



## Effective Strategies in Marketing Development of Agricultural Products

Soleiman Rasouliazar\* , Milad Pirani, Loghman Rashidpour

Department of Agricultural Management, Mahabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mahabad, Iran

\*Corresponding author: Email: [rasouli88s@yahoo.com](mailto:rasouli88s@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

#### Keywords:

Strategies, Development Marketing, Agricultural Products, Orumiyeh, Iran.

This fact that marketing can encourage farmers to produce and their products better introduce to compete in the sell market and with market-friendly products to know better is important. The farmer who is not familiar with the importance of marketing and its technology will not be able to succeed in selling their product and may sell your product at a cheaper price and will be deprived of interest that he could be achieved in this field. The purpose of this study was to examine and effective strategies in the marketing development of agricultural products in Orumiyeh township, Iran. This research was conducted with a descriptive - survey method and data required were collected through questionnaires and were analyzed through regression statistics in SPSS software. The results of the research showed that there was a significant and positive correlation found between the independent variables strategies of packaging, training, government support and manufacturing with the dependent variable the marketing development of agricultural products. Also these variables explained 73 percent of variance in the dependent variable.

### 1. Introduction

The word of "Marketing" in the English language is meant to convey to the market, finding market or all the operations that will be used to accelerate the transmission stream of goods from production to consumption to show the ease and speed in sale and distribution work and the elimination of intermediaries (Bolourian Tehrani, 1999). Sheferd (2005) have examined the marketing concept and marketing of agricultural products from two perspectives, marketing based on its limited definition refers to all the services of harvesting time of product until it reaches to final consumer. While based on its expanded definition, marketing refers to all activities and operations that is done of the initiation stage of production and also make decisions about the production on the product until it reaches to final consumer, and therefore according to this

definition make decisions about how to produce and the variety of production is also included in the meaning of marketing (Hakim Ara , 2004).

Marketing is fundamentally about communicating information to increase demand for a product or service. Effectively gathering and using information in agricultural marketing poses some unique challenges. For example, the most important information signal in the marketplace is price; however, agriculture is often subject to price controls, and thus the wrong message can be communicated to customers. Market analysts must seek additional sources of information about supply and demand, and stay aware of what efforts are being made by companies and countries to increase supplies of agricultural products (Marketing School, 2015).

As individuals within a society become more specialized in their economic activities, they

come to rely upon others to supply at least some of the products and services which they need. Thus begins a process of exchange between buyers and sellers. For a while buyers and sellers remain in immediate contact and each party is able to determine what the other needs and values and, therefore, will be willing to exchange. As the economy develops the number and types of exchanges expand, there is a concomitant need for increasingly specialized marketing services such as physical distribution, storage, grading, and market information gathering and so. The number of participants also increases with many of the specialized services being provided by intermediaries between the seller and ultimate buyer. Few buyers and sellers are in direct contact with one another and communication between them is channeled through a complex marketing system (Crawford, 2008).

Access to agricultural markets and marketing information are essential factors in promoting competitive markets and improving agricultural sector development. The agricultural sector employs majorities in developing countries and it contributes greatly to the development of these countries. Unluckily, majorities of the farmers are smallholders living in isolated rural areas and thus lack appropriate access to markets for their products and also they are deprived of agricultural market information. As a lack of these, smallholder farmers are exploited by greedy traders and receive low prices for their agricultural produce (Mawazo et al., 2014).

The development of the agricultural sector in most countries of the world, shows that certainly is no longer send manufactured products this infrastructural industry like the former to the target markets because with the increase in consumer markets, moving away consumer from manufacturing centers (from continent to another continent or from country to another country) also have been more than before. On the other hand, because people toward food and drinking items a lot more awareness than before have found, products that are not kept in good condition and have not been a good quality due to increased waste, will not be able to benefit from a good marketability. Certainly in this competitive environment that exists in the world, countries will be able to continue to its move more firmly than before that understand situation very well and consider the necessary policies. Iran, despite all the potentials for providing quality products in agriculture sector, there have been little progress and as long as this process continues the same way, we will witness a sharp drop every day in different branches of this industry producing but oppressed. It is well-known that agricultural markets are not self-regulating.

There is no meeting point between supply and demand with optimal allocation of resources for the common good. The “invisible hand” is not only invisible, it is also often clumsy. In fact, if the invisible hand’s regulating actions are hardly perceptible (because in agriculture more than in other sectors, the market is not regulated by itself), it can have very sharp claws! At the risk of taking an overly strong “pro-farmer” position against urban consumers, it is nevertheless urgent to find solutions to improve rural conditions, to preserve the stability of countries (Lothore and Patrick, 2009).

Kazemnejad and Sadrolashrafi (2007) examined the economic analysis of rice marketing margin using econometric models. Estimated results the models of markup and marketing cost show that rice marketing margin in Iran has been influenced by factors such as marketing costs and the level of imports, the price of domestic and foreign rice, distribution of the imported rice and price risk which among most important factors were import policies and policies that lead to changes in the costs of transport (as an indicator of marketing costs), such as policy changes in the fuel prices and oil products.

Today, with the increasing number of domestic and foreign producers, competition for consumer satisfaction is an important goal in each market. Improved packaging, grading, warehousing and timely supply of the product and reduce the sale price which is possible through cost reductions, reducing margins, and reducing intermediation, Including are factors that play an important role in the satisfaction of producers and consumers and increase product marketing and internal and external market boom (Rajaei and Nasiri, 2011). The existence of difference between farm prices and retail prices is a natural process, and there are in developed countries. In developed countries, the price difference is due more to marketing services such as packaging, grading, conversion industries and delivery at home. . . , whereas in developing countries (such as Iran) is carried out little marketing services about the product. One of the important factors for the high Market margin in Iran is the existence of top lesions and market intermediaries (Beikzadeh and Chizari, 2007).

Today, the importance of marketing is related further to contribution of in the cost of product marketing costs to the consumer, so that, according to studies conducted, about 50% of the price paid by consumers for goods to be related to marketing costs (Dehdashti and Seidzadeh, 2006). Esmaili, Najafi and Rahmati (2009) in order to formulate an approach to solving the problems of the development of the fish market in a study titled fish marketing in Hormozgan province have concluded

that in general contribution of the producer or fisherman is less than the price paid by the final consumer. The low contribution of fishermen and high marketing margins of types of fish in the port city of Bandar Lengeh is more than Bandar Abbas. Also evaluation shows that the lack of knowledge of market conditions, lack of facilities, fishing permits and infrastructure facilities are of the most important problems of fishermen.

Information enables smallholder farmers to decide what to plant, when and where to sale, and to negotiate better for the prices of their agricultural produces. This agricultural growth can be translated to individual growth, rural growth and national growth as well this improvement can only be achieved if different stakeholders play their roles as expected. The governments can ensure that enabling infrastructures are established to enable for transporting agricultural commodities from rural areas to markets in urban areas or elsewhere markets can be found. The infrastructure may comprise improvements in roads, providing electricity in rural areas and developing policies that ensure smallholder farmers are not exploited in the markets (Mawazo et al., 2014)

Richards with et al (2007) examined the estimation of function of marketing margin of lemon products in four regions of California and concluded that wage rates, food packaging, the cost of transporting the product to the market, elasticity of demand and supply and some dummy variables are the most important factors affecting the marketing margin.

Zaboj (2005) reviewed the choice of distribution channel of meat products in the Czech Republic. In this study, through the evaluation of distribution costs for each channel, the best distribution channel was selected. Factors affecting the margin marketing of agricultural products are crop prices at harvest time, per capita income, retail price and time variable (Buse and Brandow, 2006).

Efficiency is the most important in marketing analysis. In marketing, interest rate has a direct relationship with its efficiency. High efficiency of marketing causes that income of the producers benefit through the sale at a higher price and consumer satisfaction by reducing the purchase price or both by reducing the difference between the buying and selling end in the market (Sheferd, 2005). The word of marketing in economic resources has been defined in different ways. But most of them understand marketing as all stages of sales and any service affecting the acceleration in faster sales. While marketing has a broader meaning as well as include other various operations such as distribution and sales stages that comprise the steps of the

marketing process (Charles and Gray, 2006). Demand for agricultural products in the field a demand is derived from demand for the product in the retail market. Therefore, price of the product in the field is in relation to its price in the retail market. The buyer of crops in the farm a price suggests that by adding marketing costs to it, for the consumer be acceptable at the retail level (Sheferd, 2005).

## 2. Materials and methods

The methodology used in this research was survey which included the use of correlation and descriptive analysis as data processing methods. This research was done in summer 2015. A questionnaire was developed based on interviews and the relevant literature. The questionnaire included both open-ended and fixed-choice questions. Content and face validity were established by a panel of experts consisting of faculty members and experts in the social science. A pilot study was conducted with farmers who had not been interviewed before the earlier exercise of determining the reliability of the questionnaire for the study. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.827, which demonstrated that the questionnaire was highly reliable. The size of the statistical population of the farmers, in Orumiyeh township in West Azerbaijan province, Iran were equal to 10241 that sample size was calculated using Cochran formula and was determined equal to 150 farmers. Multivariate regression analysis was used, to determine influencing components on the marketing development of agricultural products in the city of Orumiyeh by Statistical Package of social Science (SPSS 21).

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1 Descriptive Section

#### 3.1.1 Individual characteristic of respondents:

In table 1 individual characteristics of the respondents has been shown that include variables of age, education level, level of literacy and major products that in classification of age, the highest age of respondents between 31-40 years and on the classification of education level, the most farmers surveyed (96.66%) were literate. In relation to the classification level of literacy, the most farmers surveyed (26.6%) were in diploma level and finally, the most farmers surveyed (35.9%) were engaged in the cultivation of apples.

#### 3.1.2 Prioritizing the views of respondents about advantages of marketing development of agricultural products:

As we see in table 2 the view of farmers about advantages of marketing development of agricultural products indicated that among the

marketing advantage of agricultural products, variables such as familiarity with the prices of agricultural products ( $CV=0.254$ ), the sale of agricultural products to the highest price ( $CV=0.256$ ) and timely sales of agricultural products ( $CV=0.288$ ) had more importance and value than the other variables. Farmers stated that these three variables are the most important advantages the development of marketing of agricultural products. And also, variable of how compete with foreign agricultural products ( $CV=0.341$ ) has least importance and value than the other variables.

### 3.1.3 Prioritizing manufacturing strategies in relation to the marketing development of agricultural products:

As we see in table 3 the view of farmers about indicated that the manufacturing strategies mentioned in relation to the marketing of agricultural products, variables such as obtaining information from sale market in the early stages of production ( $CV=0.232$ ), appropriate harvest of agriculture products and preventing of the loss and damage at harvest time ( $CV = 0.234$ ), and remove brokers from options sales and enter your farmers in the market ( $CV=0.246$ ) had more importance and value than the other variables. Farmers stated that these three variables are as the most important manufacturing strategy in relation to the marketing of agricultural products. And also manufacture a product tailored to market demand ( $CV=0.288$ ) has lowest important and values than other variables.

Table 1. Individual characteristics of respondents

| Title                 | Frequency | Valid Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Classification of Age |           |                  |
| Less than 25          | 20        | 14.3             |
| 30- 25                | 22        | 15.7             |
| 31- 40                | 38        | 27.2             |
| 41-50                 | 36        | 25.7             |
| More than 50          | 24        | 17.1             |
| Total                 | 140       | 100              |
| Level of Literacy     |           |                  |
| Literate              | 145       | 96.66            |
| Illiterate            | 5         | 3.33             |
| Total                 | 150       | 100              |
| Level of Education    |           |                  |
| Primary               | 28        | 18               |
| Middle School         | 33        | 22               |
| High School           | 25        | 18               |
| Diploma               | 39        | 26.6             |
| University            | 20        | 14.6             |
| Total                 | 145       | 100              |
| Major Products        |           |                  |
| Sugar beet            | 43        | 32.8             |
| Wheat                 | 21        | 16               |
| Corn                  | 10        | 7.6              |
| Pea                   | 2         | 1.5              |
| Apple                 | 47        | 35.9             |
| Other products        | 8         | 6.1              |
| Total                 | 131       | 100              |

Table 2. Prioritizing farmers' views about benefits of marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables  | Mean | SD    | CV    | Rank |
|--|------|-------|-------|------|
| Familiarity with the price of agricultural products                  | 4.07 | 1.034 | 0.254 | 1    |
| Sales of agricultural products to the highest price                  | 3.92 | 1.005 | 0.256 | 2    |
| Timely sales of agricultural products                                | 3.86 | 1.113 | 0.288 | 3    |
| Increased sales of agricultural products                             | 3.54 | 1.125 | 0.318 | 4    |
| Knowledge of market conditions for agricultural products             | 3.92 | 1.279 | 0.324 | 5    |
| Export and gaining Foreign exchange through sales in foreign markets | 3.38 | 1.134 | 0.335 | 6    |
| How to compete with foreign agricultural products                    | 3.64 | 1.242 | 0.341 | 7    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

Table 3. Prioritizing items in relation to manufacturing strategies in marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables   | Mean | SD    | CV    | Rank |
|---|------|-------|-------|------|
| obtaining information from the market in the early stages of production                           | 4.07 | 0.945 | 0.232 | 1    |
| appropriate harvest of agriculture products and preventing of the loss and damage at harvest time | 4.1  | 0.999 | 0.243 | 2    |
| removing brokers from options sales and enter your farmers in the market                          | 4.03 | 0.995 | 0.246 | 3    |
| A convenient transportation to get to the sale market   | 4.08 | 1.067 | 0.261 | 4    |
| Manufacturing a product tailored to market demand   | 3.95 | 1.139 | 0.288 | 5    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

Table 4. Prioritizing items in relation to the packaging strategies in marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables  | Mean | SD    | CV    | Rank |
|--|------|-------|-------|------|
| promoting the packaging of agricultural products in the country to improve product sales in domestic and foreign markets   | 4.51 | 0.68  | 0.129 | 1    |
| focusing on the shape and appearance and color of the packaging for its impressing in the market among a host of packages  | 4.29 | 0.886 | 0.206 | 2    |
| matching characteristics of packages with the standards of transport in order to facilitate transportation to sales market | 3.71 | 1.119 | 0.302 | 3    |
| The use of preservative material tailored to the product for keeping most of until they reach sale market                  | 2.69 | 1.096 | 0.423 | 4    |
| Inserting expiration date and manufacturing date and the price on the packages for consumer satisfaction                   | 2.44 | 1.045 | 0.428 | 5    |
| Creating a separate plant for the packaging of agricultural products   | 2.49 | 1.095 | 0.44  | 6    |
| creating conditions in packaging to prevent of its theft   | 2.32 | 1.308 | 0.563 | 7    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

### 3.1.4 Prioritization of packaging strategies in relation to the marketing development of agricultural products:

As we see in table 4 the perspective of farmers indicated that among the packaging strategies mentioned in relation to the marketing of agricultural products, variables such as promoting the packaging of agricultural products in the country to improve product sales in domestic and foreign markets (CV=0.129), and focusing on the shape and appearance and color of the packaging for its impressing in the market among a host of packages (CV=0.206), matching characteristics of packages with the standards of transport in order to facilitate transportation to sales market (CV=0.302) had more important than the other variables. And also creating conditions in packaging to prevent of its theft (CV=0.563) had the lowest importance and value than the other variables.

### 3.1.5 Prioritizing strategies of government support in regarding the marketing development of agricultural products:

As we can see in table 5 the perspective of farmers indicated that among the strategies of government support in relation to the marketing of agricultural products, variables such as providing banking facilities to farmers for marketing their products (CV=0.241), enter farmers to foreign

markets and export products by farmers (CV=0.242) and reduce production costs to reduce the sale price and thus purchasing easier by the consumer (CV=0.260) had more important than the other strategies mentioned. As well as offering an effective proposal in relation to the marketing of agricultural products (CV=0.326) had the lowest importance and value than other solutions.

### 3.1.6 Prioritizing educational and extension strategies in relation to the marketing development of agricultural products:

As we can see in table 6 the perspective of farmers indicated that among the variables related to educational and extension strategies in relation to marketing of agricultural products, variables such as use of radio, television and publications to acquaint the farmers with the appropriate sales market (CV=0.275), encouragement by other villagers to find sales market (CV=0.347) and the presence of promoters and experts in the field for how sale and marketing of agricultural products (CV=0.388) had more important and value than the other items mentioned. As well as participation in courses and promotional classes in relation to the marketing of agricultural products (CV=0.509) had the lowest importance and value than other items.

Table 5. Prioritizing the items related to strategies of government support in the marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables  | Mean | SD    | CV    | Rank |
|--|------|-------|-------|------|
| Providing banking facilities to farmers for marketing their products                             | 4.28 | 1.031 | 0.241 | 1    |
| Entering farmers to foreign markets and export products by farmers                               | 4.22 | 1.024 | 0.242 | 2    |
| Reducing production costs to reduce the sale price and thus purchasing easier by the consumer    | 4.22 | 1.097 | 0.26  | 3    |
| Removing middlemen and entering the government in market for better sale the products of farmers | 3.81 | 1.106 | 0.326 | 4    |
| Establishing a suitable center to obtain the information needed for product marketing            | 3.76 | 1.133 | 0.301 | 5    |
| Capacitate the competitiveness of domestic agricultural producing against foreign products       | 4.01 | 1.256 | 0.313 | 6    |
| Offering an effective proposal in relation to the marketing of agricultural products             | 3.63 | 1.183 | 0.326 | 7    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

Table 6. Prioritizing educational and extension strategies in relation to the marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables  | Mean | SD   | CV    | Rank |
|--|------|------|-------|------|
| use of radio, television and publications to acquaint the farmers with the appropriate sales market                      | 3.74 | 1.03 | 0.275 | 1    |
| encouragement by other villagers to find sales market  | 3.40 | 1.18 | 0.347 | 2    |
| the presence of promoters and experts in the field for how sale and marketing of agricultural products                   | 3.55 | 1.38 | 0.388 | 3    |
| Acquaint the farmers with market conditions, such as convenient transportation, adequate ratings, proper storage and ... | 3.29 | 1.35 | 0.410 | 4    |
| Acquaint the farmers with how appropriate harvest of agricultural products for sell better                               | 3.52 | 1.56 | 0.443 | 5    |
| Induce farmers to participate in training classes to better understand the sale market of agricultural products          | 3.61 | 1.66 | 0.459 | 6    |
| participation in courses and promotional classes in relation to the marketing of agricultural products                   | 3.14 | 1.60 | 0.509 | 7    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

Table 7. Prioritizing issues and problems in the marketing development of agricultural products

| Variables   | Mean | SD    | CV    | Rank |
|---|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lack of government support in the marketing of agricultural products            | 3.38 | 0.945 | 0.279 | 1    |
| Absence of appropriate market post-production                                   | 3.58 | 1.028 | 0.287 | 2    |
| The existence of different rates for sale                                       | 3.55 | 1.053 | 0.297 | 3    |
| Technical failure in the storage of agricultural products                       | 3.63 | 1.101 | 0.303 | 4    |
| Absence of organizations and cooperatives needed                                | 3.49 | 1.133 | 0.324 | 5    |
| Lack of information needed post-production                                      | 3.57 | 1.172 | 0.328 | 6    |
| Get the required credit from brokers  | 3.42 | 1.137 | 0.332 | 7    |
| Presale of agricultural products  | 3.48 | 1.229 | 0.353 | 8    |
| Bad harvests of agricultural products and the loss of it in the time of harvest | 3.53 | 1.320 | 0.373 | 9    |

Likert scale: very low = 1, low = 2, moderate=3, high=4, very high=5

### 3.1.7 Prioritize issues and problems in the Marketing Development of Agricultural Products:

As we can see in table 7, the perspective of farmers indicated that among the variables related to marketing problems in relation to marketing of agricultural products, variables such as Lack of government support in the marketing of agricultural

products, such as not providing insurance, loans and agricultural services (CV=0.279), absence of appropriate market post-production (CV=0.287), and the existence of different rates for sale (CV=0.297) had more important and value than the other items mentioned. That is, respondents have expressed these three items as the most important problems of

marketing of agricultural products. And also, bad harvests of agricultural products and the loss of it in the time of harvest ( $CV=0.373$ ) had lowest importance and value than other items.

### 3.2 Statistical Analysis

The perspective of farmers about strategies affecting the marketing development of agricultural products were studied and analyzed. First, this study examined the correlation coefficient between variables. Based on Spearman coefficient conducted and according on the table 8, there was a significant and positive correlation between the marketing development of agricultural products and variables such as packaging factor, educational factor, government support and production factor. The highest correlation coefficient was found between the marketing development of agricultural products and conditions of packaging factor (table 8).

For predicating probability affective factors on the marketing development, the logical of  $f(x)$  function was calculated that could be inferred to the population of this study (table 9).

The goal in multiple regressions is to find predictive variables that changes will predict the criterion variables either alone or jointly. In this research was used multiple regression analysis (simultaneously) that its results are as follows:

The multivariate regression analysis indicated that about 73% of variance in marketing development could be explained by government support, educational support and packaging factor.

Due to significant level, educational factor, government support and packaging factor has a significant impact in the equation. Because a significance level is smaller or equal than 0.05 ( $Sig \leq 0.05$ ), then above factors have contributed significantly to the prediction of the dependent variable. Based on statistically significant variables in the regression analysis, and constant values, the regression equation could be derived as follows by respondents. Also according to the standard betas in table 9 components of packaging factor had the most powerful role in explaining the dependent variable. The final multivariate regression model:

$$Y=11.641+0.144X_2+0.573X_3+0.297X_4$$

Table 8. correlation coefficient measures between variables

| First variable        | Second variable    | Spearman correlation coefficient | Significant level |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Marketing Development | Production factor  | 0.617**                          | 0.000             |
|                       | Government support | 0.674**                          | 0.000             |
|                       | Educational factor | 0.698**                          | 0.000             |
|                       | Packaging factor   | 0.751**                          | 0.000             |

Table 9. Variables coefficients in regression analysis

| Factors            | B      | Standard error b | Normalized value $\beta$ | t value | Significance level |
|--------------------|--------|------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------|
| Constant value     | 11.641 | 2.780            | -                        | 4.187   | 0.000              |
| Production factor  | 0.153  | 0.117            | 0.148                    | 1.306   | 0.195              |
| Government support | 0.144  | 0.193            | 0.105                    | 0.745   | 0.048              |
| Educational factor | 0.573  | 0.299            | 0.272                    | 2.500   | 0.014              |
| Packaging factor   | 0.297  | 0.100            | 0.357                    | 0.981   | 0.004              |

VIF=3.183 Durbin Watson: 2.05  $R=0.803$   $R^2=0.725$   $F=39.431$  sig.=0.000

### 4. Conclusion and recommendations

Most farmers believe that one of the main advantages of marketing development of agricultural products is getting to know the price of agricultural products because farmers with any product other farmers can become familiar and this view to reach reasonable prices for their own products. By comparing the quality of the product other farmers, and its price in the market and your product will make a logical fit that most farmers sell their product in the marketplace without getting to know price and with it large profits to brokers and their own are incurred losses that the farmers sell own product at a reasonable price and at the right time. One of the

problems of the farmers in the field, keeping the own product in the warehouse for a long time to increase prices which unfortunately in most cases, this leads to both deterioration and loss of product quality and reduce the prices it will be even several times the actual price. These results are compatible with research results of Sheferd (2005) and Marketing School (2015).

Most of the respondents believed that if, at the outset, the farmer is aware of the market for own product or market a product that will generate it could be better comment on whether or not it produces. In these cases, the farmer with the knowledge of sell location of product, it can be better

work about the quality and quantity of product that produced crop are external or internal or local markets or local outside. Results of this research are compatible with researches carried out by Mawaz et al (2014) and Marketing School (2015).

In the opinion of most farmers, most of the damage that may be entered to agricultural crop is at harvest time. In this context, farmers must use skillful workers and update technology up to enter the least damage to your product. Because product that is damaged during storage time and transport is magnified injury it, and not only fruits but also other fruits surrounding it will be lost and customer and consumer towards it will not go away.

At the time of the sale of agricultural products in Iran, brokers will benefit the most and this needs to enter the government in agricultural product sales. Remove brokers from sell options makes that both farmers sell their product at a reasonable price and consumers buy it at a reasonable price. Always, in Iran, there is a huge difference between the price that farmer sells product itself and price that the consumer buys it which these two includes a large number of people of a nation and the profits that can be made in this among are the brokers. With the elimination this option focuses to trade the farmer and the consumer directly. The results are compatible with research carried by Lothore, and Delmas (2009); Kazemnezhad and Sadrolashrafi (2007); Rajaei and Nasiri (2011) ; Beikzadeh and Chizari (2007) and Buse and Brandow (2006).

The majority of respondents believed that packaging of agricultural products in Iran has not found generality mode and the other hand, sales of this product in the domestic market is not economical due to the consumer's perspective and consumers will prefer to buy products with lower cost and in bulk and it's not a problem from the manufacturer or the consumer, but, a problem is high cost that for packaging products will suffer orchardists. If the government does support and factories of packaging products manufacturer established and orchardist is not bear the high costs of packaging then farmers can sell it for the same price or a little more to consumers. Results of this research are compatible with researches carried out Lothore, and Delmas (2009); Kazemnezhad and Sadrolashrafi (2007); Rajaei and Nasiri (2011) ; Beikzadeh and Chizari (2007) and Buse and Brandow (2006).

Based on the results, the recommendations are:

- Select appropriate packaging for outstanding products in the market and protect from losses due to prolonged storage in the warehouse and transportation.

- Government support of the farmers by eliminating middlemen and single-rate product and financial support from farmers.
- The establishment of appropriate and reliable market for farmers.
- Familiarizing and educating farmers from domestic and foreign market and give advice on how to sell agricultural product.
- Training farmers about how a good production and harvesting for producing a product tailored to market.
- The creation of a stability in prices available on the market.
- Reduce packaging costs through government support to reduce the price of packaged products and thus consumer attitudes toward these products.

### References

1. Beikzadeh, P. & Chizari, A. (2007). Examine the marketing channel and the factors influencing potato marketing margin. *Economics and Development*, 15(57):81-103.
2. Bolourian Tehrani, M. (1999). *Marketing and market management*. Tehran: Bazargani publishing.
3. Buse, R. C. & Brandow, G. E. (2006). The relationship of volume price and cost to marketing margine for farm food. *Journal of Farm Economic*. 42: 362-370.
4. Charles, C. L. & Gray, D. T. (2006). Temporal and spatial aggregation: alternative marketing models. *American Journal of Agriculture Economics*. 75(3): 523-539.
5. Crawford, I. M. (2008). *Agricultural and Food Marketing Management*. Publication by the FAO Regional Office for Africa. On line: [www.fao.org/docrep/004/w3240e/W3240E00.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/w3240e/W3240E00.htm)
6. Dehdashti, Z & Seidzadeh, H. (2006). The relationship between the use of marketing mix elements and farmed fish marketing from the perspective of consumer case study in Ilam city. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development*, 14 (53): 133-152.
7. Esmailia, A., Najafi, B & Rahmati, D. (2009). Fish marketing in Hormozgan province. *Journal of agricultural Economics Research*, 1 (3): 77-100.
8. Hakim Ara, M. (2004). *Advertising ongoing convinced*. Samat Publication, Tehran.
9. Kazemnezhad, M. & Sadrolashrafi, M. (2007). Economic analysis of marketing margins by using economic models (case study of rice). *Proceedings of the Third Conference of Agricultural Economics*, Mashhad: 116-180.
10. Lothore, A. & Delmas, P. (2009). Market Access and Agricultural Product Marketing



Promoting Farmer Initiatives. Online: [http://publications.cta.int/media/publications/downloads/1580\\_PDF.pdf](http://publications.cta.int/media/publications/downloads/1580_PDF.pdf)

11. Marketing School. (2015). Explore the Strategy of Agricultural Marketing. Marketing School publication. On line: <http://www.marketing-schools.org/types-of-marketing/agricultural-marketing.html>.

12. Mawazo, M., Kisangiri, M & Jesuk, K. (2014). Agricultural Market Information Services in Developing Countries: A Review. *Advances in Computer Science: an International Journal*, 3(9): 38-47.

13. Rajaei, E. & Nasiri, C. (2011). Apple marketing study in the city of Urmia, using a mark-up pattern. *Journal of Management Quantitative Studies*. 1(2): 21-34.

14. Richards, J., Kagan, A., & Pamela, M. (2007). Marketing order suspensions and fresh lemon retail-FOB margin. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 54(2): 263-277.

15. Sheferd, D. (2005). Marketing efficiency. *American Journal of Agriculture Economics*. 2(5): 234-259.

16. Shepherd, G. S. & Futrell, G. A. (1969). *Marketing Farm Products*. State University Press, Iowa. Economic Analysis. Iowa.

17. Zaboň, M. (2005). *Choosing the distribution channel for meat products*. Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry Brno, Czech Republic.

<http://ijasrt.iau-shoushtar.ac.ir>