The Journal of Rural and Agricultural Research Vol. 17 No. 1, 55-58 (2017) Received March 2017; Acceptance June 2017

# Constraints Faced By The Marigold Growers In Meerut District of Western Uttar Pradesh

SHRIKANT RANA, DAN SINGH, P.K.SINGH<sup>1</sup> AND V.K. SHARMA<sup>2</sup> Deptt. of Agricultural Extension and Communication, S.V.P.U.A.&T., Meerut

## Abstract

This study was conducted in Daurala, Kharkhoda and Rajpura blocks of Meerut district of Western Uttar Pradesh. From each block four villages were selected purposively and from each selected village five marigold growers were taken for the investigation. Thus the total sample size was of 60 respondents for this investigation. The data were collected from marginal, small, medium and large farmers through personal interview with the help of interview schedule. To know the constraints faced by the marigold growers. It was observed that more risk involved in the cultivation of marigold flowers. It was the major constraint and ranked in I<sup>st</sup> with mean score 2.85 in socio- personal constraints and Lack of consumer awareness and motivation. It was ranked in the v<sup>th</sup> with mean score 1.15. Regarding technical constraints lack of training facilities on expert-oriented production and post production technology of marigold flowers ranked in I<sup>st</sup> with means score 2.65. More demand and spoilage due to storage facilities are less. It was ranked in VIII<sup>th</sup> with mean score 0.55 in this category. Regarding economic constraints short life of flower, it was ranked in I<sup>st</sup> with mean score 3.00 and lack of cooperative credit facilities. It was ranked in XI<sup>th</sup> with mean score 1.05 in this category. Regarding communicational constraints unavailability of scientific information at proper time ranked in I<sup>st</sup> with mean score 2.70. Less provision of flowers fairs/ exhibitions/ demonstrations, it was ranked in V<sup>th</sup> with means score 0.70 in this category. Regarding general constraints harvesting of marigold flowers by hand and ranked in the I<sup>st</sup> with mean score of 3.0. Marketing facilities are not available in local, it was ranked in XI<sup>th</sup> with mean score 0.50.

Key words: Marigold growers and constraints

### Introduction

Flower are the associated with dawn of civilization. It is said that in Indian man is born with flowers, live with flowers and finally dies with flowers. Flowers are used for various purposes in our day to day life like worshipping, religious and social functions, wedding, interior decoration and self-adornment. Saying flower is very common and different flowers are used to convey the human feeling. The government of India has identified floriculture as sunrise industry and accorded it 100 per cent export oriented status, owing to steady increase in demand of various classes of flowers. Floriculture has become one of the important commercial trades in agriculture. Globally,

more than 140 countries are involved in cultivation of floricultural crops. Among various countries Germany, continues to the highest consumer followed by Japan. India is having very large scope in the future. In India the area under flowers tree 255 thousand hectares and production of 2297 thousand metric tons. The Uttar Pradesh is the iv<sup>th</sup> largest producer of flowers after West Bengal, Karnataka and Odisha. In Uttar Pradesh the area of flowers trees 16.6 thousand hectares and the production 86.26 thousand metric tons. In this context, India has progressed significantly during the past 6 decades in developing high yielding varieties / hybrids of different flower crops with their improved qualities and standardized agro-techniques, suitable for agro- climatic condition. But small and marginal farmers are engaged in flowers cultivation. The small

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Directorate of Extension, S.V.P.U.A.&T., Meerut

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Deptt. of Agricultural Extension, R.B.S. College, Bichpuri, Agra

and marginal farmers have little knowledge about the technical aspect and cost effective methods of floriculture farming. The Meerut district is nearest to Delhi, so the floriculture entrepreneurs obtain maximum profit from flower cultivation and uplift their living standard. In this regards, there is need to increase the production and productivity of marigold flowers. Therefore, it is necessary to study the constraints faced by marigold growers in Meerut district of Western Uttar Pradesh.

## **Research methodology**

The present study was conducted in Meerut district of Western Uttar Pradesh. The Meerut district comprises of 12 blocks out of which three blocks namely Daurala, Kharkhouda and Rajpura were selected randomly for the study. From each selected block four villages were selected purposively and from each village 05 marigold growers were purposively selected. Thus the total sample size was of 60 marigold growers for the investigation. The descriptive type survey based research design was used for the investigation. The data were collected through personal interview with the help of interview scheduled.

The constraints were categorized into 5 categories i.e. socio - personal, technological, economical, communicational and general constraints. The identified constraints were administered through a three point continuum as agree, disagree and undecided with a score of 3,2 and 1 respectively on the basis of score obtained by the marigold growers, mean per cent score (MPS) was calculated and ranked the constraints.

**Mean per cent score:** It was computed by multiplying total obtained score of the respondents by hundred and divided by the maximum obtainable score under each constraints the formula is as under:

Total score obtained x100

Mean per cent score (MPR) =------Maximum obtainable score

#### **Results and Discussion**

The data presented in table 1, reveals that the most important constraints related to socio-personal constraints were more risk involved in the cultivation of marigold flowers. Its mean score value was 2.85 and ranked in first, followed by lack of infrastructure for support to post harvest package of practices. Its mean score value was 2.15 and ranked in second. Lack of pertinent knowledge about innovation, its mean score value was 1.85 and ranked in third place. Low level of education, its mean score value was 1.30 and ranked in fourth. Lack of consumer awareness and motivation, its mean score value was 1.15 and ranked at fifth place.

The second category constraints related to technological constraints were lack of training facilities on expert-oriented production and post production technology of flowers in the cultivation of marigold flowers. Its mean score value was 2.65 and ranked in first, followed by unavailability of skilled labours. its mean score value was 2.45 and ranked in second. Lack of scientific process, storage and marketing facilities, its mean score value was 2.05 and ranked in third. Pest and disease problem, its mean score value was 1.90 and ranked in fourth place. Technology beyond the common people, its mean score value was 1.85 and ranked in fifth. Unavailability of trained/experienced expert for guidance, its mean score value was 1.45 and ranked in sixth. Poor access to input. Its mean score value was 0.95 and ranked in seventh. More damage and spoilage due to storage facilities, its mean score value was 0.55 and ranked in eight place the data presented in (Table 2).

Trade, *et al.* (2005) reported that market fluctuation, lack of knowledge about recommended doses at time of application of fertilizer, unavailability of manures and lack of knowledge about post-harvest technology are the major problem faced by flower growers. Karthikeyan et al. (2001) reported that the

Table1: Distribution of respondents on the basis of socio-personal constraints

| S.No. Constraints  | Agree | Disagree | Undecided | Mean Score | Rank |
|--|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------|
| (i) Lack of consumer awareness and motivation.   | 23    | 29       | 08        | 1.15       | V    |
| (ii) Lack of pertinent knowledge about innovation.   | 37    | 18       | 05        | 1.85       | III  |
| (iii) Low level of education.  | 26    | 32       | 02        | 1.30       | IV   |
| (iv) More risk involvement.  | 57    | 03       | 00        | 2.85       | Ι    |
| <ul><li>(v) Lack of infrastructure for support to<br/>post harvest package of practices.</li></ul> | 43    | 15       | 02        | 2.15       | II   |

| S.N              | o. Constraints  | Agree | Disagree | Undecided | Mean Score | Rank |
|------------------|---|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------|
| $\overline{(i)}$ | Poor access to input.                                       | 19    | 27       | 14        | 0.95       | VII  |
| (ii)             | Technology beyond the common people                         | 37    | 14       | 09        | 1.85       | V    |
| (iii)            | Lack of scientific process storage and marketing facilities | . 41  | 13       | 06        | 2.05       | III  |
| (iv)             | Pest and disease problem.                                   | 38    | 15       | 07        | 1.90       | IV   |
| (v)              | Lack of training facilities on expert-oriented production   |       |          |           |            |      |
|                  | and post production technology of flowers.                  | 53    | 07       | 00        | 2.65       | Ι    |
| (vi)             | Non availability of skilled labour's.                       | 49    | 06       | 05        | 2.45       | II   |
| (vii)            | Unavailability of trained/experienced expert for guidance.  | 29    | 21       | 10        | 1.45       | VI   |
| (viii            | ) More damage and spoilage due to storage facilities.       | 11    | 42       | 07        | 0.55       | VIII |

#### Table 2: Distribution of respondents on the basis of technological constraints

Table 3: Distribution of respondents on the basis of economical constraints

| S.No. Constraints  | Agree | Disagree | Undecided | Mean Score | Rank |
|--|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------|
| (i) Lack of finance.   | 22    | 37       | 01        | 1.10       | X    |
| (ii) Non-availability of loaning facilities for purchase of input. | 33    | 15       | 12        | 1.65       | VIII |
| (iii) High cost of input.  | 52    | 08       | 00        | 2.60       | III  |
| (iv) Difficult and costly maintenance/management of new practi     | ce 45 | 13       | 02        | 2.25       | VI   |
| (v) Price fluctuation in the market.                               | 47    | 08       | 05        | 2.35       | IV   |
| (vi) Unavailability of subsidy on agricultural inputs.             | 46    | 14       | 00        | 2.30       | V    |
| (vii) No support price by the Govt.                                | 29    | 20       | 11        | 1.45       | IX   |
| (viii) Monopoly of private commission agents in fixing prices.     | 54    | 06       | 00        | 2.70       | II   |
| (ix) Short life of flowers.  | 60    | 00       | 00        | 3.00       | Ι    |
| (x) Lack of cooperative credit facilities.                         | 21    | 30       | 09        | 1.05       | XI   |
| (xi) Poor investment due to poor saving.                           | 44    | 16       | 00        | 2.20       | VII  |

major problems faced by cut flower growers were lack of sufficient technical knowledge and skills on hightech production and post-harvest handling of cut flowers.

The third category constraints related to economical constraints were short life of flowers in the cultivation of marigold flower, its mean score value was 3.00 and ranked in first, followed by monopoly of private commission agents in fixing prices. Its mean score value was 2.70 and ranked in second. High cost of input, its mean score value was 2.60 and ranked in third. Price fluctuation in the market, its mean score value was 2.35 and ranked in fourth. Ashok *et al.* (2005) reported lack of minimum supports price and wide fluctuation in prices.

Unavailability of subsidy on agricultural inputs, Its mean score value was 2.30 and ranked in fifth place. Difficult and costly maintenance/management of new practice, its mean score value was 2.25 and ranked in sixth. Poor investment due to poor saving, its mean score value was 2.20 and ranked in seventh. Nonavailability of loaning facilities for purchase of input, its mean score value was 1.65 and ranked in eight. No support price by the government, its mean score value was 1.45 and ranked in ninth. Lack of finance, its mean score value was 1.10 and ranked in tenth. Lack of, cooperative credit facilities, Its mean score value was 1.05 and ranked in eleventh place the data presented in (Table 3). Kumar *et al.* (2002) reported that unavailability of quality planting material, lack of market regulation, lack of labor during peak season, unavailability of loans unavailability of extension services, and inadequate train spent and storage facilities.

The fourth category constraints related to communicational constraints were unavailability of scientific information at proper time its mean score value was 2.70 and ranked in first, followed by poor linkage among scientists, extension workers and farmers. Its mean score value was 2.45 and ranked in second place. Low social mobility of the marigold growers, Its mean score value was 1.75 and ranked in third. Poor linkage among governmental organization/ NGOs/agencies/Farmers, its mean score value was 1.30 and ranked in fourth. Less provision of flower fair/exhibitions/demonstrations, Its mean score value

#### THE JOURNAL OF RURALAND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

#### Table 4: Distribution of respondents on the basis of communicational constraints

| S.No. Constraints   | Agree | Disagree | Undecided | Mean Score | Rank |
|---|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------|
| (i) Poor linkage among governmental organization/                 |       |          |           |            |      |
| NGOs/agencies/ farmers.   | 26    | 30       | 04        | 1.30       | IV   |
| (ii) Poor linkage among scientist's extension workers and farmers | 49    | 08       | 03        | 2.45       | II   |
| (iii) Low social mobility of the marigold growers.                | 35    | 16       | 09        | 1.75       | III  |
| (iv) Unavailability of scientific information at proper time.     | 54    | 06       | 00        | 2.70       | Ι    |
| (v) Less provision of flower fair/exhibitions/demonstrations      | 14    | 39       | 07        | 0.70       | V    |

Table 5: Distribution of respondents on the basis of general constraints.

| S.No.    | Constraints  | Agree | Disagree | Undecided | Mean Score | Rank |
|----------|--|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------|
| (i) P    | Problem of erratic supply of electricity                           | 45    | 10       | 05        | 2.25       | IV   |
| (ii) P   | roblem of interference of middleman in marketing syster            | n 47  | 13       | 00        | 2.35       | III  |
| (iii) P  | roblem of wild animals   | 34    | 15       | 11        | 1.70       | II   |
| (iv) P   | oor weighting in the market.                                       | 29    | 24       | 07        | 1.45       | IX   |
| (v) U    | Innecessary charges by police man at barrier/police chouk          | i 31  | 24       | 05        | 1.55       | III  |
| (vi) U   | Inavailability of labour at proper time.                           | 39    | 15       | 06        | 1.95       | V    |
| (vii) N  | lo priorities assigned to handling of perishable flower production | on 17 | 34       | 09        | .85        | Х    |
| (viii) M | Aarketing facilities are not available in local market             | 10    | 35       | 15        | 0.50       | XI   |
| (ix) H   | Iarvesting of marigold by hand                                     | 60    | 00       | 00        | 3.00       | Ι    |
| (x) Un   | availability of quality seed & other agril. inputs at proper tim   | e 59  | 01       | 00        | 2.95       | II   |
| (xi) U   | Jnavailability of quality planting material                        | 37    | 15       | 08        | 1.85       | VI   |

was 0.70 and ranked in fifth place the data presented in (Table 4).

The fifth category constraints related to general constraints most of the farmers were harvesting of marigold by hand. It was major problem in the cultivation of marigold flowers. Its mean score value was 3.00 and ranked in first. Followed by unavailability of quality seed, Its mean score value was 2.95 and ranked in second. Problem of interference of middleman in marketing system, its mean score value was 2.35 and ranked in third. Problem of erratic supply of electricity, Its mean score value was 2.25 and ranked in fourth. Unavailability of labour at proper time, its mean score value was 1.95 and ranked in fifth place. Unavailability of quality planting material, Its mean score value was 1.85 and ranked in sixth. Problem of wild animals, Its mean score value was 1.70 and ranked in seventh. Unnecessary charges by police man at barrier/police chouki, its mean score value was 1.55 and ranked in eight. Poor weighting in the market, its mean score value was 1.45 and ranked in ninth. No priorities assigned to handling of perishable flower production, its mean score value was 0.85 and ranked in tenth. Marketing facilities are not available in local market, its mean score value was 0.50 and ranked in eleventh place the data presented in (Table 5). Kumar

*et al.* (2011) reported problem of wild animals ranked in first, problem of land shifting ranked in second, problem of erratic supply of electricity ranked in third, less provision of flower fair/exhibitions ranked in fourth, problem of interference of middleman in credit facility and marketing system ranked in fifth.

#### References

- Dhillon, Ashok and Khatkar, R. K. (2005) Constraints encountered by the farmers in flower cultivation and marketing in Haryana. *Haryana Agricultural University Journal of Research 34 (1): 41-44.*
- Karthikeyan, C. and Chandrakandan, K. (2001) Profile and problems of cut flower growers. *Madras Agricultural Journal*; 87 (7/9): 500-503.
- Kumar, K. V., Pechaiah, M. and Reddy, G. R. (2002) A study of problem faced by flower growers Journal of research – ANGRAV. 30 (30): 28-30.
- Kumar, R., Singh, D., Yadav, R. N., Singh, D. K., Singh, V. K. and Kumar, M. (2011) A study of infrastructural profile and constraints of cut flower growers. *Annals* of Horticulture; 4 (2): 181-186.
- Trade, V. J., Thorat, D. R. and Pharate, D. N. (2005) Problems faced by the flower growers in Pune district, Pune, India. *Indian Journal of Maharashtra Extn. Edu.*, 30 (1): 62–63.

58