International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: 3108-1754 (Online)
Volume 02 Issue 11 November-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5



Rural Market Penetration and Dealer Engagement Strategies for Agricultural Input Products

An Empirical Field Study of Hifield Organics in Nanded District, Maharashtra

[**Adesh Sanjay Bhosale**] | [Indira School of Bussines Studies] | [MBA – Marketing Managment]

How to Cite this Article:

Bhosale, A. S. (2026). Rural Market Penetration and Dealer Engagement Strategies for Agricultural Input Products. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, 02(11), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.112

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.







https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.112

Abstract

The introduction of a relatively unfamiliar agricultural-input brand into a district market requires more than product availability. It depends on retailer confidence, clear commercial terms, credible agronomic communication and continued contact with farming communities. This paper examines the early market-development activities undertaken for Hifield Organics and its associated agrochemical portfolio in Nanded district, Maharashtra. The analysis is based on a descriptive field record covering 113 interactions—94 dealer outlets and 19 farmers—across 14 locations during the 2026 Kharif-season entry period. The recorded activity indicates that Krushi Seva Kendras represented 61.7% of dealer contacts, while Nanded, Ardhapur, Loha and Dharmabad together accounted for 60.2% of all visits. Forty field days produced an average of 2.8 contacts per day. Recorded sales totalled ₹18,000 and were generated by one dealer, equivalent to a dealer-level conversion of approximately 1.1%. The findings indicate that initial reach and product introduction can be achieved through structured personal selling, but awareness alone does not guarantee stocking or repeat purchases. Dealer-facing price and margin information, crop-stage communication, field demonstrations and systematic follow-up emerge as important areas for improvement. As the evidence comes from one intern's self-maintained record during a limited seasonal period, the results are exploratory and should not be interpreted as representative of the wider market.

Keywords: agricultural marketing; rural distribution; dealer engagement; biostimulants; agrochemicals; market penetration; field sales; Maharashtra.

1. Introduction

Agricultural-input companies depend heavily on local retail networks to connect their products with cultivators. In many rural markets, the retailer is not simply a point of sale: the dealer also explains product use, compares alternatives and influences the farmer's final purchase. For a company entering a new territory, establishing reliable dealer relationships is therefore a central market-development activity.

This challenge becomes more pronounced in the biostimulant category. Unlike products whose effects may be immediately visible, biostimulant performance can vary with crop, application timing, dosage and environmental conditions. Retailers may consequently seek practical evidence, dependable product information and a clear commercial proposition before allocating shelf space to an unfamiliar brand. The Indian regulatory framework also makes product compliance and documentation relevant to the confidence-building process.

The present paper reframes the field experience as a study of rural market penetration and channel engagement. It considers how a new agricultural-input portfolio was introduced, which outlet categories and locations received attention, what sales outcomes were recorded, and what changes could improve the movement from first contact to commercial adoption.



1.1 Research objectives

- To describe the reach achieved among agricultural retailers and farmers in selected Nanded markets.
- To examine the role of dealer-oriented communication in introducing the company and its product range.
- To assess the distribution of field contacts by outlet category, location and period.
- To identify factors associated with the limited conversion of introductory visits into recorded orders.
- To recommend practical steps for strengthening the company's local distribution and engagement process.

2. Industry Background and Conceptual Review

2.1 Agricultural-input marketing in rural India

The agricultural-input marketplace includes seeds, fertilisers, crop-protection products, plant-growth regulators and specialised crop-nutrition solutions. Retailers operate at the point where manufacturers' product strategies meet local farming requirements. Their willingness to stock and recommend a product can be influenced by expected demand, retailer margins, credit arrangements, product availability, technical support and confidence in the supplier.

Biostimulants occupy a developing and diverse segment within this marketplace. Product categories include humic and fulvic substances, amino-acid formulations, protein hydrolysates, seaweed extracts and beneficial microorganisms. Research has discussed their potential contribution to nutrient-use efficiency, crop quality and tolerance to environmental stress, while also emphasising that outcomes depend on crop and application conditions (Du Jardin, 2015; Calvo, Nelson, & Kloepper, 2014). This variability makes accurate communication and field-level evaluation especially important.

2.2 Distribution intermediaries and trust

Marketing-channel theory views distribution as a coordinated set of organisations that make products accessible to end users (Coughlan et al., 2006). In agricultural markets, the dealer performs both a commercial and advisory function. A retailer may recommend a formulation because it is familiar, has generated customer enquiries, offers an acceptable margin or is supported by a responsive field representative. A new supplier must therefore establish value for the retailer as well as relevance for the farmer.

The Nanded field experience also reflects the distinction between channel-oriented promotion and farmer-oriented demand creation. Dealer visits help introduce the brand, explain the range and encourage stocking. Farmer interactions can create product recognition and may later influence enquiries at the retail counter. A coordinated approach is required because either activity in isolation may have limited effect.

2.3 Adoption and personal selling perspectives

Rogers' (2003) diffusion-of-innovations framework identifies relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability as factors influencing adoption. Where benefits are difficult to observe quickly, demonstration plots, low-risk trial quantities and recommendations from trusted local sources can help reduce uncertainty. These ideas are relevant to biostimulants, whose performance may not be immediately distinguishable from the effects of weather, crop condition or other farm inputs.

The AIDA sequence—Attention, Interest, Desire and Action—offers a second lens for examining sales conversations. A brochure or product presentation may attract attention and create initial interest, but an order usually requires additional information and confidence. In this setting, price, retailer margin, promotional schemes, registration details, dosage guidance and evidence from local use may influence the decision to proceed.

2.4 Competitive conditions and the research gap The field material describes a crowded retail environment in which several brands offer products with broadly similar positioning. Retailers can compare suppliers and may be reluctant to allocate shelf space to a product without a clear reason for doing so. This creates pressure on new entrants to differentiate through reliable service, transparent commercial terms, practical crop-stage advice and visible local support rather than relying only on catalogue descriptions.



Existing literature explains biostimulant categories and adoption considerations, but the practical sequence of entering a district, contacting outlets and converting introductory discussions into orders receives less attention. This case contributes a field-level account using visit records and simple performance indicators. It does not attempt to estimate market share or establish causal relationships.

2.5 Analytical framework

The study interprets market-entry activity through three connected dimensions: (i) coverage, measured through the number and distribution of dealer and farmer contacts; (ii) engagement, reflected in the communication and information provided during visits; and (iii) conversion, represented by recorded sales relative to the number of dealer outlets approached. These dimensions help distinguish the creation of initial awareness from the achievement of commercial adoption.

3. Study Context and Research Method

3.1 Geographic and organisational setting

The fieldwork was carried out in Nanded district, located in Maharashtra's Marathwada region. The local economy has a substantial agricultural base, with crops such as soybean, cotton and pigeon pea forming part of the Kharif cultivation pattern. Chickpea, wheat and sorghum are among the crops associated with the Rabi season, while irrigated areas also support crops including sugarcane, banana and turmeric. The timing of the field assignment coincided with the early Kharif period, when farmers and retailers prepare for sowing and crop-management requirements.

The case concerns Hifield Organics Inc. and its associated entity, Hifield-AG Chem India Pvt. Ltd., based in Chhatrapati Sambhaji Nagar, Maharashtra. The product catalogues described a combined portfolio of 98 items, comprising 38 biostimulant and related organic-input products and 60 agrochemical products. The range included humic and fulvic formulations, amino-acid and seaweed products, plant-growth regulators, fungicides, insecticides and farmer-safety kits. The catalogues provided product-use and dosage information, while price, dealer margin and scheme details were not printed in the material examined.

3.2 Research design

A descriptive single-case design was adopted to document the market-development assignment. The study is based on a record of actual field contacts rather than a questionnaire survey or a statistically selected sample. The internship assignment ran from 21 May to 20 July 2026. The available visit register contains 113 completed entries recorded between 20 May and 15 July 2026, spread across 40 field days and 14 locations.

3.3 Sources and variables

The primary information source was the field visit register maintained during the assignment. Entries contained the visit sequence, outlet or contact name, date and place. For analysis, each contact was classified as a dealer visit or a farmer visit. Dealer outlets were grouped using the shop descriptions recorded in the register. The sales outcome was taken from the field sales record. Company product details were drawn from the two catalogues.

Variable	Operational description	Recorded information
Field contact	One recorded dealer or farmer interaction	113 entries
Contact category	Dealer outlet or farmer	94 dealers; 19 farmers
Outlet classification	Shop category inferred from recorded outlet name	KSK, agro agency/trader, fertiliser shop, seed shop
Geographic coverage	Location attached to each visit	14 places
Sales outcome	Total value recorded during the assignment	₹18,000



3.4 Processing and analytical approach

The analysis uses totals, proportions, location comparisons, time-period groupings and basic sales productivity ratios. Empty rows in the original register were excluded. The source paper notes that one date was corrected as a likely entry error and that the register's first two contacts preceded the formal assignment start by one day; those entries were retained. Place names were standardised for tabulation. Since the data are descriptive and originate from one field representative, no inferential statistical tests are applied.

3.5 Scope and ethical considerations

The study reports aggregated findings and does not reproduce individual dealer or farmer names. The author's dual role as field representative and analyst may influence how interactions were recorded or interpreted. The case should therefore be read as an account of one market-entry exercise, not as an independent audit of company performance. Company-related publication should be cleared with the organisation before formal submission.

4. Field Findings and Analysis

4.1 Overall coverage

The register contains 113 field contacts: 94 dealer interactions (83.2%) and 19 farmer interactions (16.8%). Activity was recorded on 40 days during the 61-day assignment period, producing an average of approximately 2.8 contacts per field day. The pattern shows that the initial approach concentrated on building retailer reach, with farmer-level engagement becoming more visible towards the end of the recorded period.

Indicator	Recorded result
Assignment duration	61 calendar days
Recorded contacts	113
Dealer interactions	94 (83.2%)
Farmer interactions	19 (16.8%)
Days with field activity	40 (65.6% of calendar days)
Average contacts per field day	2.8
Locations covered	14
Recorded sales	₹18,000

4.2 Geographic distribution

Nanded city recorded the highest number of contacts, with 27 visits. Ardhapur followed with 17, while Loha and Dharmabad each recorded 12. Together, these four markets accounted for 68 contacts, representing 60.2% of the total. The remaining activity was spread across smaller markets and villages. Farmer interactions were concentrated in Kahala, which accounted for 11 of the 19 farmer contacts.

Location	Dealer	Farmer	Total	Share
Nanded	27	0	27	23.9%
Ardhapur	17	0	17	15.0%
Loha	12	0	12	10.6%
Dharmabad	12	0	12	10.6%
Kahala	0	11	11	9.7%
Umri	10	0	10	8.8%
Kandhar	7	0	7	6.2%
Other recorded places	9	8	17	15.0%
Total	94	19	113	100%



The territory pattern suggests that field coverage was concentrated in the larger or more frequently visited clusters. Some smaller markets received relatively limited attention, indicating an opportunity for a more balanced second round of visits. The grouping of nearby locations may reduce travel time, but repeat contact is still needed to determine whether a dealer is genuinely interested in stocking the range.

4.3 Type of retail outlet contacted

Krushi Seva Kendras (KSKs) formed the largest group, accounting for 58 of the 94 dealer contacts, or 61.7%. Agro agencies, traders and other outlets represented 25 visits (26.6%). Fertiliser shops accounted for eight contacts (8.5%), while seed shops represented three (3.2%). The high share of KSKs is commercially relevant because these outlets commonly deal in multiple categories of agricultural inputs and maintain regular contact with farmers.

Outlet category	Number	Share of dealer visits
Krushi Seva Kendra	58	61.7%
Agro agency / trader / other	25	26.6%
Fertiliser shop	8	8.5%
Seed shop	3	3.2%
Total	94	100%

4.4 Timing and sequence of activity

The first three reporting fortnights were primarily devoted to dealer introductions and outlet coverage. In the final fortnight, the recorded pattern changed: six dealer visits were accompanied by 19 farmer contacts. This indicates a shift from a predominantly channel-focused introduction process towards direct interaction with cultivators. Across the 40 field days, three contacts per day was the most common workload, reflecting the time required for travel, product explanation and individual conversations.

Recorded period	Total visits	Dealer	Farmer	Field days
20 May – 3 June	33	33	0	12
4 – 17 June	32	32	0	10
18 June – 1 July	23	23	0	9
2 – 15 July	25	6	19	9
Total	113	94	19	40

5. Sales Outcome, Interpretation and Managerial Actions

5.1 Sales conversion and field productivity

The recorded sales value for the period was ₹18,000. The source record attributes the entire amount to one dealer. Against 94 dealer outlets contacted, this represents a conversion of approximately 1.1%. The result demonstrates a clear difference between the number of outlets reached and the number that placed a recorded order. It should not be interpreted as a normal or long-term conversion rate because the evidence covers one introductory assignment and one seasonal window.

Performance measure	Value	Basis
Sales per field day	₹450	₹18,000 ÷ 40
Sales per calendar day	₹295	₹18,000 ÷ 61
Sales per dealer contact	₹191	₹18,000 ÷ 94
Sales per total contact	₹159	₹18,000 ÷ 113
Dealer conversion	1.1%	1 ordering dealer ÷ 94 visited



The concentration of all recorded sales in a single account also creates uncertainty. The available information does not identify which products were purchased, whether the order was followed by repeat business, or whether the same result could be replicated across other dealers. Order-level records and subsequent follow-up are required before stronger conclusions can be drawn.

5.2 Interpretation of the findings

First, the field effort achieved meaningful initial reach. More than four-fifths of the contacts were dealers, which is consistent with the importance of retailers as local sources of agricultural information. The prominence of KSKs indicates that the representative reached outlets that can potentially connect several product categories with a broad farmer base.

Second, contact volume did not translate proportionately into orders. The product catalogue and introductory discussion may have generated awareness, but the recorded material did not include printed price, retailer margin or scheme information. These details can be important when a dealer compares an unfamiliar product with established alternatives. A field conversation that explains product features but leaves commercial questions unresolved may not be sufficient to secure an order.

Third, biostimulant products may require a stronger demonstration-led approach. Where the benefits are not immediately observable, dealers and farmers may prefer to wait for local evidence. Small trial quantities, carefully documented demonstration plots and farmer meetings can reduce uncertainty, provided that product use follows approved labels and qualified agronomic advice.

Finally, the shift towards farmer contact in July broadened the communication approach, but the register does not capture the farmers' crop details, purchase intentions or later enquiries. The effect of this activity on dealer demand therefore remains unknown.

5.3 Recommended managerial actions

Priority	Suggested action	Practical implementation
1. Improve follow-up	Create a visit-to-order tracker	Record each outlet, discussion outcome, next contact date, order status and reason for non-purchase.
2. Clarify commercial terms	Provide a separate dealer price sheet	Share current pack prices, margins, schemes, payment terms and ordering procedure.
3. Focus on anchor outlets	Develop a priority KSK group	Select 15–20 suitable dealers based on farmer footfall, interest and willingness to participate.
4. Simplify product communication	Prepare crop-stage product guides	Create concise Marathi reference sheets for major crops such as soybean, cotton and pigeon pea.
5. Build local evidence	Conduct dealer-linked demonstrations	Work with a small group of progressive farmers and document application, crop conditions and observations.
6. Extend territory coverage	Plan core and development clusters	Schedule repeat visits in key markets while ensuring systematic first-round coverage in smaller locations.
7. Strengthen product confidence	Conduct dealer orientation sessions	Explain product documentation, label directions, safe handling, storage and responsible claims.

The first operational priority should be accurate tracking. Without recording follow-up outcomes and order details, the organisation cannot identify which communication methods or territory choices are producing commercial results. Promotional claims should remain consistent with product labels and available evidence.



6. Conclusion, Limitations and Further Research

6.1 Conclusion

This case illustrates that entering a new agricultural-input market involves two distinct tasks: reaching potential channel partners and persuading them to take a commercial step. During the recorded Nanded assignment, 113 contacts were made across 14 locations, with dealer outlets accounting for 94 interactions. KSKs were the most frequently approached outlet category, while four major locations represented approximately three-fifths of all recorded visits. The field routine therefore established an initial presence across a meaningful set of local markets.

The sales outcome, however, remained limited. Recorded business of ₹18,000 came from one dealer, resulting in a conversion of approximately 1.1% among the outlets visited. The gap between contact activity and purchasing behaviour suggests that introductory communication needs to be supported by clearer commercial information, practical product guidance, demonstrations and planned follow-up. For a regional agricultural-input company, the next stage should focus less on counting first visits and more on measuring outlet activation, order frequency, repeat purchases and farmer-level response.

The study's central implication is that distribution expansion and brand development should be managed as a continuous relationship-building process. Retailer confidence, evidence of product performance and dependable field support are likely to be important in converting an initial introduction into a stable local presence.

6.2 Limitations

- The analysis covers one company-related field assignment and one district; the findings cannot be generalised to all agricultural markets.
- The observation period was short and concentrated around the early Kharif season; other crop cycles were not examined.
- The visit register was maintained by the same person who conducted the field activity, creating a possibility of recording and interpretation bias.
- No structured questionnaire was administered, so dealer awareness, satisfaction, purchase barriers and farmer perceptions were not measured systematically.
- The available sales record contains one buying dealer and does not provide product-wise sales, order frequency, margins, profitability or repeat-order information.
- Outlet classification was inferred from shop names; outlet size, turnover and customer base were not independently verified.

6.3 Directions for future research

A follow-up study could survey dealers to measure brand familiarity, margin expectations, willingness to stock and reasons for rejecting an unfamiliar product. Farmer-level research could compare crop-stage practices and the perceived value of selected biostimulant programmes. A multi-season analysis of invoices and repeat orders would provide a stronger picture of commercial performance. Similar studies across additional Marathwada districts could also show whether territory characteristics influence dealer activation and product adoption.

Declarations

Acknowledgement: The author may acknowledge the academic institution, Hifield Organics and the dealers and farmers who contributed time during the field assignment. Names and designations should be confirmed before submission.

Conflict of interest: The fieldwork was undertaken in an internship capacity with the organisation discussed in this paper. This relationship should be disclosed transparently.

Funding: No funding information was available in the source material. The author should confirm the appropriate statement.

Data availability: The underlying visit register contains business-contact information and is not reproduced. Only aggregated figures are presented.



References

Calvo, P., Nelson, L., & Kloepper, J. W. (2014). Agricultural uses of plant biostimulants. Plant and Soil, 383, 3–41.

Canellas, L. P., et al. (2015). Humic and fulvic acids as biostimulants in horticulture. Scientia Horticulturae, 196, 15–27.

Coughlan, A. T., Anderson, E., Stern, L. W., & El-Ansary, A. I. (2006). Marketing Channels (7th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Du Jardin, P. (2015). Plant biostimulants: Definition, concept, main categories and regulation. Scientia Horticulturae, 196, 3–14.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing Management (15th ed.). Pearson Education.

Porter, M. E. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. Harvard Business Review, 86(1), 78–93.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of Innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Rouphael, Y., & Colla, G. (2020). Biostimulants in agriculture. Frontiers in Plant Science, 11, 40.

Yakhin, O. I., Lubyanov, A. A., Yakhin, I. A., & Brown, P. H. (2017). Biostimulants in plant science: A global perspective. Frontiers in Plant Science, 7, 2049.

Hifield Organics Inc. (n.d.). Biostimulants product list. Brand Sales Division, Chhatrapati Sambhaji Nagar.

Hifield-AG Chem India Pvt. Ltd. (n.d.). Brand product catalogue. Chhatrapati Sambhaji Nagar.