

STUDY ON BRAND PROMOTION, BRAND AWARENESS AND CONSUMER'S BUYING BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS SELECTIVE HERBICIDE (COUNCIL ACTIV) IN ETAH DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH



Vivek Ranjan¹ and Nitin Barker²

¹MBA (Agribusiness) and ²Associate Professor

Department of Agricultural Economics, NAI

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

Corresponding author: 23mbaab073@shiats.edu.in

<https://doie.org/10.10346/AE.2025884430>

ABSTRACT

The present study, titled “Study on Brand Promotion, Brand Awareness, and Consumer’s Buying Behaviour towards Selective Herbicide (Council Activ) in Etah District of Uttar Pradesh” was conducted in Aliganj block, where five percent of paddy-growing villages were purposively selected, and ten percent of farmers were randomly chosen as respondents. Selective herbicides, which target specific weed species without harming crops, play a crucial role in modern agriculture. The study explored the promotional strategies, awareness levels, and buying behavior associated with Council Activ. Findings revealed that van campaigning (30.83%) and farm meetings (24.17%) were the most influential promotional tools, while methods like wall paintings, phone calls, and display items had limited impact. Company representatives and demonstrations were found effective in knowledge dissemination and trust-building. Among the factors influencing brand awareness, product availability (21.67%) was the most significant, followed by performance, reputation, price, and packaging. Availability at retailer shops (57.50%) greatly affected purchasing behavior. Farmers prioritized curative efficacy, medium pricing, and small pack availability, indicating a preference for practical and result-oriented product features.

Keywords: *Selective herbicide, Brand awareness, Buying behaviour, Council Activ, Promotional strategies*

INTRODUCTION

Selective herbicides were developed as chemical agents designed to control or eliminate specific weed species while leaving desired crops largely unaffected. These herbicides functioned by targeting physiological pathways or biochemical processes that were unique to certain types of weeds, thereby minimizing damage to

surrounding vegetation. Their selective action made them a vital component in modern agricultural practices, where maintaining crop health and maximizing yield were of paramount importance. Unlike non-selective herbicides that eradicated all plant matter indiscriminately, selective herbicides allowed farmers to manage weeds



more efficiently without the need for labour-intensive manual weeding or mechanical cultivation. Their application not only reduced competition between weeds and crops for essential nutrients, water, and sunlight but also contributed to improved soil structure and reduced erosion due to less tillage. However, the effectiveness of selective herbicides depended on several factors such as timing of application, correct dosage, crop species, and prevailing climatic conditions. Improper use often resulted in phytotoxicity or resistance development among weed species. Over time, advancements in herbicide chemistry and formulation techniques led to the production of more crop-specific, environmentally safer, and target-efficient herbicides. These developments significantly aided integrated weed management strategies, especially in major cereal crops such as paddy, wheat, and maize. In regions like Uttar Pradesh, where agriculture played a central role in the rural economy, the adoption of selective herbicides had increased notably. Their role in enhancing productivity while reducing labor input underscored the growing importance of understanding farmers' perceptions, brand preferences, and usage behaviour toward selective herbicides.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a purposive cum random sampling technique for the selection of the district, block, villages, and respondents. The Etah district in Uttar Pradesh was purposively selected to minimize logistical challenges and time constraints faced by the investigator.

Within the district, Aliganj block was chosen based on the prevalence of paddy cultivation among the farming population. A comprehensive list of villages within Aliganj block was prepared, and five percent of villages with a high concentration of paddy farmers were randomly selected. From these villages, a list of all paddy-growing farmers was compiled and categorized into five farm-size groups based on landholding: Marginal (less than 1 hectare), Small (1–2 hectares), Semi-medium (2–4 hectares), Medium (4–10 hectares), and Large (more than 10 hectares). A total of 120 paddy farmers were selected using proportionate random sampling across these size categories. Additionally, 10 wholesalers, 5 retailers, and 5 consumers were included to examine brand awareness, brand promotion, and consumer buying behaviour in the study area. Primary data were collected using a well-structured interview schedule administered through direct personal interviews. Secondary data were obtained from relevant books, journals, reports, and official records available at district and block headquarters. Appropriate statistical tools were employed for data analysis and interpretation. The data collection and fieldwork were conducted during the 2024–2025 agricultural year.

Analytical Tools

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

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Brand Promotion of Council Activ in the study area

| S.No. | Promotional tools | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------|------------------------|------------|----------------|
| 1 | Van campaign | 37 | 30.83 |
| 2 | Farmers meeting | 29 | 24.17 |
| 3 | Wall painting/poster | 19 | 15.83 |
| 4 | Company people/ person | 15 | 12.5 |
| 5 | Demo | 11 | 09.17 |
| 6 | Phone call | 05 | 04.17 |
| 7 | Literature display | 04 | 03.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Table 1: The survey reveals that, out of the total sample size, 30.83% of farmers consider van campaigning as the best source of information. Additionally, 24.17% of respondents believe farm meetings are the most effective method for brand promotion. 15.83% indicated that wall and trolley paintings are virtually non-existent in the insecticide market. Moreover, 12.50% of respondents, who regarded farmer meetings as the best source, also emphasized the importance of company representatives (individual contact)

in updating their knowledge of recent agronomic practices for paddy cultivation. Regarding demonstrations, 09.17% stated that every company should conduct demos, as they foster goodwill among farmers. Furthermore, 04.17% mentioned that phone calls about new herbicide advertisements play a crucial role in brand promotion, while 03.33% suggested that display items such as cut-outs, promo gates, posters, and cubes could also aid in promoting herbicides in the study area.

Table 2: Brand awareness of Council Activ in the study area.

| Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Marginal | Small | Semi-medium | Medium | Large | |
| Availability | 26 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 21.67 |
| Performance and Quality | 19 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 15.83 |
| Brand Reputation | 16 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13.33 |
| Price and Value | 15 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 12.50 |
| Proposition | | | | | | | |
| Marketing and Advertising | 14 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11.67 |
| Distribution | 12 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10.00 |
| Product | | | | | | | |
| Packaging and Design | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 09.17 |
| Social Media Presence | 7 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 05.83 |
| Total | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 2: The study reveals that several factors influence brand awareness of Council Activ in the study area, as reported by different categories of respondents. The most significant factor is the availability of herbicide, cited by 21.67% of respondents, followed by performance and quality (15.83%). Brand reputation plays a role for

13.33%, while price and value proposition are important for 12.50%. Marketing and advertising contribute to 11.67%, and the distribution of insecticides in the area accounts for 10.00%. Product packaging and design are cited by 09.17%, and social media presence is considered a factor by 05.83% of respondents.



Table 3: Distribution of respondents buying behaviour according to availability of Council Activ

| General | Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|----------------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Marginal | Small | Semi medium | Medium | Large | |
| Availability of Council Activ | Retailer | 69 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 57.50 |
| | Wholesaler | 42 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 35.00 |
| | Online | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 07.50 |
| Total | | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 3: The study reveals that the availability factor significantly affects the buying behavior of Council Activ among different categories of respondents. The majority, 57.50%, reported that availability at retailer shops is the most influential factor.

This is followed by 35.00% who cited availability at wholesaler shops, while 07.50% considered the availability of the product on online platforms as a determining factor in their purchase decisions.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents buying behaviour according to quality of Council Activ

| General | Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Marginal | Small | Semi- medium | Medium | Large | |
| Quality of Council Activ | Curative | 68 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 10 | 8 | 56.67 |
| | Preventive | 32 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 26.67 |
| | Safe to Applicator | 20 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 16.67 |
| Total | | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 4: The study reveals that the quality factor plays a significant role in influencing the buying behaviour of Council Activ among different categories of respondents. A majority of 56.67% emphasized the curative quality of the product, followed by 26.67%

who valued its preventive qualities. Additionally, 16.67% of respondents considered the product to be safe for the applicator as an important factor in their purchasing decision.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents buying behaviour according to price of Council Activ

| General | Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Marginal | Small | Semi- medium | Medium | Large | |
| Price of Council Activ | Low | 37 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 30.83 |
| | Medium | 65 | 21 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 54.17 |
| | High | 18 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 15.00 |
| Total | | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 5: The study reveals that the price factor significantly influences the buying behaviour of Council Activ among different categories of respondents. A majority, 54.17%, consider a medium price as the most acceptable, while 30.83% prefer a low price. Only 15.00% of respondents are willing to purchase the product at a high price, indicating that price sensitivity plays a key role in their purchasing decisions.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents buying behaviour according to the Packaging of Council Activ

| General | Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Marginal | Small | Semi- medium | Medium | Large | |
| Packaging of Council Activ | Small pack | 62 | 19 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 51.67 |
| | Large pack | 26 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 21.67 |
| | Packet | 25 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 20.83 |
| | Quality Packaging quality | 07 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 05.83 |
| | Total | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 6: The study reveals that the packaging factor significantly affects the buying behavior of Council Activ among different categories of respondents. A majority, 51.67%, prefer the availability of the product in small packs, followed by 21.67% who favor large packs. Additionally, 20.83% of respondents consider the packet quality important, while 05.83% focus on the overall packaging quality when making their purchasing decisions.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents buying behaviour according to the availability of the Performance of Council Activ

| General | Categories | Respondents Number | Respondents | | | | | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| | | | Marginal | Small | Semi- medium | Medium | Large | |
| Performance of Council Activ | Poor | 20 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 16.67 |
| | Average | 43 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 35.83 |
| | Excellent | 57 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 47.50 |
| Total | | 120 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 14 | 100.00 |

Table 7: The study reveals that the performance factor significantly affects the buying behavior of Council Activ among different categories of respondents. A majority, 47.50%, reported that the excellent quality of Council Activ influences their

purchasing decisions. This is followed by 35.83% who consider the product's average performance, while 16.67% of respondents were influenced by poor performance, indicating a clear preference for higher-performing products in the market.



CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present study on brand promotion, brand awareness, and consumer buying behavior towards the selective herbicide Council Activ in Etah district of Uttar Pradesh revealed that farmers' purchasing decisions are significantly influenced by a combination of promotional methods, product characteristics, and accessibility. Among various promotional tools, van campaigning and farm meetings were the most impactful, while traditional media like wall and trolley paintings had minimal reach. Personal engagement through company representatives and on-field demonstrations played a vital role in enhancing farmer trust and knowledge regarding product use. Brand awareness was primarily driven by product availability, followed by performance, brand reputation, price, and marketing strategies. The study further highlighted that availability at retailer shops had the strongest influence on buying behavior, indicating the importance of robust retail networks. Quality perceptions centered on curative efficacy, and pricing preferences leaned towards medium-cost products. Packaging in smaller units was favored for its convenience and affordability. Importantly, product performance emerged as a decisive factor in driving brand loyalty. These findings emphasize that for effective market penetration, companies must focus on accessibility, performance consistency, farmer engagement, and targeted promotional strategies. The insights gained from this research can inform strategic planning for

agrochemical firms and policymakers aiming to enhance the adoption of selective herbicides among small and marginal farmers.

REFERENCES

- Adamu Bako, & Kwame Osei (2021) "Marketing Strategies for Herbicides in Sub-Saharan Africa." *International Journal of Agribusiness Marketing*, 13(2), 75–88.
- Amit Patel, & Rajeev Yadav (2020) "Adoption of Herbicides in the Indian Agricultural Sector." *Asian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 31(4), 275–287.
- Carlos Martínez, & Javier Silva (2022) "Trends in Herbicide Consumption and Marketing in Latin America." *Latin American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 11(2), 144–156.
- Farhan Mohammed, and Rahman Ahmed (2019) "Barriers to Herbicide Adoption in Developing Regions." *African Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 9(4), 201–215.
- Harvinder Singh, & Gurpreet Kaur (2021) "Perception of Farmers on Herbicide Marketing and Usage in Punjab." *Journal of Rural Marketing*, 15(3), 103–118.
- Joseph Mensah, & Richard Abeku (2020) "Market Dynamics and Challenges in Herbicide Distribution in Africa." *African Journal of Rural Development*, 25(1), 67–81.

- Krishan Sharma, and Lokendra Choudhary (2022) “Role of Advertising in Herbicide Market Expansion.” *Journal of Marketing Strategies*, 14(1), 34–46.
- Prabir Dutta, and Sudipta Banerjee (2021) “Consumer Preferences for Organic Herbicides.” *Sustainable Agriculture Reviews*, 15(2), 112–123.
- Ramasamy Parasuraman, Sivasankaran Annamalai, and Pradeep Kumar (2022). “Farmers’ Buying Behaviour of Herbicides and Preference Towards Weeding Operations in Tamil Nadu.” *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 92(6), 748–756.
- Ravi Thakur, and Harvinder Singh (2021) “Farmers’ Willingness to Pay for Herbicides.” *Journal of Economic Studies*, 10(2), 145–156.
- Srinivas Reddy, & Rajesh Sharma (2022) “Role of Social Media in Promoting Herbicides in India.” *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 32–43.
- Syed Ahmed, and Rizwan Khan (2022) “Market Potential of Bio-Herbicides.” *Environmental Agriculture Journal*, 18(2), 77–90.
- Tariq Ahmad, Shahid Khan, and Jamil Malik (2021). “Impact of Branding on Herbicide Marketing.” *International Journal of Agribusiness*, 10(2), 98–110.

