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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Review of past research work done by various researchers in the field can help research worker not only to plan and organize the research work on proper line but also provides the opportunity to improve over the past. It is also useful to research worker to outline the problem of research, formulate the objectives, select the methodology and avoid necessary duplication of efforts, it also provides a general orientation about the topic of investigation by creating an insight and sense of integration about the subject as a whole. The researcher would be able to make improvement over the existing studies and also expand the horizon of investigation on the subject matter. The review could also help in refusing the concepts and statements made in earlier studies as well as for supporting the findings of the present study. The attempt of a new research worker is to study the literature related to the problem under study. Hence, an effort is made in this chapter to review the selected reference related to the study in brief. The reviews are grouped under the following heading.

2.1 Socio-economic aspects of farmers
2.2 Costs and returns
2.3 Marketing cost marketing margin and marketed surplus
2.4 Price spread in marketing channels of farm products
2.5 Constraints and opinions of farmers

2.1 SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF FARMERS

Rajkumar and Harisingh (1996) studied the social status of chickpea growers in Vidharbha region of Maharashtra state and found that nearly 19.98 per cent growers had light type of soil while 53.33 per cent people owned medium type of soil and 26.64 per cent people had heavy type of soil. In case of land holding 3.33 per cent people had owned less than one hectare of land while 30.00 per cent people owned up to two hectares of land. About 63.33 per cent people owned more than two hectares of land.
Kapse (1998) stated that, majority of respondent's, i.e., 55.83 per cent were from middle age group followed by 26.27 per cent and 17.50 per cent from old and young age category, respectively.

Ramesh (1999) studied the socio-economic status of pulse growers in Andhra Pradesh and found that 66.66 per cent growers cultivated kabuli type chickpea varieties on their farm while 33.33 per cent cultivated desi type of varieties. Kabuli varieties were preferred over desi as they have greater yield per hectare, fetch greater price in market and tolerant to water stress.

Malik et al. (2000) studied sources of information on improved crop production technology and its valuation in Haryana. The study was related to Hisar district of Haryana. State and based on the primary data collected from 90 farmers randomly selected from two villages. As such respondent belonged to holding size categorized in to small, medium and large. The socio-cultural and economic profile of the respondent was classified in to education, type of family, occupational level, land holdings and organizational membership. There were 34.57 per cent of respondents who were below metric followed by metric respondents (28.39 per cent) and illiterate (19.75 per cent). A majority of the families were joint 71.60 per cent and 28.40 per cent of them nuclear. Agriculture was observed main source of livelihood for more than 97 per cent of respondent. 24.69 per cent of the farmers were having service as subsidiary occupation and only one respondent was having business as his main occupation. About 19 per cent of the respondent farmers were members of some rural organization.

Pawar et al. (2002) analyzed the farm investment and income pattern of farm size group in Maharashtra. The study is based on primary data collected from 300 families for year 1997-98 under comprehensive scheme for studying the cost of cultivation. The farm size holding groups were marginal (below 1 hectare), small (1 to 2 hectares), semi medium (1 to 2 hectares), medium (4 to 6 hectares) and large (above 6 hectares). Simple statistical tools like per cent age and averages were employed. It was revealed that cropping intensity worked out to be 110.91 per cent at the overall level, which was
lowest 105.52 per cent in medium size group of farms. The per hectare capital investment decreased with the increased in the size group of farms similar trend observed in items of capital investment. The source wise average income of farm size group in Maharashtra showed that medium farm size group earned more income from crop production (79.23 per cent) and milk production (8.20 per cent) than other farm size groups.

Rodge (2007) studied the socio-economic characteristics of soybean growers. For this study Vasmat and Selu tehsils were selected from Parbhani district. The primary data were collected from 120 soybean growers. The study revealed that, majority of farmers growing soybean crop were of middle age (25-50 years) that was 42.50 per cent. Most of the soybean growers educated up to primary school (42.50 per cent) and agriculture was observed to be the main source of livelihood for 82.50 per cent of growers. The family size ranged between 5-8 members.

Pawar (2008) studied economies of soybean based cropping system in Washim district of Maharashtra. For this study primary data were collected from 120 farmers. Data pertained for the year 2006-07. Result revealed that, regarding socio-economic characteristics, family size was 6.45 members. Most of the soybean growers educated up to primary school (31.20 per cent) and land holding was 5.5 hectares. Per hectare capital investment was ₹159850.77 in which land (90.91 per cent), implements (0.96 per cent), livestock (1.03 per cent) and farm building (7.60 per cent) were involved.

Chitinis (2009) studied the evaluation of on farm technologies and implementing constraints. He studied the socio-economic characteristics of respondent's. The study revealed that equal percentage of respondents' i.e.30 per cent were found educated upto primary and secondary level followed by middle educated and illiterate, both 18 per cent respectively, only 4 per cent were degree holders. While analyzing the composition of family, it was observed that majority of the respondents (59 per cent) were having 6.10 members in their family.
Askı et al. (2010) studied knowledge and its relationship with personal, socio-economic and psychological characteristics of sunflower growers of Bijapur district. The study revealed that, majority of the farmers belonged to medium knowledge category having the detailed knowledge about important sunflower cultivation practices and there was positive and significant relationship with personal socio-economic and psychological characteristics of sunflower growers.

2.2 COSTS AND RETURNS

Patil et al. (1997) studied economics in kharip sunflower cultivation in Marathwada region of Maharashtra. They observed that, per hectare cost of cultivation was ₹7057, the per hectare gross and net returns from sunflower cultivation worked out to be ₹5703 and ₹1354 respectively. The study revealed that, during the year under study sunflower growth sustained a low of ₹1354 at cost ‘C’.

Ambegaonkar (1998) studied the economics of soybean production in Parbhani district of Marathwada region. The study was undertaken with following objective likely see the performance of soybean crop and to find out the constraint of soybean cultivation, per hectare cost - C calculated was ₹10998.98 the contribution of cost - A was to be extent of 68 per cent to total cost that is ₹7460.80. The contribution of cost - B was ₹93 per cent that is ₹10193.13. The total humane labour required 80.42 man days. The family labour (21.45 man days) contributed to 7 per cent to the cost that is 805.45. Hired human labour, seed, bullock labour and fertilizer contributed 15.60 per cent, 10.78 per cent and 10.60 per cent to total cost respectively.

Satpute (2000) studied the soybean crop in Parbhani and Hingoli district. About 148 respondents were selected and grouped into small, medium, and large holdings. The study revealed that at overall level cost-A, cost-B and cost-C were ₹9639.36, ₹1257.37, and ₹13664.64 respectively. In which share of
cost-A was 70.55 per cent and cost-B was 92.02 per cent per hectare main produce was ₹14069.15 at the perfect gross return was ₹10975.14.

Potekar (2001) studied economics of soybean crop in Parbhani district, for this purpose, 148 cultivators were selected and grouped into 3 groups viz. small (up to 2 ha.) medium (2.0 ha) and large (4 and above). It was observed that from the study that overall level per hectare use of human labour was 120 days while bullock labour was 17 days. In all groups the application of nitrogen was formulating at overall level about 1492 kg produce was obtained for production of one hectare soybean crop.

Kamlakar (2003) studied economics of pulses production and identification of constrains in raising their production in Maharashtra. He studied per hectare cost, gross return operating cost and net return for pigeon pea in Nagpur and Yavatmal, chickpea in Nasik and Jalgaon district. A comparison of cost and return per hectare of included pulse crop revealed that pigeon pea showed higher gross net return per hectare. The gross return from pigeon pea was ₹12420 per hectares and the earning cost ₹4630 per hectares. The data on cost and return of chickpea indicate that gross and net return were ₹11435 per hectare and ₹5738 per hectare respectively. In nutshell, the analysis suggests that net return were of pigeon pea in Nagpur and Yavatmal district were significantly higher than that of chickpea in Nasik and Jalgaon district.

Pawar (2006) carried out the study in Buldhana district of Maharashtra state with an aim to find out the costs and returns of black gram. Cost -A was estimated to ₹5675, cost- B was ₹8810per quintal cost of production was ₹1025 per quintal net profit was ₹774 and B: C ratio was 1.87.

Pawar and Pawar (2007) studied on technique of evaluation in economics of rain fed black gram and green gram production. Data were collected from 48 black gram and 48 green gram growers from Latur district for the year 2004-05. The results revealed that main produce of black gram was 9.54 quintals per hectare while that green gram was 9.08 quintal per hectare. In production process, cost-C was found to be ₹1080.42 per hectare
and ₹11232.88 per hectare for black gram and green gram production, respectively. Net profit was ₹2766.78 per hectare from black gram while that was ₹3701.12 per hectare from green gram. Output input ratio was 1.25 and 1.33 in case of black gram and green gram production, respectively. Cost of production of black gram was ₹1089.98 per quintal while the green was ₹192.38.

Chavan (2008) studied economic analysis of semi medium farm in Marathwada region of Maharashtra. For the study, cross sectional data were selected for various crops from 100 sample farmers. Result revealed that cost of production was ₹11750.53 per hectare whereas, expenditure incurred on cost-A was ₹ 8032.50 (68.36 percent) and cost-B was ₹10586.53 (90.09 per cent). Amongst the various items of expenditure in cultivation of soybean, the highest cost was ₹ 2057.72 on bullock labour (17.51 per cent) and rental value of land ₹ 2408.75 (20.50 per cent). It was seen that the main produce and by produce was 12.06 and 9.88 quintals per hectare, respectively. The output input ratio was 1.24 which was indicated that soybean cultivation was profitable enterprise.

Asmatoddin et al. (2009) studied economic analysis of pulses medium farms in Marathwada region of Maharashtra. The study of economic analysis of pulse crops viz. soybean, green gram and pigeon pea was undertaken from medium farm during agriculture year 2005-06 in Marathwada region of Maharashtra. The data were taken from cost of cultivation scheme MKV, Parbhani. The sample of 100 medium farm size farmers throughout zone was selected. Data were tabulated and analyzed from appropriate statistical tools. The result revealed that, in case of soybean production process rental value of land (23.27 per cent), bullock labour (15.80 per cent), seed (12.88 per cent), hired human labour (12.00 per cent) and family human labour (9.64 per cent) were the major items of cost. Per hectar cost of cultivation i.e. cost-C was ₹11355.60 and net profit was ₹4761.86.

Thakre et al. (2011) studied net returns and cost of cultivation of soybean grower’s family in Anjangaon tehsil of Amravati district. The study revealed
that per hectare input cost for cow pea has been higher for large farmers as compared to other farmers. Per hectare total cost of cultivation of cow pea for the sample farmers as whole has been ₹ 15429.83 and return from cow pea for all farms gas been ₹ 29382.60. The output - input relationship at overall size group has been 1.90 at cost - ‘C’.

2.3 MARKETING COST MARKETING MARGIN AND MARKETED SURPLUS

Pawar (1996) studied marketed surplus and price spread of groundnut a sample study. Data was collected from 75 cultivators from the respective villages in Ahamadpur district of Marathwada region surveyed during the year 1990-91. Information presented on the marketable and marketed surplus from each farmer size small, medium and large (25 cultivators were chosen from each groups). The major marketing channel is noted producer wholesaler, retailer and consumer. The price spread within the marketing channels is examined.

Gupta et al. (1998) reported in the study of price spread in marketing of groundnut, rapeseed and mustered in Punjab, that, as the number of market functionary increases, they add value to commodity in marketing channel resulting in fall in producer share in consumer rupee. But sales are indirect and also there is some value adding to the commodity the producers share in groundnut falls to larger extent (33.45) the price spread was minimum for groundnut when the wholesaler directly purchased it from the farmer in the market.

Pawar and pawar (1999) identified marketing channel for soybean in Maharashtra. Data was obtained from surveys of 114 soybean growers in Satara district and 24 commission agent, 16 wholesalers and 29 retailers in the Satara, karad, koregaon and Umbaras market, three channel were identified producer-trader-commission agent-oil miller (channel-I), produce-commission agent-wholesaler-oil miller (channel-II) and producer-wholesaler-oil miller (channel-III). Commission charges (64.68 per cent) were the most expensive
item in the marketing cost. Gross marketing margin was highest in channel-I followed by channel II & III. The producer share in consumer rupee in channel-III was the highest as 81.06 per cent followed by channel -II (87.46 per cent) and channel-I (82.43 per cent).

Perumal (2000) in order to undertake the research on groundnut cultivation and marketing in Trichirapalli district (Tamil Nadu) with the objectives to study the different type of costs, market margin incurred for groundnut cultivation in this district, to identify the different pattern of sale of groundnut by farm owners, to identify the marketing cost and market margin in marketing of groundnut by different mode of sales and explore further possible avenues of increasing marketing efficiency. Study reviled that per hectare production cost of groundnut was field preparation ₹900, seeds (15 kg), ₹450, sowing cost ₹300, irrigation cost ₹2000, manures, chemical fertilizers ₹1400, plucking kala is ₹600, harvesting cost ₹700 and total per hectare production cost of groundnut estimated was ₹6370.

Pande et al. (2005) studied different marketing aspects of soybean marketing. The present study was conducted in Indore district of Madhya Pradesh. It was evident from study that, the common marketing channel were like channel - I (producer - oil miller - consumer), channel - II (producer - primary market - secondary market - oil miller - consumer), channel- III (producer - secondary market - oil miller - consumer), channel- IV (producer - co-operative societies (oil miller) - consumer), channel - V (producer - National Agricultural Marketing Federation (NAFED) - oil miller- consumer. Many marketing agencies involved in soybean marketing were farmer, middleman viz. (village traders) secondary traders (wholesale traders), and facultative middleman (Hammal, Transporters).

Panghal and Luhach (2005) studied marketing cost and margins of sunflower in Haryana. They identified the two most important channels of marketing of sunflower viz.

Channel – I: Producer- Commission agent – Wholesaler - Consumer
Channel – II: Producer- Consumer
The channels of distribution include various marketing intermediaries or middlemen like village traders, commission agent, wholesalers and consumers etc. It was observed that, the producers share in consumers rupee was 82.22 and 83.10 per cent in Hansi and Kaithal market, respectively in channel I, where as it was 97.89 and 98.18 per cent in Hansi and Kaithal markets respectively in channel II. Per quintal cost of marketing incurred by producer was ₹110.07 and ₹113.50 in Hansi and Kaithal market in channel-I respectively. Whereas it was ₹70.00 and ₹87.60 in Hansi and Kaithal market respectively in channel-II.

Shelke et al. (2009) studied the price spread in groundnut marketing to find out the marketing cost and market margin. Primary data were collected from groundnut growers, commission agents, roasters, retailers and consumers in Parbhani district of Maharashtra. Thirty producers and thirty sellers were selected from selected market area. The study revealed that, the most important marketing channel exist in the market was producer commission agent retailer consumer. The farmer share in consumer rupee had been found 49.99 per cent. The farmer incurred maximum expenditure on transportation that was ₹3.25 per quintal out of the total expenses of ₹7.25 per quintal. The total cost incurred had been found ₹240.81 per cent per quintals of ground nut, which was 18.51 per cent of the consumer, price paid. The margin of the roaster was ₹105.65 per quintal.

Shrivastava et al. (2010) the study was undertaken in Mandsaur district of Madhya Pradesh with the objective to examine the price spread and marketing efficiency of soybean. It was observed that highest margin was charged by retailer.

Kumar Vinod (2010) studied the marketing cost, price spread, price behaviour and marketing efficiency of groundnut in Rajasthan. He observed that the average marketing cost for groundnut was ₹63.52 per quintal. It was ₹69.36 in Bikaner district. The cost of gunny bags followed by transportation cost was the major components constituted around 51.92 per cent and 47.62 per cent of the respective cost of gunny bags in Jaipur and Bikaner districts. The
transportation expense incurred by the producer farmer was 32.00 per cent and 37.48 per cent respectively in Jaipur and Bikaner district. The loading and miscellaneous' expenses incurred by the producer's farmer were approximately 4 per cent in both districts.

Farkade et al. (2011) Studied economic analysis of production and marketing of soybean in Vidharbha region of Maharashtra. They observed that, the total marketing charges paid by producer, village trader, processor, wholesaler and retailer in the marketing of soybean were ₹ 34.2, ₹ 36.80, ₹ 153, ₹ 37 and ₹ 31 per quintal in channel - I, respectively. Marketing charges paid by the producer, wholesaler, processor, wholesaler and retailer in the marketing of soybean were ₹ 54.00, ₹ 32.00, ₹ 148, ₹ 40 and ₹ 35 per quintal in channel - II, respectively. Marketing charges paid by the producer, wholesaler, processor, wholesaler and retailer in the marketing of soybean were ₹ 42.41, ₹ 30.00, ₹ 151, ₹ 59 and ₹ 30 per quintal in channel - III respectively. The producer's share in consumer rupee was the highest in channel-II (34.35 per cent) followed by channel-III (33.74 per cent) and channel-I (32.85 per cent), respectively.

2.4 PRICE SPREAD IN MARKETING CHANNELS OF FARM PRODUCTS

Rajagopal (1985) studied the economics of linseed marketing. For this study, Rajnandgaon and Bastar districts were selected from Madhya Pradesh. From each district ten big farmers and ten small farmers were selected. The study revealed that the small farmer (-5 ha) sold 86.68 per cent of produce. Whereas, the big farmer (more than 5 ha) disposed only 79.55 per cent of produce. It was found that 67 per cent of small farmers disposed off their produce in the village to the private traders whereas 21 per cent of them to the co-operative marketing societies. On the country, 86.31 per cent of the big farmers preferred to sell their crop to the marketing societies and only 13.69 per cent to the private traders. The total marketing cost was higher in case of small farmer by about ₹1.69 per bag of 75 kg than the cost incurred by big
farmers. It can be inferred that, the total marketing cost and the farm size were inversely related.

Gupta and arrora (1988) carried out study on marketing of soybean in Uttar Pradesh and found that the quantity of soybean retained on three size group of farms for consumption were as 0.38 quintals, 1.47 quintals and 1.36 quintals per annum, respectively. They further found that 34 per cent, 30 per cent and 24 per cent farmers of marginal, small and large farms respectively sold their produce in the village itself. In marketing of soybean the maximum cost incurred by soybean producer was on transportation followed by storage. The storage cost increased weight the increase in the size of the farm that was Rs 0.58, Rs 0.65 and ₹0.92 per quintals. The cost of transportation of produce varied according to distance from farm gate to selling place and it worked out to be ₹ 3.00, 3.41 and 2.61 per quintal on marginal, small, and large farms respectively. Per quintal marketing cost incurred by farmer was Rs4.45.02 and 3.96 on marginal, small, and large farms respectively.

Ugalwat and kunnal (1989) studied the price-spread in groundnut in Beglkot and Badami markets of Karnataka. Two marketing channels were indentified. Channel-I indicated the sale of groundnut through the village merchants via commission agents and wholesaler to the mill owner. Channel-II indicated direct routing of output through commission agent and wholesaler to the mill owner. Marketing cost per quintal in channel-I was found to be higher for small farmer (₹5.6) compared to that incurred by medium farmer (Rs 7.66) and the large farmer (₹7.46) in channel-II. The cost incurred per quintal by the small farmer was found to be higher (Rs 13.60) compared to that of medium (₹12.97) and large farmer (₹11.69) in Beglkot market. In contrast the small farmer in Badami market incurred lower cost per quintal (₹11.91) compared to the medium (Rs13.48) and large farmers (₹12.90). Commission and transport charges were the major components of marketing cost in both the markets. The costs incurred by commission agent were much lower to be ₹19.45 per quintal in Beglkot market and ₹21.56 in Badami market.
Pawar et al. (1999) identified marketing channels for soybean in Maharashtra. Data were obtained from a survey of 144 soybean growers in Satara district and 24 commission agents, 16 wholesalers and 29 retailers in the Satara, Karad, Koregaon, and Umbarj markets. Three channels were indentified like producer-itinerant trader-commission agent-oil miller (channel-I) producer commission agent-wholesaler-oil miller (channel-II) and producer-wholesaler-oil miller (channel-III). Commission charge (64.68 per cent was the most expensive item in the marketing costs. Gross marketing margin was highest in channel-I followed by channels II and III. The producer’s share in consumer’s rupee in channel III was the highest as 86.06 per cent followed by channel II (83.46 per cent) and channel I (82.43 per cent).

Pandey et al. (2005) studied different marketing aspects of soybean marketing. The present study was conducted in Indore district of Madhya Pradesh. It was evidently from study that, the common marketing channels were like channel-I (producer-oil miller-consumer), channel-II (producer-primary market-secondary market-oil miller-consumer), channel-III (producer-secondary market-oil miller-consumer), channel-IV producer-cooperative societies (oil miller)-consumer), and channel-V (producer-national agricultural marketing federation (NAFED) -oil mill- consumer). Many marketing agencies involved in soybean marketing were farmer, middleman viz., primary traders (village trader), secondary trader (wholesale trader), and facultative middle men (hammal, transporter).

Raghuwanshi et al. (2007) studied price spread in marketing of soybean in Sehore district of Madhya Pradesh. For this purpose 87 respondents were selected as 43 small, 23 medium and 21 large. The data pertained for the year 203-04. Three marketing channels were observed in the study area and they were as channel-I (producer-village merchants-wholesaler-processors-refiner wholesaler dealer (oil)-oil retailer-consumer), channel-II (producer-whole seller-oil retailer-consumer) and channel -III (producer-ITC company-processors-Retailer-oil wholesaler-oil retailer-consumer). The results revealed that, the producer cost was highest in channel-II (1.67 per cent) followed by
channel-III (1.16 per cent) and channel-I (0.35 per cent). Highest margin was received by the first stage processor was, ₹ 188.14 per quintal followed by retailer (Rs. 33.78/q), wholesaler (₹31.00/q), grain wholesaler (₹25.26/q) and second stage processor margin was Rs.8.45 per quintal. The producer’s share in consumer’s rupee was 73.23 per cent in channel-III, which was highest followed by channel-II (72.85 per cent) and channel-I, (71.88 per cent). This indicated that with the increase in the number of market functionaries in the marketing process, there was reduction in producer’s share in consumer’s rupee.

Wankhede (2007) studied economic analysis of production, processing and marketing of soybean in Amravati district. Primary data were collected from Ahchalpur, Chandur, Bazaar, Tiwasa and Amravati tehsils from these tehsils 120 cultivators were selected. The data pertained for the year 2006-07. It was revealed form the results that cost of processing for Narendra mill and Bhaskar oil mill was estimated to ₹1427.72 per quintal and ₹ 1400.05 per quintals of soybean, respectively. The gross return received by narendra and bhaskar oil mill owners were Rs 1648.50 and Rs 1632.75 respectively. The net return was Rs. 220.78 and Rs. 232 by Narendra and Bhaskar oil-mill respectively. In the channel studied the share of total marketing cost incurred by different functionaries in consumer price was to the extent of 9.98 per cent in which the share of producer, wholesaler, processor and retailer accounted for 3.08 per cent, 4.04 per cent and 1.11 per cent, respectively. It was also observed that the producer’s share in consumer’s price was 72.30 per cent.

Singh et.al. (208) studied marketing of soybean in Madhya Pradesh. For this purpose 30 soybean growers were selected randomly form 5 villages of block Sonkurch in district dewas. The present study had been conducted during the year 2006-07. The marketing channels observed in the study area were as channel-I (producer-wholesaler/trader-soy plant-retailer-consumer) and channel-II (producer-soy plant-retailer-consumer). The study indicated that the marketing charges paid by the producer, wholesaler, and oil producer were worked out to Rs 33.75, Rs 17.20, and Rs10.00 per quintal, respectively. The
net amount received by the producer was worked out to be ₹1085.00 per quintal. Thus, the margin of the retailer was Rs 410.00 per quintal. The marketing charges paid by the wholesaler were worked out to be Rs 17.20 per quintal. It was lower than the soya plant or retailer and producer being Rs 335.00 and Rs 33.75 respectively. Total marketing charge paid by the producer, wholesaler, and soy plant was ₹ 385.95. The share in the price paid by the consumer was worked out to be 55.54 per cent.

2.5 CONSTRAINTS AND OPINIONS OF FARMERS

Bhople (1994) studied constraints regarding production of safflower. For present investigation, total 240 cultivators were selected randomly for the help of specially designed schedule by survey method from Ausa, Latur, Renapur tehsils of Latur districts. Finding of study indicate that, lack of labor during kharip and rabi seasons, no use of any insect pest control measure, fertilizer dose used was not as per recommended, lack of funds were the major constraints faced by the cultivators.

Ingale et al. (1995) examined the constraints for adoption of recommended technologies for cultivation of summer groundnut. The study related to 47 groundnut growers from Alegaon and Charangaon village in Nirgua irrigation project command area. It was observed that, lack of knowledge of improved practices and inadequate irrigation water were the main constraints in the adoption. The study suggested that demonstration of groundnut cultivation on farmer’s field be organized by the extension agencies.

Nirmal et al. (1996) reported constraints in adoption of soybean technology using data collection from 150 randomly selected farm families from 3 study villages in Uttar Pradesh during 1993-94. The problems with adoption soybean technology were non availability of improved seed and lacks of technical knowledge regarding packages of practices amongst small farmers were major constraints to expanding soybean production over a larger area. Timely knowledge provided by the scientist and high yields were two main
reasons for linking the VLS-2 variety but easy sowing operations and scope for inclusions in mixed cropping were the most important reason for preferring the local soybean variety.

Radha et al. (1998) studied analysis of yield gaps and constraints for low yield in rainfed groundnut in Karimnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. They observed that, 93 per cent of farmers in group I and 84 per cent in group II felt that marketing is the major problem followed by the constraints in seed, fertilizers and plant protection, chemicals. Both the group of farmers opined that, agronomic practices, post-harvest operations and sowing methods were influencing less in rainfed groundnut productivity. Further, the relationship between two groups of farmers was tested by rank correlation which revealed that, constraints for low yields in rainfed groundnut as expressed by both the groups of farmers were the same and there was no difference among both the groups in ranking the constraints. After identification the constraints for low yields in rainfed groundnut in the district, the following suggestion could be considered while formulating the policies and making decisions to bridge the existing yields gaps. 1) Improved production technology must reach the farmers through different extension programmes like verification trails, on-farm trails, etc. at various locations in the district. 2) Care should be taken to see that the fertilizers including gypsum be available in time to the farmers. 3) More research is needed for developing high yielding, disease resistant, dormant varieties of kharip groundnut.

Gupta (2002) has made an attempt to study the problems and constraints relating to pulses production. For this Jhabua, a tribal district from Western plateau and Hill region selected. Data pertains forth year 1999-2000. He revealed that black gram was grown without irrigation, chickpea was affected by heliothis. The good quality soils were used for maize or paddy, seed of high yielding varieties of chickpea was costly, insecticides available were are not good quality and sometimes proved ineffective. Blackgram and kulthi were
susceptible to water logging. There were no high yielding varieties in pulses. There was lack of processing and marketing facilities for pulses.

Reddy and Reddy (2005) studied the production and marketing constraints faced by farmers in the rainfed areas of Adonitaluka of Kurnool district. They found that, about 90 per cent respondent felt that, cost of fertilizer was high. Hence average quantity of fertilizers used per acre was far below the recommended level. Marketing of sunflower indicate that, the delay in cash payment after the sale of produce was serious problem for about 95 per cent respondent. 65 per cent of the sample farmers felt that commission charges were relatively high and affect their income from sunflower. 78 per cent of the respondent expressed that, they were forced to sale the produce at relatively lower price due to immediate financial needs and lack of storage facilities.

Raghuwanshi et al. (2007) the study conducted for price spread and constrains of marketing of soybean in Sehore district of Madhya Pradesh. The study revealed that, main constrains of producers are higher transportation rate faced by 97 per cent of total farmers. Lack of farmers organization is faced by 94 per cent producers, low prices of peak period faced by 92 per cent, 76 per cent farmers complained about market located at distant place, 75 per cent faced the problem lack of information about the ware houses facilities, 24 per cent farmer complained inadequate facilities in market, 23 per cent of producers complained about improper weighing in the market.

Singh et al. (2011) the study was undertaken in block Sonkutch of district Dewas of Madhya Pradesh with object of problems and suggestion in economics of production and marketing of soybean. Farmers in study area faced some problem they were instability and fluctuation in prices of agricultural produce which ultimately affects net income of farmers. Problem of transportation of agricultural produce was found severely. Lack of marketing intelligence among the farmers have been identified, method of selling of agricultural produce through auction was not appropriate and Mandi staff charges extra amount from the farmers.
Farkade et al. (2011) the study was undertaken in six districts in Vidharba region of Maharashtra with objective to constrain and to suggest suitable measures in the marketing of soybean in studied area. Constraints like, the producers were forced to sell their produce to intermediaries under financial obligation and nearly 80 per cent of the farmers had sold their soybean just after harvesting because of lack of storage facilities, 67 per cent producer were prevalence of mal practices in the market, 71 per cent producers had lack of proper grading and packing facilities, 55 per cent producer had constraints of lack of market yard, 75 per cent producers had constraints of high charge of transportation.

Deshmukh and Deshmukh (2013) the present study was undertaken in Morshi tehsil of Amravati district in Vidhrabh region. The aim was to study constraints in production and marketing of soybean using primary data which was collected by personal interview method. According to constraints level 25.33 per cent showed high constraint level. In rank of situational constraints, first rank was given to non-available of labour in time. In case of knowledge and information constraints, first rank was given to lack of knowledge about seed treatment and in communication constraints lack of contact with extension agencies ranked first. In economic constraints, first rank was given to high cost of manures and fertilizers and in production constraints first rank given to lack of processing plant in the area. Regarding suggestion 100 per cent of the respondents suggested a need of cooperative processing plant in the area and refresher training before season was suggested by 99.33 per cent of the respondent.