avoid price reductions if they know rivals will match them. Others suggest LPGs intensify competition by encouraging consumers to search for lower prices, increasing market pressure on retailers.

In online retail, LPGs are common in sectors with frequent price fluctuations, such as travel and electronics. Websites like Hotwire.com and CheapAir.com offer price guarantees to reassure customers, while airlines introduce their own LPGs to remain competitive. However, in the grocery sector, LPGs are less common due to non-branded fresh produce and frequent price promotions.

The agricultural sector faces multiple risks, including weather variability, price fluctuations, yield uncertainty, input costs, and policy changes. While policies help mitigate these risks, marketing strategies play a crucial role in influencing consumer adoption.

Marketing tools such as demonstrations, product sampling, salesperson interactions, and training reduce uncertainty and accelerate adoption. However, the literature has largely overlooked how different marketing tools affect various adopter segments. For instance, demonstrations appeal more to innovators, while information from previous adopters influences late adopters.

Additionally, private sector marketing efforts in risk reduction are often underappreciated. While public-sector initiatives receive significant attention, the private sector's role in product adoption and risk mitigation—particularly in fresh produce and agricultural inputs—remains understudied. Marketing efforts should balance consumer-targeted activities (e.g., samples, advertising) with business-to-business strategies (e.g., retailer partnerships, trade incentives).

Due to quality variability and seasonality, fresh produce lacks strong brand loyalty, making advertising less effective. Instead, product sampling and in-store demonstrations are crucial for rebuilding consumer goodwill, especially at seasonal product launches. Retailers also favor sampling, as it reduces uncertainty for consumers and stimulates trial purchases.

Data from Israeli agribusinesses suggest that marketing budgets differ significantly between fresh produce and agricultural inputs. On average, seed manufacturers allocate 65% of promotional budgets to risk-reduction activities, including field trials, samples, and demonstrations, while fresh produce exporters invest significantly less in marketing—as little as 0.1% of revenue for small exporters.

These findings indicate that risk mitigation strategies are more crucial in business-to-business (B2B) markets, where adoption depends on durability, performance, and financial risks, rather than in direct consumer markets.

Consumer decision-making, especially for experience and trust goods (such as online purchases or biotechnology products), is heavily influenced by perceived risk and trust levels. In these cases, marketing serves not just to differentiate products but to reduce uncertainty, making it an informational tool rather than an emotion-driven strategy. Heterogeneity among producers and consumers is a key source of market uncertainty—alongside traditional risks such as price, health, and financial concerns. Consumers whose expectations differ from marketed benefits may experience lower-than-expected satisfaction, reducing demand and prompting sellers to adopt risk-mitigation marketing tools.

Key gaps in marketing research include an overemphasis on consumer costs of returns, while producer-side costs and supply chain effects remain underexplored. There is insufficient research on the effectiveness of demonstrations, particularly in their role in reducing search costs and enhancing decision quality. Additionally, the influence of the secondary market (SHM) on consumer risk perceptions is often neglected. Poor-quality money-back guarantees (MBGs) and inadequate pre-purchase demonstrations may drive consumers toward resale markets of returned products, intensifying competition and affecting primary market dynamics.

Optimizing demonstration periods is essential, as poorly designed trials may fail to resolve uncertainty and even increase consumer regret. For instance, test-driving a car in urban traffic may lead to false satisfaction, only for the consumer to later discover poor performance on highways—a risk compounded by the lack of MBGs in the auto industry.

Risk management and financial reforms in agriculture are critical for ensuring stability and growth in the sector. Farmers face dual risks—yield risks due to unpredictable weather and price risks from market fluctuations. Various instruments help mitigate these challenges. Yield risk management can be addressed through crop and weather insurance, while price risk management includes policies like the Minimum Support Price (MSP), contract farming, and the Farm Income Insurance Scheme (FIIS). Strengthening MSP policy enforcement, reforming state APMR laws for contract farming, and expanding FIIS will enhance farmer protection.

Additionally, organizing farmers into marketing groups, self-help groups (SHGs), cooperatives, or farmer-producer companies is necessary to maximize benefits from deregulated markets, contract farming, and insurance schemes. Capacity-building efforts must focus on quality standards, contract negotiations, and market preparedness, with government agencies, APMCs, cooperatives, NGOs, and PRIs playing key roles.

Public investment in agricultural marketing infrastructure is crucial to attract private sector participation. Investments in rural roads, market yards, cold storage, grading, and value addition facilities will improve efficiency and market access. To improve rural credit flow, policy reforms should ensure a decentralized, flexible financial system while prioritizing small borrowers and preventing politicization of credit policies. Measures such as the warehouse receipt system, NGO and PRI involvement, and credit integration with input supply and output marketing will enhance financial accessibility. Expanding insurance coverage, supporting non farm rural enterprises, and introducing a Rural Credit Card Scheme (RCCS) will further strengthen rural financial systems.

Strengthening rural banking networks, increasing private sector participation, and linking priority-sector lending targets with infrastructure development will improve financial support. Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) and cooperatives should be given greater autonomy, professional management practices, and recapitalization support. Key agricultural policy reforms must focus on revising State APMR Laws, redefining the role of State Marketing Boards, repealing restrictive regulations like the Essential Commodities Act (ECA), and establishing a unified food law. Strengthening MSP policies, ensuring stable investment regulations, expanding farmer insurance schemes, and enhancing marketing extension services will improve agricultural competitiveness and market integration.

Conclusion

Effective risk management in agriculture requires a combination of policy interventions, marketing strategies, and financial reforms. While government policies such as MSP, contract farming, and insurance schemes help mitigate price and yield risks, private-sector marketing efforts play a crucial role in influencing consumer adoption and reducing uncertainty. Marketing tools like demonstrations, product sampling, and strategic partnerships can significantly impact adoption rates, particularly in fresh produce and agricultural inputs.

However, there are key gaps in research regarding the effectiveness of different marketing approaches, especially in risk reduction for both businesses and consumers. Addressing these gaps through empirical studies can help optimize marketing investments and enhance decision-making. Additionally, strengthening financial systems, improving rural credit access, and investing in marketing infrastructure will support agricultural competitiveness and long-term sustainability. A balanced approach that integrates policy reforms, market-driven risk mitigation strategies, and financial accessibility will be essential for fostering a resilient agricultural sector.

References

1. Boehlje MD, Lins DA. Risks and risk management in an industrialized agriculture; 1998.
2. Tomek WG, Peterson HH. Risk management in agricultural markets: A review. Journal of Futures Markets. 2001;21(10):953-985. doi:10.1002/fut.2004.
3. Yang SR, Brorsen BW. Nonlinear dynamics of daily cash prices. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1992;74(3):706-715.
4. Carter CA. Commodity futures markets: A survey. Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics. 1999;43(2):209-247.
5. Kaur J, Natesan S. Numerical solution of time-fractional Black-Scholes PDE by non-symmetric interior penalty Galerkin method. Computational Economics. 2025;1-24.
6. Manfredo MR, Leuthold RM. Value-at-risk analysis: A review and the potential for agricultural applications.

Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy. 1999;21(1):99-111.
7. Collins RA. Toward a positive economic theory of hedging. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1997;79(2):488-499.
8. Sarmiento C, Allen PG. Dynamics of beef supply in the presence of cointegration: A new test of the backward-bending hypothesis. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy. 2000;22(2):421-437.
9. Just RE, Weninger Q. Are crop yields normally distributed? American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1999;81(2):287-304.
10. Bearden WO, Shimp TA. The use of extrinsic cues to facilitate product adoption. Journal of Marketing Research. 1982;19(2):229-239.
11. Dowling GR, Staelin R. A model of perceived risk and intended risk-handling activity. Journal of Consumer Research. 1994;21(1):119-134.
12. Tellis GJ. Effective advertising: Understanding when, how, and why advertising works. Sage Publications; 2003.
13. Mowery D, Rosenberg N. The influence of market demand upon innovation: A critical review of some recent empirical studies. Research Policy. 1979;8(2):102-153.
14. Oczkowski E, Doucouliagos H. Wine prices and quality ratings: A meta-regression analysis. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2015;97(1):103-121.
15. Markowitz H. The utility of wealth. Journal of political Economy. 1952 Apr 1;60(2):151-158.
16. Lapan H, Moschini G. Futures hedging under price, basis, and production risk. American Journal of agricultural economics. 1994 Aug;76(3):465-477.