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CHAPTER - VII

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF KANYAKUMARI AND TIRUNELVELI DISTRICTS

7.1. Profile characters of farmers

A separate questionnaire was administered to 50 farmers in Kanyakumari district and 50 farmers in Tirunelveli district. The purpose of the questionnaire was to know the competency or otherwise of these farmers in dealing with the business.

7.1.1. Age

As far as the age is concerned the respondents are in higher age group in Kanyakumari district than their counter parts in Tirunelveli district.

7.1.2. Education

In the case of education, there is a significant difference in the mean level between the two districts, which indicates that the Kanyakumari district has higher education level than their counter parts in Tirunelveli district.
7.1.3. Gender

Comparison of the gender participation reveals that in Kanyakumari district there is almost 50 percent participation by the women whereas it is only 33 percent in Tirunelveli district. The reason might be that in Kanyakumari district the accessibility to the land is very high due to the closeness. As for most of them, the lands are within one Kilometre radius. Apart from accessibility, in many cases they are forced to do it since men go to longer distances for employment. In the case of Tirunelveli district people have to go to longer distance to the farms. There has been no farming operations in the residential areas. Moreover, the size of the farms are larger in Tirunelveli district due to lesser per unit level of cost, whereas in Kanyakumari District, due to the higher value in the residential areas, normally, the farm size is small.

7.1.4. Major occupation

Comparison of the major occupation reveals that in Kanyakumari District only 44 percent of the respondents have agriculture as major occupation, whereas in Tirunelveli District it is 80 percent. As discussed earlier, in Kanyakumari District since the accessibility is very high, they might attend to farming during leisure time as well. This is sufficient in this District since there is only need for watering. The frequent rainfall
save their labour on irrigation. In the case of Tirunelveli District, there is only scattered rainfall. Hence, farming depends only on canal irrigation or pumping from deep wells. Both need personal attendance and hence people involved in agriculture cannot go for any other employment.

7.1.5. Loan in Co-operative Societies

Comparison of the scores reveals that in Kanyakumari District there is 100 percent, which means that all the respondents have availed loan, whereas in Tirunelveli district it is 84 percent. Thus, as far as the returns on yield is concerned, the farmers in Kanyakumari district have higher edge over their count part in Tirunelveli district, due to regular monsoon - both South-West and North-East monsoon seasons, in Kanyakumari district.

7.1.6. Land holding

Comparison reveals that there is no dry land cultivation among the respondents in the Kanyakumari District. The average size of the wet land in Tirunelveli District is three times than that in Kanyakumari District. In the case of garden land it is almost equal. The higher level of dry land in the Tirunelveli district might be due to the non availability of the surface and ground water. The low level of the average in the
Tirunelveli district for garden land also might be due to the non availability of the under ground water in the reachable levels.

7.1.7. Usage of Farm Yard manure

All the respondents from both the districts use farm yard manure. This is due to the regular availability.

7.1.8. Use of Chemical Fertilizer

All the respondents in both the districts use chemical fertilizer.

7.1.9. Preference to Chemical fertilizer

Majority of the Kanyakumari district respondents have expressed easy availability, as the major reason. In Kanyakumari District the peculiarity is that except the house area all other parts will normally be occupied by plants. Apart from this, there is no scarcity of water anywhere at anytime. Cultivation needs higher order of manuring and here the farmyard manure is costlier since the availability is also limited. This might have made them to go for the chemical fertilizers which are easily available to them. Even the farmers, who use farmyard manure here get it mostly from Tirunelveli District which involve higher transportation cost. In the case of Tirunelveli district, the major reason is
immediacy of return. In this district, farmyard manure is very cheap and are available in plenty. Hence, the question of availability does not arise for this district and here the farmers are more concerned about their returns.

7.1.10. Reason for choosing branded fertilizer

In Kanyakumari District maximum percentage of the respondent are concerned about the availability of the fertilizer whereas in Tirunelveli District the farmers are more concerned about the immediate effect on the soil. In Kanyakumari District there is shortage of farmyard manure. At least 60 percent of the consumption, is from Tirunelveli district as evidenced by the lorry load coming through Tirunelveli - Kanyakumari high ways. Their need is mostly met by the Tirunelveli District, since in Tirunelveli cultivation is only seasonal. Hence, there has been accumulation of farm yard manure in the off seasons but in Kanyakumari District since the major crops are coconut and bananas, there is no season for it and hence the consumption is satisfied by the off season stock in Tirunelveli District. Regarding the quality, Kanyakumari District people are more concerned than Tirunelveli District. Regarding packing, least importance is given in both the districts.
7.1.11. Sources of brand information

Comparison of the sources of brand information reveals that irrespective of the districts, mass media stands as the primary source, second comes the neighbour, and third the dealers. Thus, for higher brand information, producers should attempt to attract the customers primarily through mass media.

7.1.12. Farmers Preference to Dealers

Comparison of the results of the two districts show that the choice of the preference is identical in both the districts as in the case of source of brand information. Since the two districts are adjacent, probably their thinking also might be identical. It is interesting to note that the quality occupies the first place. Probably people who have good resources would have preferred the quality and those who have opted for the price reduction might be in the marginal level of income so that a small amount of reduction might add more in their budget. People who have opted for the availability of credit might be the marginal farmers and way out for them might be the credit. It is also interesting to note that discount and subsidy have not affected anybody in the case of fertilizer demand in the two districts.
7.1.13. Farmers' loyalty towards brand

The result reveals that as in the case of dealer preference, here also, in both the Districts the majority of the farmers have given priority to quality. The second priority is for the ready availability, and third comes the package and none for quantity. Thus, the result combined with the earlier reasons for dealer preference reveals that whether it is in the choice for the dealer or that for the fertilizer, the majority of the respondents are for the quality first and in the case of brand preference they choose the availability as the second and third comes the package.

In order to know the real situation, Kendall’s co-efficient of concordance was used to test the consistency or otherwise of the respondents towards dealer preference and brand preference.

The respondents have been asked to rank their reason for dealer preference in term of: availability of preferred brand, technical guidance from him, price of the product, peer groups influence, and discount and subsidy. The ranks given by the respondents in Kanyakumari district and Tirunelveli district were analysed separately, since there were no-ties in the ranks, directly the concordance was calculated. The calculated values of concordance for Tirunelveli district, is 0.483 and in the case of
Kanyakumari district, it is 0.591. Both of them are significant at one percent level of probability indicating that the respondents choice of preference is almost identical in both the districts. It is more consistent in the case of Kanyakumari district.

In the case of respondents reasons for the preference of a particular brand also the respondent have been asked to rank their preference separately district wise. The ranks given were subjected to Kendall’s co-efficient of concordance. The calculated value of Kendall’s co-efficient of concordance is $W = 0.562$ for Tirunelveli district and it is $W = 0.399$ for Kanyakumari District. In both the cases, the concordance is significant at one percent level of probability indicating the fact that as in the case of brand preference, here also the reasons are almost identical to both the districts. Thus, the brand preference is a factor which is perceived equally by almost all the respondents.

7.2. Profile Characteristics of the Dealers

A separate questionnaire was administered to 50 dealers in Kanyakumari, and 50 dealers in Tirunelveli district. The purpose of the questionnaire was to know the competency or otherwise of these dealers in dealing with the business.
7.2.1. Education

Comparison of the level of education shows that as in the case of farmers, in dealers also the education level is much higher in Kanyakumari District than their counter part in the Tirunelveli district. Though in comparison with the Tirunelveli District, the dealers of Kanyakumari district are more educated this is below the level of the consumers in this district. This might probably be due to the fact that in Kanyakumari district the fertilizer dealership has been maintained by rich people over a long period of time. In this district people who are rich normally do not care much for education since they have other sources of income. This might be the reason for the low level of education of the dealers in the Kanyakumari district.

7.2.2. Experience

Comparison of the experience in dealership show that it is higher in Kanyakumari District. One speciality of the Kanyakumari district is that in the villages, mostly, the dealers keep a portion of their house as the business spot. Whenever there is a customer, the request will be fulfilled by any one in the house. During off seasons they can attend to other works also. In the case of Tirunelveli district, the fertilizer shop are located in commercial centres, wherein one has to be there from morning
till evening. Another point is that in Kanyakumari district most of the dealers are in the profession for second generation. Might be these are the reasons for higher experience for the dealers in this district.

7.2.3. Number of employees employed

There is no difference between the two districts. In the small shops on an average the number employed is 2 persons. And in the case of big shops, on an average they employ 3 persons in both the districts. Since employment need regular payment, irrespective of the district they restrict it to the minimum level.

7.2.4. Brand of fertilizer stocking

The only difference is that the Kothari brand is sold only in Kanyakumari district and not in Tirunelveli district. All the other seven brands are sold in both the districts.

7.2.5. Sales Turnover

Though there is difference in quantity of sales, the pattern is identical as far as brands are concerned. The low average level in the Kanyakumari District might be due to the low level of the total cultivable land in this district, when compared with the Tirunelveli district. Though
Kanyakumari District is the smallest district in Tamilnadu and Tirunelveli district is one of the largest, the consumption per unit area is higher in Kanyakumari district.

7.2.6. Functional Analysis

The comparison of the results obtained through the functional analysis show that the variable price per bag is significant at five percent level in both the districts. That is, in both the districts it is indicated that the farmers are not bothered about the price of the fertilizers. Since the co-efficient for quality of the product is significant at one percent level of probability in both the districts, it implies that irrespective of the price per bag, farmers are concerned more about quality of the fertilizer in both the districts. Again the Co-efficient for package is also equally significant at one percent level in both the districts. This implies that, in both the districts good packing also create brand loyalty on the consumers. Might be, a good packing reduces the loss in transportation. Moreover the cover used for packing also can be reused. Thus, the reusage and minimisation of loss on transportation together would have induced loyalty to the brand. The co-efficient for the variable amount spent on advertisement is significant at 5 percent level of probability in both the districts. This might be due to the fact that good advertisements also have
positive effect on brands, in both the districts. The peer group has no impact on Brand loyalty.

Thus, the study on the whole reveals that as far as the Brand loyalty for fertilizer is concerned the respondents opinion is identical in both the districts. In both the districts, the study confirms that the major factors influencing the brand loyalty of fertilizer are: quality of the product, good package, and to a smaller extend advertisements.