



International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science

ISSN Print: 2664-844X
 ISSN Online: 2664-8458
 NAAS Rating (2026): 4.97
 IJAFS 2026; 8(10): 496-498
www.agriculturaljournals.com
 Received: 09-08-2026
 Accepted: 21-09-2026
 Published: 13-10-2026

Shivani H Atram
 M.Sc. (Agri.) Scholar,
 Department of Agricultural
 Extension Education, College
 of Agriculture, VNMKV,
 Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

Rajesh P Kadam
 Professor and Head,
 Department of Agricultural
 Extension Education, College
 of Agriculture, Parbhani,
 VNMKV, Parbhani,
 Maharashtra, India

Anuradha S Lad
 Assistant Professor,
 Department of Agricultural
 Extension Education, College
 of Agriculture, Parbhani,
 VNMKV, Parbhani,
 Maharashtra, India

RV Chavan
 Professor, Department of
 Agricultural Economics,
 College of Agriculture,
 VNMKV, Parbhani,
 Maharashtra, India

AK Gore
 Chief scientist, AICRP on dry-
 land agriculture, VNMKV,
 Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author:

Shivani H Atram
 M.Sc. (Agri.) Scholar,
 Department of Agricultural
 Extension Education,
 College of Agriculture,
 VNMKV, Parbhani,
 Maharashtra, India

Marketing strategies adopted by organic farmers for their produce in Parbhani and Hingoli districts of Maharashtra

Shivani H Atram¹, Rajesh P Kadam², Anuradha S Lad³, RV Chavan⁴, AK Gore⁵

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2026.v8.i10g.2057>

ABSTRACT

Marketing is widely seen as the weakest link of organic farming in India. This study examined the marketing strategies adopted by 120 organic farmers in twelve villages of Parbhani and Hingoli districts of Maharashtra, using an ex-post facto design and personal interviews with a pre-tested schedule. Seven aspects of marketing behaviour were studied: time, place and channel of sale, source of price information, use of fairs, grading and processing and reasons for choosing a marketing agency. Results were analysed with frequency and percentage.

A very large majority (95.83 per cent) stored their produce for some time before sale, but none used cold storage or a warehouse. Most sold in the regulated market (94.17 per cent) and through the Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC) (92.50 per cent). Price information came mainly from other persons visiting the market (57.50 per cent) or from personal visits and phone calls (42.50 per cent); no respondent relied on newspapers, broadcasts or organic agencies. Almost all (94.17 per cent) sold without grading or processing, and none used organic melas. Better price (61.67 per cent) and immediate cash payment (37.50 per cent) governed the choice of agency. Organic produce was therefore being sold through conventional channels, which agrees with the farmers' own report of weak price realization and market access. Organic-specific marketing infrastructure, price information systems, grading and value addition, and group marketing are needed.

Keywords: Organic produce, Marketing strategies, APMC, Price information, Grading, Marathwada

1. Introduction

The economic case for organic farming rests on two things: a lower cost of production and a better price for the produce. The second condition depends on how the produce is marketed. Consumer demand for chemical-free food is growing at home and abroad, and India exported about 3.68 lakh tonnes of organic products worth Rs. 5,394 crore in 2024–25 (APEDA, 2024) [1]. Yet a large part of the organic produce of small farmers reaches the market as ordinary produce, with no certification label, grading or branding, and consequently no premium.

Studies elsewhere show what good marketing can achieve. Organic hazelnuts in Italy fetched 15–20 per cent higher prices with relatively stable price movement (Franco *et al.*, 2005) [2], and organic sugarcane and banana in Sangli district of Maharashtra gave higher net returns than the conventional crop, helped by better market quality and lower costs (Jadhav *et al.*, 2006; Hile *et al.*, 2008) [3, 4]. Other work identifies what is missing in India. (Kaushal and Aggarwal) [5] found that organic farmers had difficulty fixing competitive prices and recommended value-based pricing and eco-friendly packaging. (Goyal and Kumar) [6] described collaborative marketing with eco-stores, restaurants and supply-chain partners. (Giri and Ravindran) [7] reported that online sales helped organic producers keep market access. (Saini and Meena) [8] reported inadequate storage, poor transport and low consumer awareness as problems in Haryana, and (Nongrang and Bordoloi) [9] stressed market information, certification and stronger farmer-market linkages. (Swetha *et al.*) [10] identified improved marketing channels as a strategic priority for promoting organic farming in Telangana.

The present study was undertaken to describe the marketing strategies adopted by organic farmers in Parbhani and Hingoli districts of Maharashtra.

2. Materials and methods

Parbhani and Hingoli districts of the Marathwada region were purposively selected for the large number of farmers practicing organic farming. Two talukas in each district (Manwath and Pathri; Vasmat and Sengaoon) and three villages in each taluka were purposively selected, and ten organic farmers were randomly selected

from each village, giving 120 respondents. The study followed an ex-post facto research design. Data were collected through personal interviews with a structured interview schedule that had been pre-tested. Seven aspects of marketing behaviour were recorded: (i) time of sale, (ii) place of sale, (iii) channel of sale, (iv) source of price information, (v) fairs and exhibitions used, (vi) grading and processing, and (vii) reasons for selling to a particular agency. The responses were tabulated as frequency and percentage.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Time, place and channel of sale

The marketing strategies adopted by the respondents are shown in Table 1. Almost all farmers (95.83 per cent) stored their produce for some time and sold it later, and only 4.17 per cent sold it immediately after harvest. None used cold storage or a warehouse, so storage was evidently on the farm or at home. Holding produce is a sensible strategy to wait for a better price, and it may reflect expectation of better prices and the assured nature of the marketing facilities used. This differs from (Vinayak) [11], where 70.00 per cent of organic farmers sold immediately after harvest, which was linked to limited storage facilities.

The regulated market was the place of sale for 94.17 per cent of respondents, while 3.33 per cent sold in the village and 2.50 per cent through a co-operative society. Correspondingly, 92.50 per cent sold through the APMC, 6.67 per cent through local traders and 0.83 per cent through a commission agent. Farmers therefore depend on the same mandi system as conventional growers. The regulated market gives an assured buyer and transparent payment, but it does not normally distinguish organic from conventional produce, so an organic premium is unlikely to be realised.

3.2 Price information and fairs

Price information was obtained from other persons visiting the market by 57.50 per cent of respondents and through personal visits or phone calls by 42.50 per cent. None used newspapers or broadcasts, and none used organic agencies. Farmers therefore rely on informal, word-of-mouth sources, which are cheap and trusted but not systematic, and offer little guidance on prices of organic produce in distant or special markets. A similar reliance on personal visits, telephone calls and persons visiting the market was reported by (Vinayak) [11] and (Nongrang and Bordoloi) [9] consider market information to be one of the pillars of farmer-market linkage. Regarding fairs, only 4.17 per cent used grain fairs and no one used an organic mela; the remain-

ing 95.83 per cent sold through other avenues. This points to the absence of organic-specific marketing platforms in the study area.

3.3 Grading, processing and choice of agency

Only 5.00 per cent of the farmers graded their produce by size and sold it at different rates, whereas 94.17 per cent sold it as it was, without grading or processing. Inadequate grading facilities and limited awareness of value addition may be responsible. Ungraded produce sold in an open market is priced as an average lot, which weakens the gain from better quality. (Kaushal and Aggarwal) [5] recommended value-based pricing and eco-friendly packaging, and (Goyal and Kumar) [6] described stronger branding through collaboration with partners, none of which is currently practised by the respondents. Better price was the main reason for choosing an agency 61.67 per cent, followed by immediate cash payment 37.50 per cent; only 1.67 per cent cited a small quantity of produce. Price and quick payment are the usual preferences of small farmers who have to meet recurring cash needs, and they explain the attraction of the APMC.

3.4 Marketing practices

About 61.67 per cent of the respondents reported receiving better prices for their organic produce, while 37.50 per cent received immediate cash returns through direct sale. However, limited marketing facilities for organic produce were observed during the field investigation. Strengthening organized marketing channels and providing suitable market facilities could help farmers obtain better returns.

4. Conclusion

Organic farmers in Parbhani and Hingoli districts followed essentially conventional marketing strategies. They stored produce before sale but used no cold storage, sold through the regulated market and APMC, drew price information from informal sources, rarely graded or processed, and did not use organic fairs. Price and prompt payment decided the choice of agency.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to the organic farmers of Parbhani and Hingoli districts who gave their time and information for this study, and to Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani, for providing the facilities.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest related to this work.

Table 1. Marketing strategies adopted by organic farmers ($n = 120$)

Sr. No.	Components	Frequency	Percentage
1	When you sell the produce		
A	Immediately after the harvest	05	4.17
B	Stored for some time and sold later	115	95.83
C	Stored in cold storage/warehouse and sold later	00	0.00
2	Where did you sell the produce?		
A	Village itself	04	3.33
B	Regulated market	113	94.17
C	Co-operative society	03	2.50
3	Through whom you sell the produce?		
A	Local traders	08	6.67
B	Commission agent	1	0.83
C	APMC	111	92.50
4	From what sources you collected the price information?		
A	Newspaper/broadcasting	00	0.00
B	Organic agencies	00	0.00
C	Personal visit to market or phone	51	42.50

(continued on next page)

Sr. No.	Components	Frequency	Percentage
5	D Others who visit the market	69	57.50
	Through which fairs do you sale your produce?		
	A Grain fairs	05	4.17
	B Organic mela	0	0.00
6	C others	115	95.83
	How do you sale your produce		
	A Grade the produce based on size and sell at different rates	06	5.00
	B No grading /processing selling as it is.	113	94.17
7	Reasons for selling to particular agency		
	A Better price	74	61.67
	B Small quantity of produce	02	1.67
	C Immediate cash payment	45	37.50

References

1. APEDA. Organic agriculture statistics 2024–25 [Internet]. New Delhi: Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority.
2. Franco S, Pancino B, Ferrucci D. Production and marketing of organic hazelnuts: the case of 'Tonda Gentile Romana'. *Acta Hort.* 2005;686:565-72.
3. Jadhav MS, Kamble BH, Yadav DB. Profitability of organic farming. *Agric Econ Res Rev.* 2006;19(2):234.
4. Hile RB, Chauhan MR, Pardeshi HP, Bagul RS. Economics of organic banana production in Sangli. *Agric Update.* 2008;3(1-2):20-2.
5. Kaushal N, Aggarwal R. Market influences on organic farming. *Int J Prog Res Sci Eng.* 2022.
6. Goyal A, Kumar A. Organic food firms strategy. *J Int Food Agribus Mark.* 2023.
7. Girija Y, Ravindran A. Profitability through online sales of organic produce. *Agronomy.* 2023.
8. Saini P, Meena R. Organic farming and marketing challenges: a case study of Haryana. 2024.
9. Nongrang LHL, Bordoloi SM. Market linkages for smallholder farmers in organic agricultural produce: a comprehensive review. *J Cases Manag Stud.* 2025;1(2):95-107.
10. Swetha B, Barua S, Joshi P, Saurav SK, Chaitanya NVLK. Adoption constraints and strategic priorities for promoting organic farming in Telangana: a Garrett ranking and analytical hierarchy process approach. *J Sci Res Rep.* 2026;32(7):381-90.
11. Vinayak. Empowerment of farmers through organic farming in Northern Karnataka. Dharwad: College of Agriculture; 2017.
12. Reddy AA, Melts I, Mohan G, Rani CR, Pawar V, Singh V, *et al.* Economic impact of organic agriculture: evidence from a pan-India survey. *Sustainability.* 2022;14(22):15057.
13. Kumar S, Ansari MA, Sharma SK, Singh R. Productivity, profitability and trade-offs in organic farming-based agricultural systems: global trends and role in shaping new agri-food systems. *Indian J Agric Sci.* 2025;95(3):239-48.

How to cite this article: Atram SH, Kadam RP, Lad AS, Chavan R, Gore A. Marketing strategies adopted by organic farmers for their produce in Parbhani and Hingoli districts of Maharashtra. *International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science.* 2026;8(10):496-498. doi: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2026.v8.i10g.2057>