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5.1 INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the present study were accomplished in three stages. First of all the operational and financial efficiency of the Regulated Markets were analysed. It was followed by the study of the farmers’ attitude to the Regulated Markets, the problems encountered by them and also the measures expected for the efficient working of the Regulated Markets. Finally, the traders’ views on the functioning of the Regulated Markets, their problems in the Regulated Markets and their suggestions to improve the efficiency of the Regulated Markets. The results of the analyses were presented and discussed in the earlier chapters.

The methodology was formulated according to the objective of the study with the help of comprehensive reviews of previous studies. The secondary data on the Regulated Markets were collected from the offices of the Regulated Markets and primary data were collected from the farmers, traders and officials of the Regulated Market. The collected data were analysed with the help of appropriate statistical tools. The various findings of the present study are summarised below:

5.2. PROFILE OF FARMERS

Males dominate among the farmers. About 88 per cent of the farmers are males and remaining 12 per cent of the farmers are females. Among the marginal farmers, the male farmers constitute 92 per cent of the total. Among the small farmers the male constitute 72 per cent of the total. Among the big farmers the male farmers constitute 89 per cent.
The important age groups among the farmers are 41 to 50 and 51 to 60 years which constitute about 40 and 22 per cent each of the totals respectively. The most important age groups among the marginal farmers are 41 to 50 years, which constitutes 64 per cent of its total. Among the small farmers, it is 31 to 40 years which constitutes 52 per cent of its total. Among the big farmers, it is the 51 to 60 years group which constitutes 61 per cent of its total. The Regulated Market aims at improving the welfare of the farmers by reducing the number of intermediaries in the marketing of agricultural produce. The functioning of Regulated Markets has to be designed according to the expectations of the farmers. But their expectations frequently change. Unless their expectations are correctly predicted, the officials are unable to fulfil their requirements. Hence farmers’ expectations and perceptions on various aspects of the Regulated Market are analysed in this chapter.

It confines itself to a few profile variables like gender, age, community, level of education, marital status, family size, number of dependent population per family, land ownership and the entrepreneurial behaviour among the farmers.

The important levels of education among the farmers in the present study are higher secondary school level, secondary school level and elementary school level, which constitute 30, 28 and 19 per cent to the total respectively. The farmers with under-graduation and post-graduation constitute 11 and 4 per cent to the total respectively. The most important level of education among the marginal farmers is the higher secondary level, which alone constitutes 33 per cent to the total whereas among the small farmers it is the higher secondary level and secondary school level, which constitutes 34 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is the secondary school level, which constitutes 30 per cent to the total.
The important marital status among the farmers is ‘married’ which alone constitutes about 84 per cent to the total. It is followed by the unmarried farmers and widow farmers who constitute 8 per cent to the total. The most important marital status among the marginal, small and big farmers is ‘married’ and it constitutes about 88, 76 and 88 per cent to the total of the three groups respectively.

The important family size of the farmers is 1 to 4 and 5 to 6 members which constitute 47 and 21 per cent to the total respectively. The number of farmers with 6 to 7 members constitutes 20 per cent to the total. The most important family size among the marginal, small and big farmers is 1 to 4 members. The family size among the marginal farmers is identified as higher compared to other the group of farmers.

The important numbers of dependent population among the farmers are above 5 and 4 to 5 which constitute about 42 and 22 per cent to the total respectively. The most important dependent population among the marginal farmers is above 5 members who constitute 40 per cent to the total respectively. Among the small farmers, it constitutes 43 per cent to the total respectively. Among the big farmers, it constitutes 47 per cent to the total respectively.

The important type of land ownership among the farmers is both (owner cultivator and tenant cultivator), which constitutes about 41 per cent to the total. It is followed by tenant cultivators, which constitute 35 per cent to the total. The most important type of land ownership among the three types of farmers is both cultivators. It constitutes about 43, 27 and 60 per cent to their respective totals.

The important levels of experience in farming are 21 to 30 years and 11 to 20 years, which constitute about 32 and 25 per cent to the total respectively.
The number of farmers with an experience of more than 30 years constitutes 23 per cent to the total. The most important level of experience among the marginal farmers is 11 to 20 years, which constitutes 29 per cent to the total. Among the small farmers, it is 21 to 30 years (34 per cent), and among the big farmers, it is 21 to 30 years, which constitutes 38 per cent to the total.

The important sources of irrigation are River and Bore-well, which constitute 36 and 33 per cent to the total in each. It is followed by Rain irrigation which constitutes 24 per cent to the total. The most important source of irrigation among the marginal farmers (38 per cent) and small farmers (43 per cent) are Rivers and among big farmers (55 per cent) the source of irrigation is Bore-well.

The important value of marketable surplus per annum among the farmers is less than Rs.1 lakh and Rs.2 to 3 lakhs which constitute about 28 and 25 per cent to the total respectively. Farmers with marketable surplus of above Rs.5 lakh constitute 5 per cent to the total. The most important marketable surplus among the marginal farmers is less than Rs.1 lakh and among the small farmers; it is also less than Rs.1 lakh. These two constitute 29 and 38 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is Rs.1 to 2 lakhs which constitutes 35 per cent to the total.

The important source of finance among the farmers is borrowed funds which constitute about 57 per cent to the total. The most important source of finance among the marginal farmers is only borrowed funds which constitute 56 per cent to the total whereas among the small farmers, it is only borrowed funds which constitute 56 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is also only borrowed funds which constitute 60 per cent to the total.
The important sources of borrowed funds among the farmers are commercial banks and private moneylenders, which constitute about 24 and 21 per cent to the total respectively. The most important source of borrowed funds among the marginal farmers is ‘commercial bank’ which constitutes 25 per cent to the total. Among the small farmers, it is private money lenders, which constitutes 24 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is commercial banks, which constitutes 32 per cent to the total.

The important number of sources of income among the farmers is only one which constitutes about 58 per cent to the total. It is followed by two sources of income which constitute 21 per cent to the total. The number of farmers with more than three sources of income constitutes 12 per cent to the total. The important number of sources of income among the marginal, small and big farmers is only one source. The number of farmers with more than one source of income is identified as higher among big farmers compared to the others.

In total, a maximum of about 34 per cent of the farmers have an annual income of less than Rs.30,000 followed by those with Rs.30,000 to 60,000 (31 per cent). The number of farmers with an annual income of above Rs.1.2 lakhs constitutes 6 per cent to the total. The most significant annual income among the marginal farmers is less than Rs.30,000 which constitutes 38 per cent to the total. Among the small farmers, it is less than Rs.30,000 which constitutes 40 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is Rs.30,000 to 60,000 which constitutes 41 per cent to the total.

The important annual income groups of the farmers are less than Rs.40,000 and Rs.40,000 to 80,000 which constitute about 34 and 29 per cent to the total respectively. Farmers with the total annual income of above Rs.1.6 lakhs constitute 6 per cent to the total. The most important annual income
group among the marginal and small farmers is the less than Rs.40,000 group which constitutes 36 and 39 per cent to their respective totals. Among the big farmers, it is Rs.40,000 to 80,000 which constitutes 41 per cent to the total.

The important marketing practices of farmers are post harvesting which constitutes about 53 per cent and at the time harvesting which constitutes about 29 per cent. Most of the marginal farmers are following marketing at post harvesting (97 per cent) small farmers are mostly following marketing at the time of harvest (93 per cent) and big farmers are doing marketing at the time of pre harvesting (92 per cent).

The important level of awareness among the farmers are knowing the selected field and knowing better which constitute about 27 and 21 per cent to the total respectively. The farmers just knowing all the aspects of the regulated markets constitute 11 per cent to the total. The important level of awareness among the marginal, small and big farmers just knows the selected field which constitutes 25, 28 and 30 per cent to the total respectively.

The important distances of regulated markets from the farm are less than 5km and 16 to 20km which constitute about 26 and 23 per cent to the total respectively. The farmers under a distance of above 20km constitute 16 per cent to the total. The most important distance factor of regulated markets according to the marginal farmers is 16km to 20km which constitutes 26 per cent to the total whereas among the small farmers, it is 5km to 10km which constitutes 27 per cent to the total. Among the big farmers, it is 16km to 20km which constitutes 29 per cent to the total.

Important level of cropping pattern is paddy, about 31 per cent of farmers are following paddy cropping pattern, 26 per cent farmers are following pulses cropping pattern and 16 per cent farmers following sugarcane
cropping pattern. Important levels of cropping pattern among the marginal and small farmers are paddy cropping pattern which constitutes 28 and 38 per cent to the total respectively. Important levels of cropping pattern among the big farmers are pulses cropping pattern which constitutes 33 per cent to the total respectively.

5.2.1. Innovativeness of the Farmers

Among the Mean values of different innovativeness factors, “Easy to accommodate any change” is the top ranked innovativeness factor with the mean value of 2.63, “Innovation required for survival” is the second ranked innovativeness factor with the mean value of 2.61, “Innovation needed for marketing and Innovation makes for more profit” are the third ranked innovativeness factors with the mean value of 2.60, “Innovation is essential for ever” is the last innovativeness ranked factor with the mean value of 2.59.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is no difference between types of farmers with regards to innovativeness of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.2 Decision Making of the Farmers

Regarding the Mean values of decision making factors. “Awareness of solutions” is the top ranked decision making factor with the mean value of 2.62, “Participatory decision is required” is the second ranked decision making factor with the mean value of 2.61, “Awareness of implementation procedures” is the third ranked decision making factor with the mean value of 2.60, “Awareness of problem and Own decision for anything” are the fourth ranked decision making factors with the mean value of 2.59.
The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between the types of farmers with regards to decision making of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.3 Economic Motivation of the Farmers

With regarding to the Mean values of economic motivational factors, “Money is a motivating element” is the top ranked economic motivational with the mean value of 2.63, “Always expecting more benefit” is the second ranked economic motivational with the mean value of 2.61, “Looking for better future” is the third ranked economic motivational with the mean value of 2.60 and “Earning is higher in Agricultural Marketing” is the last ranked economic motivational with the mean value of 2.58.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to economical motivational of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.4 Risk Orientation of the Farmers

“Interest in facing risks” is the top ranked Risk Orientation of the farmers with the mean value of 2.63, “Risk yields return” is the second ranked Risk Orientation of the farmers with the mean value of 2.61, “Risk is everywhere and Risk bearing is a challenge in life” is the third ranked Risk Orientation of the farmers with the mean value of 2.60 and “Risk is a part of life” is the last ranked Risk Orientation of the farmers with the mean value of 2.58.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to Risk Orientation of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.
5.2.5 Information Seeking of the Farmers

With reference to the Mean values of information seeking factors, “More information leads to better utilization” is the top ranked information seeking factor with the mean value of 2.62, “Information paves the way for development” is the second ranked information seeking factor with the mean value of 2.61, “Information seeking is a thrust” is the third ranked information seeking factor with the mean value of 2.60, “Information is an essential characteristics of entrepreneurs” is the fourth ranked information seeking factor with the mean value of 2.59 and “Information is essential in marketing” is the last ranked information seeking factor with the mean value of 2.57.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to information seeking factors of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.6 Leadership Abilities of the Farmers

Among the Mean values of leadership abilities of the farmers, “Analyzing the problem” is the top ranked leadership ability with the mean value of 3.20, “Coordinating with others in farming” is the second ranked leadership ability with the mean value of 2.63, “Decision is taken out of participation and Leading the marketing activities” are the third ranked leadership ability with the mean value of 2.60 and “Bearing all risks in marketing” is the last ranked leadership ability with the mean value of 2.57.

The Null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 levels. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to all leadership ability factors of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.
5.2.7 Entrepreneurial Behaviour of the Farmers

Out of all the mean values of entrepreneurial behaviour factors “Awareness of storage facilities, Awareness of marketing cost and Awareness of pricing” are the top ranked entrepreneurial behaviour factors with the mean value of 2.63, “Awareness of cost of cultivation” is the second ranked entrepreneurial behaviour factor with the mean value of 2.61, “Awareness of forecasting and Awareness of marketing channels” are the third ranked entrepreneurial behaviour factors with the mean value of 2.60, “Awareness of market intermediaries and Awareness of future selling” are the fourth ranked entrepreneurial behaviour factors with the mean value of 2.59 and “Awareness of returns” is the fourth ranked entrepreneurial behaviour factor with the mean value of 2.58.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to entrepreneurial behaviour factors of the farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.8 Marketable Surpluses & Financing Sources and Type Of Farmers

The Null hypothesis is rejected at 5 per cent level. It is concluded that there is an association between experience in farming, sources of irrigation, cropping pattern, value of marketable surplus per annum, source of finance, number of sources of income, annual income from farming, total annual income and time of marketing and types of farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.9 Reason for Selling in Pre Harvest Period

The analyses of the Mean values of difference reasons for selling in pre harvest period. Show that “Avoiding price risk” is the top ranked reason for selling in pre harvest period with the mean value of 2.63, “Urgent need” is the
second ranked reason for selling in pre harvest period with the mean value of 2.62, “Emergency” is the third ranked reason for selling in pre harvest period with the mean value of 2.60, “Indebtedness and Instant availability of funds” are the fourth ranked reason for selling in pre harvest period with the mean value of 2.59.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with respect to reason for selling in pre harvest period at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.10 Reason for Selling at Harvest Period

Out of the mean values of reason for selling at the time of harvest, “No packing cost” is the top ranked reason for selling at time of harvest with the mean value of 2.63, “Less intermediary expenses” is the second ranked reason for selling at time of harvest with the mean value of 2.62, “Family expenditure” is the third ranked reason for selling at time of harvest with the mean value of 2.61, “No storage facilities, No transportation cost and Indebtedness” are the fourth ranked reasons for selling at time of harvest with the mean value of 2.60, “No processing facilities and To meet the expenses for next cropping” are the fifth ranked reasons for selling at time of harvest with the mean value of 2.59.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with respect to reason for selling at harvest period at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.11 Reason for Selling Through Commission Agents

Among the Mean values of reason for selling through commission agents, “Lack of storage facility” is the top ranked reason for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 3.20, “Poor marketable surplus” is
the second ranked reason for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.63, “High transportation cost” is the third ranked reason for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.62, “Better price” is the fourth ranked reason for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.61, “Immediate cash after sales and Lack of market information” are the fifth ranked reasons for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.60, “Availability of advance payment” is the sixth ranked reasons for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.59, “Long term practice and Availability of credit facility” are the seventh ranked reason for selling through commission agents with the mean value of 2.85.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with respect to reason for selling through commission agents at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.12 Reason for Selling Through Village Traders

Regarding the Mean values of reason for selling through village traders, “Sales at the field” is the top ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.64, “Not knowing other sources” is the second ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.63, “Long term practice” is the third ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.62, “Quick disposal and Loan in advance” are the fourth ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.61, “Low transportation cost and No commission charge” are the fifth ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.60, “Immediate payment” is the sixth ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.59 and “Less marketable surplus” is the seventh ranked reason for selling through village traders with the mean value of 2.58.
The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with respect to reason for selling through village traders at significant at the five per cent level.

5.2.13 Awareness, Distance of Regulated Market From Farm, Experience of Transaction with Regulated Market and Type of Farmers.

The Null hypothesis is accepted at 5 per cent level. It is concluded that there is no association between levels of awareness, distance of regulated market from farm, experience of transaction with regulated market and types of farmers at significant at the five per cent level.

Analysis of the Inter correlation between entrepreneurial behaviour index variables. Shows that all the variables are having strong and positive correlation with other variables at the significant level of 0.01. Innovativeness is having 77 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior, decision making is having 77 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior, economic motivation is having 76 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior, risk orientation is having 76 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior, information seeking is having 64 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior and leadership ability is having 60 per cent positive relation with entrepreneurial behavior.

Positive correlation with other variables. Reason for selling at the time of pre harvest is having 65 per cent positive relation with reason for selling at the time of harvest, 60 per cent positive relation with reason for selling through commission agents and 42 per cent positive relation with reason for selling through village traders. Reason for selling at the time of harvest is having 64 per cent positive relation with reason for selling through commission agents and 45 per cent positive relation with reason for selling through village traders.
Reason for selling through commission agents is having 59 per cent positive relation with reason for selling through village traders.

5.2.14 Different Source of Awareness

Out of the mean values of different sources of awareness, “Advertisement” is the top ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 2.63, “Co-farmers and NGO’s” are the second ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 2.62, “Agricultural officials” is the third ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 2.61 and “friend and relatives” are the fourth ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 2.60.

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with respect to different source of awareness at significant at the five per cent level.

Regarding the Motivational factors, the First component consists of six motivational factors. The Eigen value is 5.055 and about 24 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Second component consists of nine motivational factors and the Eigen value is 4.148 and about 20 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Third component consists of six motivational factors the Eigen value is 5.423 and about 17 per cent of variation is explained by this component. Totally 60 per cent of variation is explained by three extracted components.
5.2.15 Motivational Factors

Regarding of the Third extracted motivational factors ‘Personal’, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between types of farmers with regards to third extracted motivational factors ‘Personal’ at significant at 5 per cent level.

5.2.16 Gap Analysis Between Farmer’s Expectation and Perception About Regulatory Markets

The gap between expected and perceived values of regulatory markets is with are average of -0.76. It shows that farmer’s perception about regulatory market is not up to the level compared to farmer’s expectation about regulatory market.

5.2.17 Perception of the Farmers

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between type of farmers, age of the farmers and level of qualification of the farmers with regards to perception factors 4 ‘Price’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.18 Farmer’s Marital Statuses, Family Type, No of Dependents, Ownership Land with Perception Factors

The Null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference between marital status of farmers, family size of the farmers, number of dependents in family of the farmers and ownership of the farmers with regards to perception factors of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.
The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between irrigation sources, cropping pattern of the farmers and marketable surplus with regards to perception factors 3 ‘Service’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.19 Sources of Finance, Borrowing Source, Number of Sources and Annual Income with Perception Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between sources of finance and number of sources with regards to perception factors 2 ‘System’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.20 Time of Marketing, Level of Awareness, Distance Between Regulatory Market and Experience with Regulatory Market Transactions with Perception Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between distance between regulatory market and experience with regulatory market transactions with regards to perception factors 3 ‘Service’ at significant at 5 percent level. And also it is concluded that there is a difference between levels of awareness with regards to perception factors at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.21 Demographics of the Farmers with Regards to Expectation of the Farmers

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between type of farmers, age of the farmers and level of qualification of the farmers with regards to expectation factors 4 ‘Price’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.
5.2.22 Farmer’s Marital Statuses, Family Type, No of Dependents, Ownership Land with Expectation Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference ownership of the farmers with regards to expectation factors3 ‘Service’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.23 Experiences in Farming, Irrigation Source, Cropping Pattern, Marketable Surplus with Expectation Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between irrigation sources with regards to expectation factor 3 ‘Service’ and factor 2 ‘System’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.24 Sources of Finance, Borrowing Source, Number of Sources and Annual Income with Expectation Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between sources of finance and number of sources with regards to expectation factors2 ‘System’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.25 Time of Marketing, Level of Awareness, Distance Between Regulatory Market and Experience with Regulatory Market Transactions with Expectation Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experience with regulatory market transactions with regards to expectation factors 1 ‘Facilities’ and factor 3 ‘Service’ at significant at 5 percent level; there is a difference between levels of awareness with regards to expectation factors 2 ‘System’ at significant at 5 percent level. And also it is concluded that there is a difference between times of marketing with regards to
expectation factors 4 ‘Price’ of the farmers about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.26 Overall Attitude to Regulated Markets

Relationship between the dependent variable (Overall perception) and farmer’s perception factors about regulated market as independent variables of health insurance companies. Multiple R is the correlation coefficient (at this step) for the simple regression of perception factor 1 (X₁), perception factor 2 (X₂), perception factor 3 (X₃), perception factor 4 (X₄) and perception factor 5 (X₅) the dependent variable of overall attitude (Y). R - R is the square root of R-Squared and is the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the dependent variable. The strength of correlation coefficient is 0.752. There is a strong positive strength of correlation between the observed variable X₁, X₂, X₃, X₄, X₅ and predicted values of the dependent variable (Y). The R-square shows the percentage of variation in one variable that is accounted by another variable. In this case the perception factors accounts values of 52% of the health insurance companies. R square (R²) is the correlation coefficient squared; also it is referred as the coefficient of determination. The adjusted R-square attempts to yield an honest value to estimate the R-squared for the population. The value of the adjusted R - square is 0.524.

5.2.27 Impact of Overall Attitude of Farmers on Farmer’s Perception Factors about the Regulated Market

The regression coefficient for independent variables of the farmer’s perception is worked out. These are the values for the regression equation for predicting dependent variable, Overall attitude about the regulated markets (Y) from the independent variable(s) of perception factors. The t-test examines the question whether the regression coefficient is different from zero to be statically significant or not. In this step, four independent variables are used to calculate the regression equation for the dependent variable. The coefficient
The table shows the result for the constant component in the regression equation. The column labelled significance shows the statistical significance of the regression coefficient for the independent variable as measured by t-test. It concludes that the model is a good fit for the data for the first function.

5.2.28 Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients can be used to calculate the discriminant score for a given case. The score is calculated in the same manner as a predicted value from a linear regression, using the standardized coefficients and the standardized variables.

5.2.29 Farmers with Regards to Deficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between type of farmers, age of the farmers and level of qualification of the farmers with regards to deficiency factors 1 ‘Mechanism’ about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level. And there is a difference between genders of the farmers with regards to deficiency factors 3 ‘Service Quality’ about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.30 Farmer’s Marital Statuses, Family Type, No of Dependents, Ownership Land with Deficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between family size and number of dependents in family with regards to deficiency factors 3 ‘Service Quality’. And there is a difference between type of ownership with regards to deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’ and deficiency factors 7 ‘System’.
5.2.31 Experiences in Farming, Irrigation Source, Cropping Pattern, Marketable Surplus with Deficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between marketable surplus with regards to deficiency factors 1 ‘Mechanism’ and deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’. And there is a difference between cropping pattern with regards to deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’, there is a difference between irrigation sources with regards to deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’.

5.2.32 Sources of Finance, Borrowing Source, Number of Sources and Annual Income with Perception Factors

The Null hypothesis rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between financial sources and borrowing sources with regards to deficiency factors 2 ‘Finance’. And there is a difference between borrowing sources and annual income with regards to deficiency factors 3 ‘Service Quality’

5.2.33 Time of Marketing, Level of Awareness, Distance Between Regulatory Market and Experience with Regulatory Market Transactions with Deficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between marketing patterns with regards to deficiency factors 1 ‘Mechanism’, there is a difference between level of awareness with regards to deficiency factors 2 ‘Finance’ and deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’. And there is a difference between distance between farm and regulated markets and experience with transaction of regulated market with regards to deficiency factors 5 ‘Personal’.

5.2.34 Demographics of the Farmers with Regards to Efficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between type of farmers, age of the farmers of the farmers with regards to
Efficiency factors 1 ‘Strategy’ and factors 2 ‘Information’ about the regulated markets at significant at 5 percent level.

5.2.35 Farmer’s Marital Statuses, Family Type, No of Dependents, Ownership Land with Efficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between family size and number of dependents in family with regards to Efficiency factors 1 ‘Strategy’. And there is a difference between type of ownership with regards to Efficiency factors 2 ‘Information’.

5.2.36 Experiences in Farming, Irrigation Source, Cropping Pattern, Marketable Surplus with Efficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences in farming with regards to Efficiency factors 1 ‘Strategy’.

5.2.37 Sources of Finance, Borrowing Source, Number of Sources and Annual Income with Perception Factors

The Null hypothesis rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between borrowing sources and annual income with regards to Efficiency factors 1 ‘Strategy’.

5.2.38 Time of Marketing, Level of Awareness, Distance Between Regulatory Market and Experience with Regulatory Market Transactions with Efficiency Factors

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between marketing patterns with regards to Efficiency factors 1 ‘Strategy’ and Efficiency factors 2 ‘Information’.
5.3 PROFILE OF THE TRADERS

The important segment of experience among the traders is 10 to 20 years which constitutes 45.6 per cent to the total. It is followed by less than 10 years and above 20 years which constitute 27.2 per cent to the total each. This shows that a majority have 10 to 20 years of experience.

The important age groups among the traders are 30 to 40 years and below 30 years which constitute 29.39 and 22.81 per cent to the total respectively. A majority of the traders in group I and the farmers are between 51 and 60 years which constitutes 35.48 per cent to the total. In group II the majority are 31 and 40 and years which constitutes 32.69 per cent to the total. Most of the group III traders are 30 to 40 years, which constitutes 45.16 to the total.

5.3.1 Value Addition Services Provided by Traders

With regard to the mean values of value addition services provided by the traders, “Sorting” is the top ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 3.82, “Processing” is the second ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 3.78, “Cleaning” is the third ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 3.51, “Packing” is the fourth ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 3.44, “Special services” is the fifth ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 2.99 and “Grading” is the last ranked values of value addition services provided by the traders with the mean value of 2.93.
5.3.2 Experience in Regulatory Market and Value Addition Services Provides by the Traders

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences in regulatory market with regards to value addition services provides by the traders at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.3 Mode of Payment to Farmers

The modes of payment to the farmers by majority of the traders is lump sum advance before buying which constitutes 36.40 per cent to the total, followed by lump sum advance while buying and full payment while buying, which are 52 each.

5.3.4 Sources of Information on Regulated Markets

Among the mean values of different sources of awareness, “Friends” is the top ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.60, “Farmers” is the second ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.54, “News” is the third ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.52, “Officials” is the fourth ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.44, “Other Traders” is the fifth ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.04 and “Relatives” is the last ranked sources of awareness with the mean value of 3.00.

5.3.5 Experience with Regulatory Market and Difference Sources of Awareness

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory market with regards to difference sources of awareness at significant at 0.05 levels.
5.3.6 Reasons for Poor Trading Activities

Out of the mean values of reasons for Poor Trading Activities, “Inadequate market arrivals” is the top ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.75, “High transport cost” is the second ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.60, “Immediate cash payment” is the third ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.55, “Total accountability” is the fourth ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.52, “Total accountability” is the fifth ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.50, “Poor quality of produce” is the sixth ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.26 and “Tax burden” is the last ranked Reasons for Poor Trading Activities with the mean value of 3.25.

5.3.7 Experience with Regulatory Market and Reasons for Poor Trading Activities

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory market with regards to reasons for poor trading activities at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.8 Steps Taken to Ensure Trading Activities

The important steps taken to ensure good trading activities in Regulated Markets among the group I traders are representing to officials and approaching the Market Committee which constitutes 29 per cent to the total respectively. The most important step taken by the group II traders is approaching the (22 per cent) representing to officials and Convincing the farmers, whereas among the group III traders, this is (45 per cent) representing to the officials.
5.3.9 Reasons for Non Interaction with the Members of the Market Committee

Analysis of the Mean values of reasons for non interaction with the members, shows that “Interference of officials” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean value of 3.60, “No scope for interaction” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean value of 3.55, “Inaccessibility” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean value of 3.54, “Fear” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean value of 3.52, , “Apprehension about the role” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean value of 3.50 and “Lack of awareness” is the top ranked reasons for non interaction with the members with the mean values of 3.15.

5.3.10 Experience with Regulatory Markets and Reasons for Non Interaction with the Members

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is no difference between experiences with regulatory markets with regards to reasons for non interaction with the members at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.11 Procedure for Nominating Traders to the Market Committee

Among the mean values of prevailing procedure for nomination traders to the market committee, “Must be Replaced with a new system” is the top ranked prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.86, “Trader should be educated” is the second ranked prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.59, “Should be dispensed with” is the third ranked prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.58, “Need for elected representative” is the fourth ranked prevailing
procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.57, “Traders should be successful entrepreneur” is the fifth ranked prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.51 and “Present system should be continued” is the last ranked prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee with the mean value of 3.25.

5.3.12 Procedure for Nominating Traders to the Market Committee

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory markets with regards to prevailing procedure for nominating traders to the market committee at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.13 Frequency of Meeting Farmers

The important frequencies of meeting the farmers among the traders are once in two months and once a month which constitute 25.4 and 25.8 per cent, to the total respectively. The number of traders who were in favor of ‘once a week’ constitutes 16.67 per cent to the total. The most important frequency of meeting the traders among the group I traders is ‘once a month’ which constitutes 30.6 per cent to the total whereas among the group II traders, it is once a month which constitutes 27.9 per cent to the total. Among the group III traders, it is once in two months which constitutes 37.1 per cent to its total.

5.3.14 Regulated Markets and Open Market

The important opinion on competition in the Regulated Markets compared to the open market is ‘equally competitive’ and ‘less competitive’ which constitute 26.75 and 21.49 per cent to the total respectively. The important opinions among the group I traders are equally competitive which constitute 35.50 per cent to the total in each. Among the group II trades,
equally competitive and they constitute 29.6 per cent to the total respectively. Among the group III traders, less competitive and constitute 33.9 per cent to the total respectively.

5.3.15 Regulated Markets Compared with Open Market

The important opinion on profit in the Regulated Markets compared to the open market is ‘equally remunerative and ‘less remunerative which constitute 28.5 and 23.24 per cent to the total respectively. The important opinions among the group I traders are equally remunerative which constitute 38.7 per cent to the total in each. Among the group II trades, equally competitive and they constitute 28.8 per cent to the total respectively. Among the group III traders, less remunerative and constitute 38.7 per cent to the total respectively.

5.3.16 Price Determination in Regulated Markets

Study of the mean values of factors leading to price determination, show that “Market arrivals” is the top ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.88, “Price in open market” is the second ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.76, “Demand and supply” is the third ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.75, “Mediation of officials” is the fourth ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.71, “Price fixed unilaterally” is the fifth ranked factors leading to price determination with mean the value of 3.68, “Interaction with farmers” is the sixth ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.47 and “Market demand” is the last ranked factors leading to price determination with the mean value of 3.43.
5.3.17 Experience with Regulatory Market and Factors Leading to Price Determination

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory market with regards to factors leading to price determination at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.18 Buyers in the Regulatory Market

Among the Mean values of buyers of the regulatory market, “Middleman” is the top ranked buyer with mean values of 3.71, “Wholesaler” is the second ranked buyer with the mean value of 3.70, “End user” is the third ranked buyer with the mean value of 3.63, “Exporter” is the fourth ranked buyer with the mean value of 3.62, “Institutional buyer” is the fifth ranked buyer with mean values of 3.61 and “Retailer” is the last ranked buyer with the mean value of 3.54.

5.3.19 Regulatory Market and Buyers in the Regulatory Market

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory Factor analysis attempts to identify underlying variables, or factors, that explain the pattern of correlations within a set of observed variables. Factor analysis is often used in data reduction to identify a small number of factors that explain most of the variance observed in a much larger number of manifest variables. In the current study Rotation Factor analysis is performed to measure the facilities variables of the study of the respondents. By using exploratory factor analysis five components has been extracted from important facilities of regulatory market. The First component consists of four factors. The Eigen value is 3.673 and about 18 per cent of variation is explained by this component.
The Second component consists of six important facilities factors and the Eigen value is 2.978 and about 15 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Third component consists of five important facilities factors and the Eigen value is 2.693 and about 14 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Fourth component consists of two important facilities factors and the Eigen value is 1.668 and about 8 per cent of variation is explained by this component. Totally 55 per cent of variation is explained by three extracted components.

5.3.20 Experience with Regulatory Markets and Factors Extracted From Important Facilities of Regulatory Markets

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory markets with regards to factors 1 ‘Marketing’ and factors 4 ‘Information’ extracted from important facility of regulatory markets at significant at 0.05 levels.

By using exploratory factor analysis six components have been extracted from problems encounter by the traders. The First component consists of four factors. The Eigen value is 4.210 and about 21 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Second component consists of three problem encountered by the trader’s factors and the Eigen value is 2.490 and about 13 per cent of variation is explained by this component.
The Third component consists of four problem encountered by the trader’s factors and the Eigen value is 2.214 and about 11 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Fourth component consists of three problem encountered by the trader’s factors and the Eigen value is 2.141 and about 11 per cent of variation is explained by this component. Totally 55 per cent of variation is explained by three extracted components.

5.3.21 Experience with Regulatory Market and Problems Encountered by the Traders

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulatory market with regards to factors extracted from problems encountered by the traders at significant at 0.05 levels.

By using exploratory factor analysis five components have been extracted from attitude towards the regulated market. The First component consists of four factors. The Eigen value is 4.210 and about 21 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Second component consists of four attitudes towards the regulated market and the Eigen value is 2.490 and about 13 per cent of variation is explained by this component.

The Third component consists of four attitudes towards the regulated market and the Eigen value is 2.214 and about 11 per cent of variation is explained by this component.
The Fourth component consists of six attitudes towards the regulated market and the Eigen value is 2.141 and about 11 per cent of variation is explained by this component. Totally 55 per cent of variation is explained by three extracted components.

5.3.22 Experience with Regulated Markets and Attitudes Towards the Regulated Markets

The Null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulated markets with regards to factors 1 ‘Human Relation’, factors 2 ‘System’ and factors 4 ‘Marketing’ extracted from attitude towards the regulated markets at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.3.23 Overall Attitude towards the Regulated Markets

In total 32.46 per cent of the traders are dissatisfied with the functioning of the Regulated Markets. Some 20.18 per cent of the traders are satisfied with the functioning of the Regulated Markets and only 9.65 per cent of traders highly satisfied with the functioning of the Regulated Markets. Among the group I traders, the number of traders with dissatisfaction and higher dissatisfaction constitute 32.3 per cent and 25.8 per cent to the total. Among the group II, satisfied group constitutes 28.8 and group III, dissatisfied group constitutes 45.2 per cent to its respective totals.

5.3.24 Impact of Perception on Various Factors in Regulated Markets as Overall Attitude

The ANOVA table shows F-Ratio for the regression model which indicates statistical significance of the Overall regression model. The F-ratio is the result of comparing the amount of explained variance to unexplained variance.
The F-value is the mean square regression divided by the Mean Square Residual, yielding \( F = 36.618 \). The p-value associated with this F value is very small. The significance value of the F-Statistic is less than 0.05. In this table the significance variable is less than 0.05 so that the group of variables (perception factors) can be used to reliably predict overall attitude towards the regulated market (the dependent variable).

**5.3.25 Relationship Between the Dependent Variable (Overall Attitude) and Trader’s Perception Factors About Regulated Markets as Independent Variables of Health Insurance Companies.**

Multiple R is the correlation coefficient (at this step) for the simple regression of perception factor 1 \((X_1)\), perception factor 2 \((X_2)\), perception factor 3 \((X_3)\) and perception factor 5 \((X_4)\) the dependent variable of overall attitude \((Y)\). \( R - R \) is the square root of R-Squared and is the correlation between the observed and predicted values of the dependent variable. The strength of correlation coefficient is 0.547. There is a strong positive strength of correlation between the observed variable \(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\) and predicted values of the dependent variable \((Y)\). The R-square shows the percentage of variation in one variable that is accounted by another variable. In this case the perception factors accounts values of 60% of the health insurance companies. \( R \) square \((R^2)\) is the correlation coefficient squared; also it is referred as the coefficient of determination. The adjusted R-square attempts to yield an honest value to estimate the R-squared for the population. The value of the adjusted R - square is 0.600.

**5.3.26 Impact of Overall Attitude of Traders on Trader’s Perception Factors About the Regulated Market**

Regression coefficient for independent variables of the trader’s perception are the values for the regression equation for predicting dependent variable, Overall attitude about the regulated markets \((Y)\) from the independent
variable(s) of perception factors. The t-test examines the question whether the regression coefficient is different from zero to be statically significant or not. In this step, four independent variables are used to calculate the regression equation for the dependent variable. The coefficient table shows result for constant component in the regression equation. The column labelled significance shows statistical significance of the regression co-efficient for independent variable as measured by t-test. It is concluded that the model is a good fit for the data for first function.

5.3.27 Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients can be used to calculate the discriminant score for a given case. The score is calculated in the same manner as a predicted value from a linear regression, using the standardized coefficients and the standardized variables.

5.3.28 Measures to Improve the Efficiency of Regulated Markets

Among The mean and standard deviation for measures to improve the efficiency of regulated markets, “Forecasting arrivals” is the first ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.90, “Ensure continuous supply of Produce” is the second ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.87, “Provision of exclusive stalls” is the third ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.75, “Adequate manpower to Market Committee” is the fourth ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.69, “Ensuring export trade” is the fifth ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.67, “Electronic device for grading” is the sixth ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.63. “Provision of value added services, Tax concessions and Improvement in transportation facilities” is the sixth ranked efficiency factor with the mean value of 3.40, 3.14 and 2.66.
5.3.29 Experience with Regulated Market and Efficiency Factors

Adequate manpower to Market Committee, Ensuring export trade, Uniform notification of commodities, Increased participation of Traders in Market Committee, Government assistance, Tax concessions, Issuing of quality certificate, Provision of value added services, Financial accommodation, Financial assistance and Increasing market arrivals. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It is concluded that there is a difference between experiences with regulated market with regards to Adequate manpower to Market Committee, Ensuring export trade, Uniform notification of commodities, Increased participation of Traders in Market Committee, Government assistance, Tax concessions, Issuing of quality certificate, Provision of value added services, Financial accommodation, Financial assistance and Increasing market arrivals at significant at 0.05 levels.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings, the present study offers some suggestions to the policy makers in order to improve the efficiency of the Regulated Markets.

The market arrivals in the Regulated Markets increase but their rate of growth keeps declining. Apart from that the increase in market arrivals does not justify the increase in net income in the Regulated Markets. If that situation is permitted, the sickness in these Regulated Markets may grow. In order to control these situations, the government should take the necessary steps to increase the market arrivals in the Regulated Markets. The authorities are advised to evaluate the cost-benefit of the new schemes offered for the development of the Regulated Markets. The government may announce some tax concessions and fair price and storage facilities and other facilities provided at the Regulated Markets.
Since the facilities offered at the Regulated Markets are not up to the expectation of both farmers and traders, the authorities have to analyse the expectations consistently. On that basis, they have to expand the facilities at the Regulated Markets.

The important facilities which need a higher focus are storage and grading facilities. If these facilities are properly given, there will be a consistent flow of market arrivals. It will justify the existence of the Regulated Markets.

Regarding transport facilities, the authorities of the Regulated Markets may provide such facilities even if the market arrivals are minimal. The authorities have to cover even small villages to improve the market arrivals. Transport service may be provided at a reasonable rate to the farmers.

The Regulated Markets may provide in time, adequate information to production, demand, price of various crop at different places. They may establish an online system to provide such information to those who need it. That information system may be connected at the national level through internet.

The Regulated Market may create an advisory board which consists of various farmers and traders. The board may consult both parties on grievances and formulate suitable steps to remedy them.

Since training, orientation and counselling are highly essential for farmers and traders, the Regulated Markets Authority may create a separate wing with agriculturalists, professors in agriculture, marketing and management. That wing should provide the necessary training and counselling to the required persons related to the Regulated Markets. The Market
Committee will be well advised to arrange seminars, workshops and exhibitions in various districts.

The service quality in the Regulated Markets is not up to the expectation of the farmers. The authorities of the Regulated Markets should understand the concept of quality service in the Regulated Markets and provide programmes on service quality.

The Regulated Markets will be well advised to provide some value added services like opening of input shops, financial accommodation facilities, hi-tech grading system, loading and unloading facilities and information facilities to the farmers and traders in order to attract more farmers and traders.

The government is advised to provide sufficient staff and financial assistance to modernise the market’s activities. The provision of modernized infra-structural facilities is the ‘mantra’ for the success of Regulated Markets. For that they have to provide more financial and technical assistance to the people who need them.

In the globalised scenario, the competition is hectic. The traders have to understand the competition in the real world. They have to change their attitude and make their mind set as customer-centric. The traders are advised to take appropriate strategy to fulfil the requirements of their customers. The customer relationship management should be implemented at the Regulated Markets in order to justify the viability of business operations.

There is need for a complete revamping of the organisational set up for marketing of agricultural produce by suitable amendment to the Act. A complete marketing approach and marketing orientation should be given to the organisational set-up.
5.5 CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the farmers’ perception of various aspects of the Regulated Markets was that they were not up to their expectation. The important discriminant factors among the satisfied and the dissatisfied farmers were facilities and services available at the Regulated Markets. The important problems perceived by farmers in the Regulated Markets were connected with their mechanism, finance, service quality, officials’ behaviour, personal and quantity factors. The farmers suggested improvements in the strategy, information facilities, system, orientation, knowledge and accessibility to increase the efficiency of the Regulated Markets.

The traders’ perception of the important facilities at the Regulated Markets showed that they faced important problems related to marketing, finance, facilities and human relations. The traders’ attitudes to important factors like human relations, system, promotion marketing and official were also just moderate. The important discriminant factors among the satisfied and dissatisfied farmers were on marketing and human relation factors in the Regulated Markets. The traders identified the important measures to improve the efficiency of the Regulated Markets as increase in the market arrivals, increase in the participation of traders in the Market Committee, uniform notification of commodities and financial assistance. The officers in the Regulated Markets viewed the important issues in the Regulated Markets as inadequate funds, insufficient staff and difficulties in the implementation of systems. They also identified the important measures for the efficient working of the Regulated Markets as connected with facilities, system, personal, government and training factors. Since the success of Regulated Markets rest on the requirements and responsibility of both farmers and traders, the officials have to understand the importance of the two aspects. On that basis, they have to create a new strategy to rejuvenate the functioning of the Regulated Markets.