CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS & SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The collected data was then grouped and then analyzed using various statistical tools in the following manner: In order to understand the socio economic profile of dealers of agricultural equipments, manufacturer of agricultural equipments, the percentage analysis and frequency distribution are worked out. In order to examine the difference among the dealers selling the agricultural equipments of different manufacturers, the Chi-Square test has been employed.

In order to study the difference in unit of prices of agricultural equipments of different manufacturers, preference of promotional practices for agricultural equipments by manufacturers, reasons for the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers and role of dealers in carrying out the sales promotional practices for agricultural equipments, the ANOVA test has been applied.

In order to discriminate the location of the dealers based on the preference of promotional practices for agricultural equipments by manufacturers, the discriminate analysis is carried out. In order to identify the factors determining the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers and the factors determining the role of dealers in carrying out the promotional practices of agricultural equipments, the exploratory factor analysis has been employed.

The correlation analysis has been carried out to study the relationship between factors determining the choice of promotional practices for agricultural equipments and annual sales of dealers of agricultural equipments.
In order to examine the influence of factors determining the choice of promotional practices for agricultural equipments on annual sales and the influence of factors determining the role of dealers in carrying out the promotional practices of agricultural equipments on annual sales the multiple regression has employed. In order to rank the problems faced by the dealers in promoting agricultural equipments, mean scores has been calculated.

7.1. FINDINGS RELATING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF DEALERS

1. The results indicate that about 82.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are males, while the rest of 17.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are females. It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments are males.

2. The results show that about 41.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments belong to the age group of 31-40 years followed by 41-50 years (39.00 per cent), more than 50 years (13.00 per cent) and 21-30 years (6.75 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments belong to the age group of 31-40 years.

3. It is clear that about 57.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are graduates followed by higher secondary (32.50 per cent), post graduates (8.25 per cent and secondary (2.00 per cent) education. It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments are graduates.

4. It is observed that about 91.50 of the dealers of agricultural equipments are married and the rest of 8.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are unmarried. It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments are married.
5. It is apparent that about 67.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments belong to the nuclear family, while the rest of 32.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments belong to the joint family. It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments belong to the nuclear family.

6. The results indicate that about 68.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are having the family size of 4-6 members followed by up to three members (40.50 per cent) and more than six members (10.75 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments are having the family size of 4-6 members.

7. The results show that about 39.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are having the experience of 7-9 years followed by up to 4-6 years (33.00 per cent), 1-3 years (21.50 per cent) and more than nine years (5.75 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments are having the experience of 7-9 years.

8. It is found that about 75.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments have 1-2 managers followed by 3-5 managers (20.75 per cent) and more than five managers (4.00 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments have 1-2 managers.

9. It is clear that about 64.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments have 4-6 employees followed by 1-3 employees (21.50 per cent) and 7-9 employees (13.75 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments have 4-6 employees.
10. It is apparent that about 42.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments have the operating capital of Rs. 5-10 lakhs followed by more than 10 lakhs (37.00 per cent) and 1-5 lakhs (21.00 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments have the operating capital of Rs. 5-10 lakhs.

11. The results indicate that about 48.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments have the annual sales of Rs. 8-10 lakhs followed by Rs. 5-7 lakhs (38.50 per cent) and Rs.11-13 lakhs (13.00 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments have annual sales of Rs. 8-10 lakhs.

12. The results show that about 45.75 per cent of dealers of agricultural equipments have geographical area coverage of 16-30 Km followed by 1-15 Km (38.50 per cent) and 31-45 Km ( 15.75 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments have geographical area coverage of 16-30 Km.

13. It is observed that about 62.00 per cent of dealers of agricultural equipments are located in semi urban area followed by rural (24.00 per cent) and urban (14.00 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments are located in semi urban area.

14. It is clear that about 29.25 per cent of dealers of agricultural equipments are non exclusive dealers followed by exclusive dealers for Mahindra and Mahindra(17.00 per cent), VST (14.00 per cent), Escorts (13.50 per cent), John Deere (10.50 per cent), New Holland (8.50 per cent) and HIMCO (7.25 per cent). It reveals that the majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments are non exclusive dealers.
7.2. FINDINGS RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENTS

7.2.1. Findings Relating to Land Development, Tillage, Seed Bed Preparation Equipments

1. The results indicate that about 28.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra tractors followed by Escorts (23.50 per cent), John Deere (14.00 per cent), VST (12.00 per cent), Eicher (10.50 per cent), New Holland (7.00 per cent) and Breaks (5.00 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra tractors.

2. The chi-square value of 0.002 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the tractors of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the tractors of different manufacturers is rejected.

3. The results show that the highest price of tractor is Rs. 610000 for Escorts followed by Eicher and New Holland (Rs. 600000), VST(Rs.595000), Brakes(Rs. 590000), John Deere(Rs. 585000) and Mahindra & Mahindra(Rs. 550000). It reveals that the lowest price for tractor is Mahindra & Mahindra.

4. The F-value of 5.642 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of tractors of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of tractors of different manufacturers is rejected.
5. It is found that about 25.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra levelers followed by Bharat Industries (24.50 per cent), Brahmpuri Agricultural Farm Equipments (23.50 per cent), Punjab Agro Sales (16.00 per cent) and Shri Sai Agro Equipments Pvt. Ltd (10.50 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra land levelers.

6. The chi-square value of 0.034 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the levelers of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the levelers of different manufacturers is rejected.

7. It is apparent that the highest price of leveler is Rs. 200000 for Bharat Industries followed by Brahmpuri Agricultural Farm Equipments (Rs. 195000), Punjab Agro Sales (Rs.165000), Shri Sai Agro Equipments Pvt. Ltd (Rs. 160000) and Mahindra & Mahindra(Rs. 150000). It reveals that the lowest price for leveler is Mahindra & Mahindra.

8. The F-value of 4.158 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of levelers of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of levelers of different manufacturers is rejected.

9. It is observed that about 32.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Sanjay Udyog ploughs followed by Anika Farming Equipment (25.50 per cent), Mukesh Agro Industry(24.50 per cent) and
Bharat Electric Welding Works (18.00 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Sanjay Udyog ploughs.

10. The chi-square value of 0.028 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the ploughs of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the ploughs of different manufacturers is rejected.

11. The results show that the highest price of plough is Rs. 29750 for Anika Farming Equipment followed by Bharat Electric Welding Works (Rs. 29600), Mukesh Agro Industry (Rs. 29200) and Sanjay Udyog (Rs. 28500). It is inferred that the lowest price for plough is Sanjay Udyog.

12. The F-value of 5.042 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of ploughs of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of ploughs of different manufacturers is rejected.

7.2.2. Findings Relating to Sowing and Planting Equipments

1. The results show that about 37.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra seed driller followed by VST (24.00 per cent), Dale (22.00 per cent) and Escorts (17.00 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra seed driller.

2. The chi-square value of 0.026 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the seed driller of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there
is no significant difference among the dealers selling the seed driller of different manufacturers is rejected.

3. It is observed that the highest price of seed driller is Rs. 172000 for Dale followed by Escorts (Rs. 168000), VST (Rs.165000) and Mahindra & Mahindra (Rs. 160000). It is inferred that the lowest price for seed driller is Mahindra & Mahindra.

4. The F-value of 4.984 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of seed driller of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of seed driller of different manufacturers is rejected.

5. It is found that about 29.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra transplanter followed by VST (20.50 per cent), Escorts (20.00 per cent), Punjab Agro Sales(20.00 per cent) and Checchi & Magli (12.00 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Mahindra & Mahindra transplanter.

6. The chi-square value of 0.034 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the transplanter of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the transplanter of different manufacturers is rejected.

7. It is apparent that the highest price of planter is Rs. 165000 for Escorts followed by Punjab Agro Sales (Rs. 162000), VST (Rs.160000), Checchi &
Magli (Rs. 158000) and Mahindra & Mahindra (Rs. 155000). It is inferred that the lowest price for planer is Mahindra & Mahindra.

8. The F-value of 5.168 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of planter of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of planter of different manufacturers is rejected.

7.2.3. Findings Relating to Weeding, Intercultivation and Plant Protection Equipments

1. The results indicate that about 26.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the VST tiller followed by A.I.C. Machinery (24.00 per cent), Amar Agricultural Implements (18.00 per cent), National Engineering (17.50 per cent) and Kavi Agro Agency (14.50 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the VST tiller.

2. The chi-square value of 0.037 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the tiller of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the tiller of different manufacturers is rejected.

3. The results show that the highest price of tiller is Rs. 29500 for A.I.C. Machienry followed by Kavi Agro Agency (Rs. 29000), National Engineering (Rs. 28500), Amar Agricultural Implements (Rs. 28000) and VST (Rs. 27500). It is inferred that the lowest price for tiller is VST.
4. The F-value of 4.946 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of tiller of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of tiller of different manufacturers is rejected.

5. It found that about 30.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Aspee sprayer followed by Buvico Spraying Equipments (24.00 per cent), Peekay Farm Equipments (20.50 per cent), Master MFG (17.00 per cent) and Aditya International Agro Suppliers (8.50 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Aspee sprayer.

6. The chi-square value of 0.032 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the sprayer of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the sprayer of different manufacturers is rejected.

7. The results reveal that the highest price of sprayer is Rs. 18750 for Aditya International Agro Suppliers followed by Peekay Farm Equipments (Rs. 18500), Buvico Spraying Equipments (Rs.18250), Master MFC (Rs. 18000) and Aspee (Rs. 17500). It is inferred that the lowest price for sprayer is Aspee.

8. The F-value of 4.745 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of sprayer of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no
significant difference in price of sprayer of different manufacturers is rejected.

9. It is apparent that about 37.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Aspee duster followed by Ignition Products India (18.50 per cent), Master MFG (17.50 per cent), Peekay Farm Equipments (15.00 per cent) and Aditya International Agro Suppliers (12.00 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Aspee duster.

10. The chi-square value of 0.038 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the duster of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the duster of different manufacturers is rejected.

11. It is clear that the highest price of sprayer is Rs. 4500 for Aditya International Agro Suppliers followed by Peekay Farm Equipments (Rs. 4200), Ignition Products India (Rs.4000), Master MFC (Rs. 3800) and Aspee (Rs. 3500). It is inferred that the lowest price for sprayer is Aspee.

12. The F-value of 4.816 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of duster of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of duster of different manufacturers is rejected.
7.2.4. Findings Relating to Harvesting and Threshing Equipments

1. The results indicate that about 28.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Punjab Agro Sales harvester followed by L & T (24.50 per cent), New Holland (21.00 per cent), Escorts(14.50 per cent)and HIMCO (12.00 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Punjab Agro Sales harvester.

2. The chi-square value of 0.034 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the harvester of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the harvester of different manufacturers is rejected.

3. The results show that the highest price of harvester is Rs. 1475000 for HIMCO followed by Escorts (Rs. 1450000), L &T (Rs.1400000), New Holland(Rs. 1375000) and Punjab Agro Sales (Rs. 1250000). It is inferred that the lowest price for harvester is Punjab Agro Sales.

4. The F-value of 5.285 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of harvester of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of harvester of different manufacturers is rejected.

5. It is found that about 27.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Punjab Agro Sales thresher followed by HIMCO (24.00 per cent), TAFE (21.00 per cent), Escorts (19.00 per cent) and Indo-Farm Agro Industries (9.00 per cent). It reveals that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments sell the Punjab Agro Sales thresher.
6. The chi-square value of 0.031 is statistically significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference among the dealers selling the thresher of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among the dealers selling the thresher of different manufacturers is rejected.

7. The results reveal that the highest price of thresher is Rs. 150000 for Escorts followed by HIMCO (Rs. 145000), L &T (Rs.1400000), Indo-Farm Agro Industries (Rs. 1400000), TAFE (Rs. 135000) and Punjab Agro Sales (Rs. 120000). It is inferred that the lowest price for thresher is Punjab Agro Sales.

8. The F-value of 4.984 is statistically significant at five per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in price of thresher of different manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in price of thresher of different manufacturers is rejected.

7.3. FINDINGS RELATING TO PREFERENCE OF PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES

1. The results indicate that about 77.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the advertising through newspaper is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (22.50 per cent). The results show that about 49.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement through periodicals is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (34.50 per cent), less preferred (6.75 per cent), very less preferred (5.50 per cent) and neutral (3.50 per cent).

2. It is observed that about 36.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement through magazines is neutral with the manufacturers followed
by less preferred (31.25 per cent), very less preferred (30.25 per cent) and preferred (1.75 per cent). It is clear that about 40.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement through trade journals is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (29.25 per cent), very less preferred (24.00 per cent) and preferred (6.50 per cent).

3. It is apparent that about 50.50 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement through professional journals is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (25.00 per cent), very less preferred (20.25 per cent) and preferred (4.25 per cent). The results show that about 35.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the advertising through television is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (27.50 per cent), less preferred(15.25 per cent), very less preferred(12.50 per cent) and neutral(9.75 per cent).

4. The results show that about 35.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement through cinema is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (21.25 per cent), less preferred(18.00 per cent), preferred( 13.50 per cent) and neutral( 11.50 per cent). It is very clear that about 47.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertising on transports is neutral with the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (17.00 per cent), highly preferred (15.00 per cent) less preferred (11.00 per cent) and preferred(10.00 per cent).

5. It is clear that about 35.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertising on bus shelters is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred(24.00 per cent), less preferred(16.00 per cent), neutral (13.00 per
cent) and very less preferred (12.00 per cent). It is apparent that about 23.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertising on walls and buildings is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (21.25 per cent), neutral (20.00 per cent), very less preferred (18.25 per cent) and preferred (17.50 per cent).

6. The results reveal that about 33.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the posters is neutral with the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (18.25 per cent), less preferred(17.75 per cent), preferred(16.00 per cent) and highly preferred (14.25 per cent). The results indicate that about 46.50 per cent of the dealers opine that the signs are less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (25.50 per cent), very less preferred (22.00 per cent), preferred (3.50 per cent) and highly preferred (2.50 per cent).

7. It is apparent that about 33.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the boards are very less preferred by the manufacturers followed by less preferred (31.50 per cent), neutral (17.50 per cent), highly preferred (10.00 per cent) and preferred (7.75 per cent). It is observed that about 36.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the packaging design is neutral with the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (28.50 per cent), less preferred (27.00 per cent), highly preferred (5.00 per cent) and preferred (3.50 per cent).

8. It is observed that about 35.50 per cent of the dealers opine that the dealer loaders is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (27.00 per cent), very less preferred (22.25 per cent), preferred (8.50 per cent) and highly preferred (6.75 per cent). The results show that about 47.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the point of sale materials is less
preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (27.00 per cent), very less preferred (21.25 per cent) and preferred (4.50 per cent).

9. The results show that about 34.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the dealer competition is very less preferred by the manufacturers followed by less preferred (32.75 per cent), neutral (31.50 per cent) and preferred (7.00 per cent). It is very clear that about 42.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the dealer trainings are less preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (23.25 per cent), neutral (22.50 per cent) and preferred (7.00 per cent).

10. It is clear that about 30.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the credit is very less preferred by the manufacturers followed by less preferred (34.75 per cent), neutral (23.75 per cent) and preferred (3.50 per cent). It is apparent that about 44.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the promotional gifts is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (29.00 per cent), neutral (22.50 per cent) and preferred (4.25 per cent).

11. The results reveal that about 35.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the coupon offer is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (23.25 per cent), very less preferred (12.50 per cent), preferred (12.50 per cent) and highly preferred (7.50 per cent). The results indicate that about 25.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the price reductions is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (23.00 per cent), neutral (20.00 per cent), highly preferred( 13.00 per cent) and preferred (13.00 per cent).
12. It is observed that about 26.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the discount and rebate is less preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (24.00 per cent), neutral (22.50 per cent), highly preferred (17.50 per cent) and preferred (10.00 per cent). It is clear that about 24.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the premium price is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by very less preferred (22.50 per cent), less preferred (20.50 per cent), preferred (18.75 per cent) and neutral (14.00 per cent).

13. It is apparent that about 38.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the field demonstrations are highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (31.75 per cent), neutral (22.25 per cent), less and very less preferred (4.25 per cent). The results show that about 30.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the participation in extension programmes are preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (28.50 per cent), very less preferred(19.75 per cent), less preferred(11.00 per cent) and neutral (10.00 per cent).

14. The results show that about 44.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the quality assurance is preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (40.00 per cent), less preferred (8.00 per cent), very less preferred( 4.75 per cent) and neutral (3.00 per cent). It is very clear that about 33.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the warranty is preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (29.75 per cent), very less preferred ( 14.25 per cent), neutral( 12.50 per cent) and less preferred(10.25 per cent).

15. It is clear that about 38.50 per cent of the dealers opine that the after sales service is preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (35.00 per cent), less preferred (11.50 per cent) and neutral and very less preferred
(7.50 per cent). It is apparent that about 24.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the location of outlets is neutral with the manufacturers followed by less preferred (24.50 per cent), very less preferred (24.00 per cent), preferred (15.00 per cent) and highly preferred (11.75 per cent).

16. The results indicate that about 34.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the free transportation charges is neutral with the manufacturers followed by less preferred (25.00 per cent), very less preferred (22.50 per cent), preferred (12.50 per cent) and highly preferred (6.00 per cent). The results show that about 27.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the free trails are neutral with the manufacturers followed by less preferred (26.50 per cent), very less preferred (19.25 per cent), preferred (14.75 per cent) and highly preferred (11.75 per cent).

17. It is apparent that about 45.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the participating in trade fairs is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (33.25 per cent), neutral (9.50 per cent), less preferred (7.00 per cent) and very less preferred (5.25 per cent). It is observed that about 34.50 per cent of the dealers opine that the participating in farmer’s day function is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (27.75 per cent), neutral (25.75 per cent), less preferred (7.00 per cent) and very less preferred (5.00 per cent).

18. It is clear that about 25.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the participation in exhibition is highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by less preferred (22.25 per cent), preferred (18.50 per cent), neutral (17.75 per cent) and very less preferred (16.50 per cent). The results show that about 36.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that van campaign is preferred by
the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (34.00 per cent), neutral (12.00 per cent), less preferred (10.00 per cent) and very less preferred (7.00 per cent).

19. The results show that about 22.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the additional equipments are very less preferred by the manufacturers followed by highly preferred (20.25 per cent), preferred (19.50 per cent), less preferred (19.25 per cent) and neutral (18.75 per cent). It is very clear that about 32.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the celebrity endorsements are highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (28.75 per cent), neutral (19.50 per cent), very less preferred (12.25 per cent) and less preferred (6.75 per cent).

20. It is clear that about 30.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the sponsorship is neutral with the manufacturers followed by less preferred (25.00 per cent), very less preferred (22.50 per cent), highly preferred (12.25 per cent) and preferred (10.20 per cent). It is apparent that about 28.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the visits are less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (26.25 per cent), very less preferred (26.00 per cent), highly preferred (10.75 per cent) and preferred (8.75 per cent).

21. The discriminant analysis shows that the variables of advertising on bus shelters, advertising on walls and buildings, posters, credit, promotional gifts, discount and rebate, field demonstrations, warranty, after sales services and additional equipments discriminate best among the three locational groups of dealers of agricultural equipments. Based on the discriminant function, 87.25 per cent of the measures have been correctly classified.
22. The results show that about 35.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the field days are less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neural (34.50 per cent), very less preferred (21.00 per cent), highly preferred (5.25 per cent) and preferred (4.25 per cent). It is very clear that about 29.75 per cent of the dealers opine that the catalogues are less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (29.25 per cent), very less preferred (23.75 per cent), highly preferred (9.75 per cent) and preferred (7.50 per cent).

23. It is apparent that about 61.00 per cent of the dealers opine that the advertisement in local languages are highly preferred by the manufacturers followed by preferred (24.00 per cent), neutral(5.50 per cent), very less preferred (5.25 per cent) and less preferred (4.25 per cent). It is clear that about 31.25 per cent of the dealers opine that the sponsoring social awareness programmes are very less preferred by the manufacturers followed by neutral (28.25 per cent), less preferred (25.75 per cent), preferred (9.25 per cent) and highly preferred (5.50 per cent).

24. The F-value of 272.594 is significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in preference of promotional practices for agricultural equipments by the manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in preference of promotional practices for agricultural equipments by the manufacturers is rejected.
7.4. FINDINGS RELATING TO REASONS FOR THE CHOICE OF PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES OF AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENTS BY THE MANUFACTURERS

1. The results indicate that about 77.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are targeting the ultimate consumers followed by agree (16.25 per cent), neutral (2.50 per cent), disagree (2.25 per cent) and strongly disagree (1.50 per cent). The results show that about 47.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are targeting the distributors followed by agree (41.25 per cent), strongly disagree (5.00 per cent), neutral (3.50 per cent) and disagree (2.75 per cent).

2. It is observed that about 26.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are neutral with the promotional measures are targeting the dealers followed by strongly agree (23.75 per cent), disagree (21.50 per cent), strongly disagree (16.25 per cent) and agree (12.50 per cent). It is clear that about 31.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are disagreed with the promotional measures are targeting the industrial buyers followed by strongly disagree (27.00 per cent), neutral (21.25 per cent), agree (11.50 per cent) and strongly agree (9.25 per cent).

3. It is apparent that about 28.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are neutral with the promotional objective is to inform consumers in an effort to increase their level of awareness followed by disagree (24.25 per cent), agree (20.25 per cent), strongly disagree (14.25 per cent) and strongly agree (12.75 per cent). The results indicate that about 43.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the objective of
promotional elements is to persuade the consumers to buy the product followed by disagree (34.00 per cent), neutral (9.25 per cent), disagree (8.25 per cent) and strongly disagree (5.25 per cent).

4. The results show that about 49.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the promotional measures are used to stresses brand differences followed by strongly agree (35.25 per cent), neutral (6.25 per cent), disagree (5.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (4.50 per cent). It is apparent that about 25.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the promotional measures are used to maintain existing buyers followed by neutral (23.75 per cent), strongly agree (18.25 per cent), disagree (18.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (14.75 per cent).

5. It is clear that about 34.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are crucial to remind buyers of the equipment’s existence followed by agree (30.50 per cent), neutral (30.25 per cent), strongly disagree (3.50 per cent) and disagree (1.75 per cent). It is apparent that about 35.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are disagreed with the promotional measures are important for the technical sophistication of the equipments and hence the amount of understanding required using it followed by neutral (25.00 per cent), agree(16.00 per cent), strongly agree(14.25 per cent) and strongly disagree(9.00 per cent).

6. The results indicate that about 29.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional elements encourage the consumers to try the equipments followed by agree (26.75 per cent), disagree (19.50 per cent), neutral (16.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (8.00 per cent).
The results show that about 39.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are used to establish the seller’s reputation followed by agree (26.25 per cent), neutral (16.75 per cent), strongly disagree (10.25 per cent) and disagree (7.50 per cent).

7. It is observed that about 29.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are important to enhance the decision making of customers followed by neutral(26.25 per cent), agree (25.00 per cent), disagree (13.75 per cent) and strongly disagree (6.00 per cent). It is clear that about 32.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures are very helpful in encouraging demand followed by agree (25.25 per cent), neutral (22.50 per cent), disagree (12.50 per cent) and strongly agree (7.75 per cent).

8. It is apparent that about 29.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional measures help the buyer for right purchase followed by agree (28.50 per cent), neutral (22.50 per cent), strongly disagree (10.00 per cent) and disagree (9.75 per cent). The results indicate that about 30.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the sales promotions encourage repeat purchase from satisfied first-time triers followed by agree (26.75 per cent), neutral (18.00 per cent) disagree (12.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (12.00 per cent).

9. The results show that about 28.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the promotional practices assist in moving a
equipment through the channel of distribution followed by neutral (24.50 per cent), strongly agree (22.75 per cent), strongly disagree (12.50 per cent) and disagree (11.75 per cent). It is observed that about 27.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the promotional practices help wholesalers to encourage orders and provide sales assistance and this increases purchase of equipment followed by strongly agree (26.75 per cent), neutral (23.25 per cent), disagree (16.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (6.00 per cent).

10. It is apparent that about 34.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the manufacturer directs its promotional mix to customers to encourage them to ask retailers for the equipment followed by agree (23.50 per cent), neutral (23.00 per cent), disagree (10.75 per cent) and strongly disagree (8.50 per cent). It is clear that about 41.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional practices provide consistent message across all customers followed by agree (24.75 per cent), neutral (18.75 per cent), disagree (9.25 per cent) and strongly disagree (6.00 per cent).

11. The results indicate that about 41.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the promotional practices increase the sales volume followed by agree (34.25 per cent), neutral (17.75 per cent) disagree and strongly disagree (3.50 per cent). The results show that about 29.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with promotional practices create effective demand for equipments followed by agree (25.00 per cent), neutral (22.75 per cent), strongly disagree (12.00
per cent) and disagree (11.25 per cent). It is very clear that about 26.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are neutral with the promotional measures play important for role to gain low risk trial followed by strongly agree (26.25 per cent), agree (20.50 per cent), disagree (16.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (10.00 per cent).

12. The F-value of 329.498 is significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in reasons for the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in reasons for the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers is rejected.

13. The factor analysis shows that there are eight independent groups which are extracted accounting for a total of 71.63 per cent of variations on 23 reasons. The each of the eight factors contributes to 13.68 per cent, 11.88 per cent, 10.19 per cent, 9.00 per cent, 7.39 per cent, 7.37 per cent, 6.21 per cent and 5.91 per cent respectively.

14. It is inferred that consumer focus, demand creation, exposure, familiarity, encouragement, reputation, existence and value creation are the factors determining the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers.

15. The results shows that the correlation co-efficient between consumer focus and annual sales is 0.42 which is significant at one per cent level of significance. The correlation co-efficient between demand creation and annual sales is 0.36 is significant at one per cent level of significance.
16. The results indicate that the correlation co-efficient between familiarity and annual sales is 0.35 which is significant at one per cent level of significance. The correlation co-efficient between reputation and annual sales is 0.38 is significant at one per cent level of significance.

17. Besides, The correlation co-efficient between value creation and annual sales is 0.37 is significant at one per cent level of significance. It is inferred that if consumer focus, demand creation, familiarity, reputation and value creation increase, the annual sales of agricultural equipments would increase further. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant relationship between factors determining the choice of promotional practices for agricultural equipments and annual sales is rejected.

18. The multiple regression analysis shows that the coefficient of multiple determination ($R^2$) is 0.69 and adjusted $R^2$ is 0.67 indicating the regression model is moderately fit. It is inferred that about 67.00 per cent of the variation in dependent variable (Annual Sales) is explained by the independent variables (Factors Determining the Choice of Promotional Practices for Agricultural Equipments). The F-value of 7.482 is significant at one per cent level indicating that the regression model is good fit.

19. The results indicate that consumer focus, demand creation, familiarity, reputation and value creation are positively influencing the annual sales of agricultural equipments at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant influence of factors determining the choice of promotional practices for agricultural equipments on annual sales is rejected.
20. The results indicate that about 61.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the expenses for promotional practices are met by both manufacturers and dealers followed by dealers (22.50 per cent) and manufacturers (16.00 per cent). It is inferred that the most of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the expenses for promotional practices are met by both manufacturers and dealers.

7.5. FINDINGS RELATING TO ROLE OF DEALERS IN CARRYING OUT THE PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES FOR AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENTS

1. The results indicate that about 39.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers proved training to the customers about the usage of equipments followed by agree (23.50 per cent), neutral (15.00 per cent), strongly disagree (12.50 per cent) and disagree (10.00 per cent). The results show that about 42.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers carry the field trails on equipments and machineries followed by agree (25.50 per cent), neutral (14.50 per cent), strongly disagree (10.00 per cent) and disagree (7.50 per cent).

2. It is found that about 28.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers advertise in local newspapers about the equipments followed by agree and neutral (25.00 per cent), disagree (12.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (8.75 per cent). It is clear that about 40.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are neutral with the dealers advertise in local television networks followed by strongly disagree (32.50 per cent),
agree (13.00 per cent), disagree (11.00 per cent) and strongly agree (3.50 per cent).

3. It is apparent that about 42.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers advertise on walls and buildings followed by agree (26.00 per cent), neutral (18.25 per cent), disagree (7.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (5.75 per cent). The results reveal that about 37.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers prepare and stick the posters in important places followed by strongly agree (26.25 per cent), neutral (16.50 per cent), strongly disagree (11.75 per cent) and disagree (8.00 per cent).

4. The results show that about 32.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers display the equipments in their show rooms followed by strongly agree (25.00 per cent), neutral(19.50 per cent), disagree(19.25 per cent) and strongly disagree(3.50 per cent). It is observed that about 39.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers distribute pamphlets and brouchers about equipments followed by strongly agree(27.50 per cent), neutral (15.00 per cent), strongly disagree (10.00 per cent) and disagree (8.50 per cent).

5. It is apparent that about 38.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are disagreed with the dealers provide sponsorships for local and religious festivals followed by strongly disagree (23.00 per cent), neutral (19.25 per cent), strongly agree (11.00 per cent) and agree (8.50 per cent). It is clear that about 37.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers deliver the equipments at free of cost followed by
strongly agree (30.00 per cent), neutral (12.50 per cent), disagree (10.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (9.50 per cent).

6. The results indicate that about 30.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers provides the installation services at free of cost followed by neutral (29.25 per cent), agree (26.00 per cent), strongly disagree (7.75 per cent) and disagree (6.25 per cent). The results show that about 25.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers provide the price discounts followed by agree (22.75 per cent), neutral (18.75 per cent), disagree (17.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (16.00 per cent).

7. It is observed that about 29.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers give promotional gifts followed by agree (25.50 per cent), neutral (20.25 per cent), disagree (12.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (12.25 per cent). It is apparent that about 30.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly disagreed with the dealers participate in trade fairs followed by disagree (25.25 per cent), neutral (25.00 per cent), agree (10.75 per cent) and strongly agree (8.50 per cent).

8. It is clear that about 26.75 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are agreed with the dealers arrange field demonstrations followed by strongly agree (25.00 per cent), neutral (22.25 per cent), strongly disagree (13.50 per cent) and disagree (12.50 per cent). The results reveal that about 35.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are disagreed with the dealers
offer trips and visits followed by strongly disagree (30.75 per cent), neutral (19.00 per cent), agree (8.50 per cent), and strongly agree (6.75 per cent).

9. The results show that about 39.25 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers disseminate the information to the customers about the equipments followed by agree (30.75 per cent), neutral (12.50 per cent), disagree (10.00 per cent) and strongly disagree (7.50 per cent). It is observed that about 35.50 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly agreed with the dealers offer the after sales services followed by agree (33.25 per cent), neutral (14.25 per cent), disagree (9.50 per cent) and strongly disagree (7.50 per cent). It is clear that about 45.00 per cent of the dealers of agricultural equipments are strongly disagreed with the dealers proved the feedback of farmers to the manufacturers followed by agree (28.75 per cent), neutral (10.00 per cent), strongly disagree (9.75 per cent) and disagree (6.00 per cent).

10. The F-value of 878.930 is significant at one per cent level indicating that there is a significant difference in role of dealers in carrying out the sales promotional practices for agricultural equipments. Hence, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference in role of dealers in carrying out the promotional practices for agricultural equipments is rejected.

11. The factor analysis indicates that there are eight independent groups which are extracted accounting for a total of 69.67 per cent of variations on 19 roles. The each of the eight factors contributes to 10.11 per cent, 9.78 per cent, and 9.52 per cent, 9.33 per cent, 8.21 per cent, 8.13 per cent, 7.40 per cent and 7.19 per cent respectively.
12. It is inferred that information provider, advertising, social interaction, outdoor promotion, service provider, demonstration, incentives provider and value addition are the factors determining the role of dealers in carrying out the promotional practices of agricultural equipments.

13. The multiple regression analysis indicates that the coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) is 0.68 and adjusted R^2 is 0.65 indicating the regression model is moderately fit. It is inferred that about 65.00 per cent of the variation in dependent variable (Annual Sales) is explained by the independent variables (Factors Determining the Role of Dealers in Carrying Out the Promotional Practices of Agricultural Equipments). The F-value of 8.026 is significant at one per cent level indicating that the regression model is good fit.

14. The results show that advertising, social interaction, service provider, demonstration and value addition are positively influencing the annual sales of agricultural equipments at one per cent level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant influence of factors determining the role of dealers in carrying out the promotional practices of agricultural equipments on annual sales is rejected.

**7.6. FINDINGS RELATING TO PROBLEMS FACED BY THE DEALERS IN PROMOTING AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENTS**

1. The results show that insufficient irrigation, diversified soil types, seasonal usage of equipments, labour density, inefficient diffusion of technology, non availability of credit facilities, low size of operational holding, rural illiteracy, more number of small farmers and decreasing importance of agriculture are
the problems faced by the dealers in promoting agricultural equipments in the order of importance.

7.7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.7.1 Recommendations to Government:

1. It is highly recommended to extend more credit facilities to the farmers with irrespective of farm holdings for purchasing agricultural equipments through public sector banks or agricultural cooperative banks. Since the credit facility is found to be a major factor for the purchase of agricultural equipment.

2. It is right time that the Government has to bring in a special programme for providing incentives to farmers who have adopted farm equipments and has increased their crop production. The incentive may be given in the form of additional equipment free of cost or with increased subsidy rate from normal 50% to 60%.

3. In order to increase the level of farm mechanization and improve the usage of agricultural equipments, the cooperative farming is necessarily to be encouraged by the government.

4. It is recommended that Farmer’s Self Help Group (SHG) may be formed at Block level and provide with credit facilities through lead banks. The Self Help Group formed is to be provided with skill training to operate agricultural equipment. This SHG may be formed in each block. The SHG has to purchase, use and rent the necessary agricultural equipment based on the local agricultural conditions.

5. It is highly recommended that the present scheme of subsidy for purchasing agricultural equipment is to be continued. The scheme has to cover all possible equipments with selling price more than Rs 1 Lakh.
6. The government has to play a significant role in popularizing agricultural equipment by joining hands along with the manufacturers.

7. It is right time for the government to encourage agricultural equipment manufacturers to manufacture new equipments that is suitable to the small land holding pattern of the country.

8. It is highly recommended that the government has to play a significant role in encouraging higher agricultural activity in the country by devising plans and programme to encourage more youth in agriculture. Since the interest towards agriculture among farmers is declining this is not good for the future of the country.

9. The government has to significantly increase funding pattern for the promotion of research, development and testing of agricultural equipments.

7.7.2 Recommendations to Manufacturers:

1. It is recommended that the manufacturers have to play a significant role in devising agricultural equipments that is suitable for the small land holding pattern of the country.

2. The manufacturers have to join hands with the dealers in undertaking programmes to popularize the usage of agricultural equipments among farming community.

3. In order to popularize the agricultural equipments and increase their sales among the farmers, the manufacturers have to give a significant importance to advertising. The advertising may be created by identifying low cost medium like walls and buildings especially in rural areas, posters, sign boards and point of purchase materials.
4. It is highly recommended that the manufacturers have to devise a contest among dealers who play an active role in demonstration of agricultural equipment. This may be carried out either crop wise or area wise.

5. The manufacturers have to provide hands on training to the dealers about technical details of the equipment, sales training and also about after sales service of equipments.

6. It is highly recommended that the manufacturers should encourage competitions among dealers. The competition has to be designed for propaganda of equipment, sales, better service provided to farmers during the purchase of equipment and also providing better after sales service. The competition has to be designed with respect to area and crop specific equipments.

7. The credit facility provided by the manufacturers as per the findings of the research is not adequate and hence the manufacturers are highly recommended to enhance the credit facility to dealers. This will help the dealers to keep variety of equipments in their showroom and boosts the sale of equipment.

8. It is recommended that the manufacturers should offer promotional gifts, coupons, price reductions, discounts and rebates and premium offers for important agricultural equipments in order to encourage the farmers to purchase them.

9. The manufacturers have to encourage dealers to set their outlets in suitable location which consist of showroom for display of equipment and servicing place for providing after sales service.
10. The promotional measure devised by the manufacturers has to address the technical sophistication of the equipments and hence the amount of understanding required for using them will improve considerably.

11. The manufacturers have to adopt innovative schemes to promote their equipment like providing educational scholarship for the meritorious students of the farmers. This will enhance the image of the manufacturer among the farming community.

12. The manufacturers can join hands with the dealers in sponsoring local festivals.

13. The manufacturers have to arrange field visits for the farmers and also arrange the field days to demonstrate agricultural equipments among the farmers. This will increase awareness level among the farmers.

14. The manufacturers have to develop a contest among the farmers for better utilization of agricultural equipment. It may be organized along with the Dealer and it may be carried out either area or crop wise.

15. The manufacturers will have to share the promotional expenditure along with the respective dealers.

16. The promotional campaign has to be devised professionally by the manufacturers since the promotional effort has to focus on specific objective and to have specific means to achieve the objective.

17. The manufacturers have to insist the dealers to concentrate highly on field demonstration of equipments rather than spending on advertising.

18. The after sales service is not given importance by the dealers and hence the manufacturers have to support the dealer in this regard financially and also technically.
19. The manufacturers are suggested to sponsor radio programmes focusing on agriculture.

20. The manufacturers are strongly recommended to create a promotional campaign with a specific objective by joining hands with a professional promotional agency.

7.7.3 **Recommendations to Dealers:**

1. In order to increase the sales of agricultural equipments, the dealers should increase the number of demonstrations to the farmers as per the findings of the study.

2. The dealers should try to enhance the provision of better after sales services to the farmers.

3. The dealers should increase their interactions with the farmers by sponsoring local and religious festivals.

4. The dealers have to advertise locally by selecting cheaper media like wall paintings, flex printing, notices and local cable television networks in order to spread the information about the availability of equipments to more farmers.

5. It is recommended that the dealers should participate in local trade fairs in order to demonstrate the equipments to farmers.

6. It is recommended that the dealers should increase their concentration in after sales service of equipments which will add revenue to the dealers. The service should be done at the farmers place itself which may increase the confidence level of the farmers.
7. It is right time to popularize the necessary equipments and this has to be jointly taken up by the Manufacturers, Dealers along with Government agencies by identifying a Proactive Farmer’s field to demonstrate the performance of equipment. This will motivate other farmers to engage agricultural equipments in their respective fields.

8. It is highly recommended that the dealers should arrange for free transportation of equipment from the dealer point to the farmer’s premises.

9. The dealers are advised to help the farmers to understand about the technical operations of the equipment by providing proper training.

10. The dealers have to develop better rapport with the local government agencies like agricultural engineering department in helping the farmers to avail governmental aids and support.

7.8. SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The present study being descriptive in nature throws up several interesting research questions which can be taken up by future studies. How to measure impact of dealers role in the level of farm mechanization? What are the preferences of agricultural equipments by the farmers across the demographic, social and economic conditions? Is it possible to replicate/ scale up success of promotional measures adopted by one dealer to other dealers in different locations? What promotional mix strategies need to be employed to enhance the sales of agricultural equipments in different socio-economic environments? With the promising nature of farm mechanisation, the role of Government subsidies for farm mechanisation needs to be revisited.
7.9 CONCLUSION

The majority of the dealers of agricultural equipments are non exclusive dealers and they prefer the agricultural equipments of Mahindra & Mahindra manufacturers. The consumer focus, demand creation, exposure, familiarity, encouragement, reputation, existence and value creation are the factors determining the choice of promotional practices of agricultural equipments by the manufacturers.

The consumer focus, demand creation, familiarity, reputation and value creation are positively influencing the annual sales of agricultural equipments. The most of the dealers of agricultural equipments opine that the expenses for sales promotional practices are met by both manufacturers and dealers.

The information provider, advertising, social interaction, outdoor promotion, service provider, demonstration, incentives provider and value addition are the factors determining the role of dealers in carrying out the sales promotional practices of agricultural equipments. The advertising, social interaction, service provider, demonstration and value addition are positively influencing the annual sales of agricultural equipments.

The insufficient irrigation, diversified soil types, seasonal usage of equipments, labour density, inefficient diffusion of technology, non availability of credit facilities, low size of operational holding, rural illiteracy, more number of small farmers and decreasing importance of agriculture are the problems faced by the dealers in promoting agricultural equipments in the order of importance

“Let us build and promote India through Agriculture”