

STUDY ON BRAND PROMOTION AND CONSUMER'S PERCEPTION TOWARD PRE-EMERGENCE HERBICIDE (TAGHIT) IN MUZAFFARPUR DISTRICT OF BIHAR

Ayush Kumar¹ and Nitin Barker²

¹MBA (Agribusiness) and ²Associate Professor

Department of Agricultural Economics

Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Naini, Prayagraj

Corresponding author: kumarayush779@gmail.com

<https://doie.org/10.10346/AE.2025867862>

ABSTRACT

The study on brand promotion and consumer perception toward the pre-emergence herbicide Taghit in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar focused on understanding the factors influencing brand awareness and farmers' purchasing decisions. The study was conducted in the Mushahari block, where five percent of paddy-cultivating villages were selected, and respondents were randomly chosen from these villages. The findings revealed that the most significant factor affecting brand awareness was the performance and quality of Taghit, cited by 26% of respondents, followed by availability at 20%. Marketing efforts and advertising contributed to 12%, while product packaging and design influenced 11% of respondents. Other factors included brand reputation (10%) and price/value proposition (9%). Distribution and social media presence had smaller impacts, accounting for 7% and 5%, respectively. In terms of purchasing decisions, 25% of farmers were influenced by their relationship with the distributor, 21% prioritized quality, and 20% focused on price. Brand image (15%) and promotional strategies (9%) were also significant, while 6% relied on peer recommendations and 4% on packaging. These results underline the importance of distributor relationships, product quality, and price sensitivity in shaping farmers' decisions in the agrochemical market.

Keywords: Taghit herbicide, brand awareness, consumer perception, agrochemical market, farmers' purchasing decisions

INTRODUCTION

Pre-emergence herbicides were a category of herbicides that were applied to the soil before the targeted weeds had emerged, aiming to prevent their growth by inhibiting seed germination. These herbicides played a crucial role in integrated weed management by providing effective control over a wide range of weed species, particularly annual weeds, before they could compete with crops for vital resources such as water, nutrients, and sunlight. The application of pre-emergence herbicides typically occurred shortly after planting but before weed seeds had germinated. They worked by being

absorbed by the weed seeds and disrupting their ability to germinate and grow. These herbicides were especially valuable in crops like cereals, vegetables, and other row crops, where early weed competition could significantly reduce yields. Over the years, pre-emergence herbicides had become a staple in modern agriculture, offering a more efficient, cost-effective, and less labor-intensive method of weed control compared to manual weeding. However, their usage also raised concerns related to environmental impact, such as potential contamination of water resources and harm to non-target plants.



Additionally, over-reliance on pre-emergence herbicides could lead to the development of herbicide-resistant weed species, creating further challenges for farmers. Despite these concerns, pre-emergence herbicides remained an essential tool in managing weed populations and enhancing crop productivity, especially in areas where weed infestations posed a significant threat to agricultural yields.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology for selecting the district, blocks, villages, and respondents was based on a combination of purposive and random sampling techniques. Muzaffarpur district was chosen for the study to avoid any inconvenience and time constraints. Among the blocks within the district, Mushahari block was selected due to its high concentration of paddy cultivation. A list of villages in the selected block was compiled, from which five percent were randomly chosen, ensuring that a majority of respondents were engaged in paddy farming. In each village, farmers were categorized into

five landholding size groups: Marginal size (less than 1 hectare), Small size (1-2 hectares), Semi-medium size (2-4 hectares), Medium size (4-10 hectares), and Large size (more than 10 hectares). A total of 100 paddy farmers were selected using proportionate random sampling. Additionally, 10 wholesalers, 5 retailers, 5 consumers, and 5 producers were selected to study brand promotion and consumer perception in the area. Primary data were collected through a specially designed schedule, while secondary data were sourced from books, journals, reports, and records from district and block headquarters. Data collection involved direct personal interviews with respondents. Statistical tools were employed to analyze the data, and the study focused on the agricultural year 2024-2025.

Analytical Tools Likert scale

Likert scale (2, 4, 5, or 7) is a common classification format used in studies. Respondents rank a product or service's quality (data) from highest to lowest, and from better to worse.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Brand Awareness of Taghit in the study area.

Categories	Respondents Number	Respondents					Percentage (%)
		Marginal	Small	Semi-medium	Medium	Large	
Performance and Quality	26	9	7	4	3	3	26.00
Availability	20	7	5	3	4	1	20.00
Marketing and Advertising	12	4	3	2	2	1	12.00
Product Packaging and Design	11	4	2	2	1	2	11.00
Brand Reputation	10	3	3	2	1	1	10.00
Price and Value Proposition	9	2	2	2	2	1	9.00
Distribution	7	2	2	1	1	1	7.00
Social Media Presence	5	1	1	2	1	0	5.00
Total	100	32	25	18	15	10	100.00



Table 1: Revealed several factors affecting brand awareness of Taghit in the study area, as perceived by different categories of respondents. The most influential factor was performance and quality, cited by 26% of respondents, followed by the availability of the herbicide at 20%. Marketing and advertising efforts contributed to 12% of brand awareness, while product packaging

and design played a role for 11% of respondents. Brand reputation was a factor for 10%, and price and value proposition for 9%. Additionally, distribution in the area and social media presence had smaller impacts, at 7% and 5%, respectively. These results highlight the multifaceted nature of brand awareness, with performance and availability being the most significant determinants.

Table 2: Consumer's Perception of Taghit

S. No.	Parameter	Respondents	Percentage (%)
1.	Relation with Dealer	25	25.00
2.	Quality	21	21.00
3.	Price	20	20.00
4.	Brand image	15	15.00
5.	Promotional Strategies	9	9.00
6.	Source of Information	6	6.00
7.	Packaging	4	4.00
Total		100	100.00

Table 2: The study identified several key factors influencing farmers' purchasing decisions for agrochemicals. A notable 25% of farmers made purchases primarily based on their relationship with the distributor, indicating the importance of distributor-farmer connections. Quality was the second most significant factor, with 21% of farmers prioritizing it when selecting agrochemicals. Price sensitivity was also evident, as 20% of

farmers focused on the cost of the product. Furthermore, 15% of farmers were influenced by brand image, while 9% responded to promotional strategies. A smaller group of 6% relied on information from peers, such as friends or neighbors, and 4% were attracted by the product's packaging. These findings underline the complex range of considerations that shape farmers' decisions in the agrochemical market.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that several factors significantly influenced the brand promotion and consumer perception of pre-emergence herbicide Taghit in Muzaffarpur district, Bihar. The most prominent factor contributing to brand awareness was performance and quality, as cited by 26% of respondents, followed by the herbicide's availability at

20%. Marketing efforts and advertising played a notable role, contributing 12% to brand awareness, while product packaging and design were important for 11% of respondents. Other factors, such as brand reputation and price-value proposition, had a moderate influence, accounting for 10% and 9%, respectively. Distribution and social media presence had relatively smaller



impacts, with 7% and 5%, respectively. Regarding purchasing decisions, the study found that farmers were most influenced by their relationship with the distributor, with 25% of farmers prioritizing this factor. Quality and price followed as key considerations, with 21% and 20% of farmers emphasizing these aspects. Brand image, promotional strategies, and peer recommendations were also significant, guiding 15%, 9%, and 6% of the respondents, respectively. The findings highlighted the multifaceted nature of farmers' purchasing decisions, revealing that factors such as quality, distributor relationships, price, and brand image were crucial in shaping their preferences for agrochemical products like Taghit.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal (2022) suggested that Consumer behaviour research is the scientific study of the processes consumers use to select, secure, use and dispose of products and services that satisfy their needs. *Res.*, 39: 161-166.
- Ajay (2019) studied farmer's buying behavior for pesticides revealed that farmers still depended on the written media for information. *Journal of economic and social development*, vol. v, no. 1.
- Anwar (2018) studied farmers buying behavior on pesticide products and reported that, past experience was an important reason for using a pesticide. *Lumle Regional Agricultural Research Centre Review Paper*, 95 (18): 23
- Appunu and Gagan. (2020) have reported that *Vigna mungo*, *V. radiata* and *V. unguiculata* plants sampled in different agronomical-ecological climatic regions of India are modulated by *Bradyrhizobium yuanmingense*, *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 52(3): 463-464.
- Ashish (2018) observed that private dealers, extension officials and advertisements in massmedia were the major sources of information for farmers, which guided them in selection of brands. *IJPR Vol. 3 July 2018 No. 1* pp97-98.
- Bharttacharya, (2018), I also causes wilting of seedlings and leaf necrosis in several plants. These symptoms were similar to those produced by the fungus itself, thus the toxin plays a key role in pathogenesis. *Agricultural Situation in India*, 46 (4):279-284.
- Chandan and Prajapati (2021) studied that the farmers were not having a very strong brand loyalty as far as pesticides are concerned, though their loyalty did increase as their association with the brand grew old. *Sustainable agriculture and food security*, 327-398.
- Dhar and Aprajita (2021) first isolated and elucidated the structure of a phytotoxic metabolite, phaseolinone 1, from the culture filtrate of *M. phaseolina*. Phaseolinone is a nonspecific exotoxin which inhibits seed germination of a large number of plants." *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*; 25(4):431-436. 10.
- Dubey and Abhay Soni (2021) isolated 8 strains of endophytic root nodule rhizobia from pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) and identified as *Ensifer sinorhizobium* based on their physiological and biochemical characteristics." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 52 (1):87-100.
- Gangawane and Reddy (2019) showed that in the absence of herbicides, more or less proportion of both the carbendazim and thiophanate methyl resistant and sensitive mutants of *Aspergillus flavus* was seen at fourth passage on groundnut pods and kernels. *Project*



report of Agro-Economic Research Center JNKVV, Jabalpur (M.P.).3(2):56-58.

Kritika Jaiswal and Nitin Barker (2023) Soyabean is a common food crop in India, used in starch and alcohol production. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*.53 (3):402-403.

Leonard P Gianessi (2017)Herbicide use is increasingly being adopted around the world. Many developing countries (India, China, Bangladesh) are facing shortages of workers to hand weed

fields as millions of people move from rural to urban areas.. *Journal of economic and social development*, vol. v, no. 1.

Madalsa Dubey and Amit Kumar (2023) The present study entitled “*An Economic Analysis on Marketing of Amistar Top (Fungicide) in Kurukshetra District of Haryana.*” *agricultural research communication centre, Indian J. Agric. Res.*, 49 (2) 2020: 114-124.
