

The Scenario of Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing Up gradation

Dr.M.Josephin Rangith

*Assistant Professor, Malankara Catholic College, Mariagiri, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu (Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli-627 012, Tamil Nadu, India)

Abstract

Rural marketing is different from the marketing. The required marketing mixes for rural marketing is also different. The marketing mixes required for the successful marketing of product are basically 4ps namely product, price, promotion, and physical distribution. The mixes required for rural marketing is different from that. The present study has made an attempt to identify the important marketing mixes for rural marketing with the help of 33 variables. The score of all 33 variables in Important Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing (IRMFRM) have been included for factor analysis(EFA) to narrate the variables Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing into important RMFRM. The validity of data for EFA has been executed with the help of KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The factor analysis narrated that Availability, Awareness, Affordability and Acceptability are important Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing.

Keywords: Required Marketing Mixes, Rural Marketing.

Introduction

Rural Marketing in Indian economy has always played an influential role in the lives of people. In India leaving out a few metropolitan cities, all the districts and industrial townships are connected with rural markets. The rural market in India is not a separate entity in itself and it is highly influenced by the sociological and behavioral factors operating in the country. The rural markets require a different marketing approach to cater to the needs of the rural customers. The marketing mixes required for the successful marketing of products are basically 4ps namely product, price promotion and physical distribution. The mixes required for rural marketing is

different from that. Since the market structure and consumer behavior in rural marketers are total different from other markets. The marketers should create an awareness and availability of the products at the reach of the consumers in rural markets. The product price should be affordable to the rural consumers. At the same time the resistances to change in rural marketing are higher. Hence the marketers should focus on the acceptability of the consumers.

Statement of Problem

People in rural India are spending more than those in urban areas, according to a study by Accenture, a multinational management consulting, technology services and oil company. Many corporations are recognizing this enormous opportunity and stepping up efforts to gain a strong foothold in India's rural markets. But they are meeting with mixed results. Dynamics of rural markets differ from other market types, and similarly rural marketing strategies are also significantly different from the marketing strategies aimed at an urban or industrial consumer. So, different opportunities and challenges prevail in rural market which needed to be studied spontaneously so as to avoid failure and to face competition. So, in this context, the present study focuses on the present scenario of Indian rural market and its strategic rural marketing practices for future.

Objective

The main objective of the study is to analyze the Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing Up gradation.

Methodology

This study focuses on the southern districts namely Kanniyakumari, Tirunelveli, Tuticorin and Viruthunagar. The determined sample size of farmers and Traders are equally distributed in all four districts. In total 596 farmers are equally distributed in all the districts and hence the sample size in each district in 149 farmers and 94 traders under judgment sampling method.

Collection of Data

The present study is merely based on the primary data. The primary data were collected through a well structured interview schedule. The data were collected from the farmers and Traders who are marketing the produce in the rural markets.

Framework of analysis

The collected data from farmers and traders were analyzed with the help of “t” statistics to find out the significant difference among the farmers and traders regarding their view on strategic rural marketing practices. (EFA) Exploratory Factor Analysis was administered in order to identify important problems and tested with the help of KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity.

Limitations of the study

The present study is subjected to the following limitations:

1. The applied sampling procedure is ‘purposive sampling’ which is non-probabilistic.
2. The scope of the study is confined to only southern part of Tamil Nadu.
3. The variables related to the various constructs developed in the present study are based on the review of previous studies.

Required Marketing Mixes For Future Rural Marketing (RMFRM)

Since the rural marketing is different from the marketing, the required marketing mixes for rural marketing is also different. The present study has made an attempt to identify the important marketing mixes for rural marketing with the help of 33 variables. The marketers are asked to rate these variables at five point scale. The mean score of variables in RMFRM among the farmers and traders have been computed separately along with its ‘t’ statistics.

Table No 1.1

View on variables in Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing (RMFRM)

S.no	Variables in RMFRM	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Farmers	Traders	
1	Value for money	3.9968	3.4011	2.5173*
2	Variety of package sizes	3.4183	3.9776	-2.9997*
3	Awareness campaigns	3.8942	3.3088	2.5149*
4	Using company delivery vans	3.0884	3.6886	-2.7384*
5	Value concisions	3.3086	3.8547	-2.4773*
6	Service on wheels	3.2142	3.8664	-2.6546*
7	Reduce resistance to change	3.8969	3.4103	2.4664*
8	Value add work	3.9045	3.4245	2.5042*
9	Lot savvier	3.1178	3.7641	-2.6558*
10	Campaign with panchayat members	3.9245	3.3089	2.6845*
11	Imaginative ideas	3.8919	3.4083	2.4546*
12	Small stock keeping units	3.3028	3.9085	-2.7341*
13	Utilization of rural folks	3.9143	3.4117	2.5117*
14	Innovative distribution models	3.3141	3.9089	-2.6784*
15	Popular value added services	3.9616	3.5117	2.4713*
16	Create opinion leaders	3.8449	3.4024	2.4996*
17	Ease of buying	3.4122	3.9696	2.5669*

Significant at five per cent level

The above table shows the mean score of first 17 variables in RMFRM among the farmers and traders along with its 't' statistics. The highly viewed variables in RMFRM by farmers are popular value added services and campaign with pan chary at members since its mean scores is 3.9616 and 3.9245 respectively. Among the traders, these two variables are variety of package sizes and ease of buying since its mean scores are 3.9776 and 3.9696 respectively. The significant difference among the farmers and traders have been noticed in their

view on 16 out of 17 variables in RMFRM since its 't' statistics are significant at five percent level.

The mean score of last 16 variables in RMFRM among the farmers and traders have been computed separately along with its 't' statistics. The results are shown in table no 5.23

Table No 1.2

Marketers' view on variables in Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing (RMFRM)

S.no	Variables in RMFRM	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Farmers	Traders	
18	Nano technology	3.8868	3.4082	2.4133*
19	Connect SHGS with business opportunities	3.4086	3.9676	-2.5242*
20	Syndicated distribution	3.3141	3.8664	-2.7631*
21	Door-to-door programmes	3.9676	3.3085	2.6969*
22	Low priced variant	3.8969	3.3996	2.5173*
23	Partnership with existing public sector banks	3.8546	3.4014	2.4997*
24	Temporary skills in rural melas	3.3082	3.8997	-2.5146*
25	Rural marketing vehicle	3.2117	3.8646	-2.6084*
26	Low priced products	3.3082	3.8996	-2.6896*
27	Continuous availability of product	3.1819	3.7514	-2.5904*
28	Direct selling	3.2409	3.8919	-2.6696*
29	Dedicated rural vertical running	3.8908	3.3848	-2.5818*
30	Product penetration	3.4117	3.9642	-2.5817*
31	Rural distribution network	3.3089	3.8441	-2.5886*
32	Smaller packs	3.3088	3.9673	-2.6996*
33	Tie up with post office for creating awareness	3.8414	3.3082	2.5841*

Significant at five per cent level

The highly viewed variables in RMFRM by the farmers are door to door programmers and low priced variant since its mean scores are 3.9676 and 3.8969 respectively. Among the traders, these two are smaller packs and connect SHGS with business opportunities since its mean scores are 3.9673 and 3.9676 respectively. The significant difference among the farmers and traders have been noticed in their view on all last 16 variables in RMFRM since its 't' statistics are significant at five percent level.

Important Required Marketing Mixes For Future Rural Marketing (IRMFRM)

The score of all 33 variables in IRMFRM have been included for factor analysis (EFA) to narrate the variables into important RMFRM. The validity of data for EFA have been executed with the help of KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's' test of sphericity. Both these two tests satisfy the validity of data for EFA. The factor analysis results in four important RMFRM. The Eigen value and the percent of variation explained by IRMFRM are illustrated in table no 5.24.

Table No 1.3

Important Required Marketing Mixes for Future Rural Marketing (IRMFRM)

S.No	IRMFRM	No.of Variable in	Eigen Value	Percent of Variation Explained	Cumulative Percent Of Variation Explained
1	Availability	11	7.8224	23.70	23.70
2	Awareness	9	4.9083	14.87	38.57
3	Affordability	7	4.1132	12.46	51.03
4	Acceptability	6	3.9673	12.02	63.05
KMO measure of sampling adequacy: 0.7089			Batlelts test of sphericity: Chi-square test: 81.83		

The first two IRMFRM narrated by factor analysis are availability and awareness since its eigen value are 7.8224 and 4.9083 respectively. The percent of variation explained by these two IRMFRM are 23.70 and 14.87 percent respectively. The next two IRMFRM identified by the factor analysis are affordability and acceptability since its Eigen values are 4.1132 and

3.9673 respectively. The percent of variation explained by these two IRMFRM are 12.46 and 12.02 percent respectively. The narrated four IRMFRM have been included for further analysis. The narrated four IRMFRM explain the 33 variables in RMFRM to an extent of 63.05 percent.

Summary of Findings

The required marketing mixes for future rural marketing in the present study is studied with the help of 33 variables. The highly viewed variables by farmers are door to door programmes and popular value added service. Among the traders, these two variables are variety of package sizes and connect SHGS with business opportunities. The significant differences among the farmers and traders have been noticed in their view on 32 out of 33 variables in it. The important RMFRM narrated by the factor analysis are availability, awareness, affordability and acceptability.

The highly correlated variables in availability and awareness are syndicated distribution and door to door programmes respectively. In the case of affordability and acceptability, these variables are smaller packs and low priced variant respectively. The highly viewed important RMFRM by the farmers are awareness and acceptability whereas among the traders, these two are affordability and availability. The significant differences among the farmers and traders have been noticed in their view on all four important RMFRM. The significantly associating important profile variables regarding the view on important RMFRM are age, marital status, personal income, family income, occupational background and personality score. The discriminate IRMFRM among the farmers and traders are affordability and awareness. The affordability highly viewed by the traders whereas the awareness is highly viewed by the farmers.

Conclusion

The present study concludes that the rural marketers have plenty of opportunities. The marketers are advised to formulate appropriate rural marketing mixes namely availability, awareness, affordability and acceptability in order to position their products in a successful manner.

References

1. Kumar, S.A. and Madhavi, C. (2006), "Rural marketing for FMCG, **Indian Journal of Marketing**, vol-36(4), pp.19-38.
2. Sarangapani,A. and Mamath.t. (2008), "Rural Consumer: post purchase behavior and Consumer behavior", **The ICFAI Journal of Management Research**,vol.7(9), pp.37-67.
3. Bhatt, Rajeshwari G. And Jaiswal, M.C. (1986), "A study of an advertising impact and consumer reation". **Indian Journal of Marketing**, vol.18(9), pp.9-16.
4. Sayulu,k. and RamanaReddy,V.V (1996), "socio-economic influence on rural consumer behavior-an empirical study", **Management Research**, vol.3(1),pp.41-51.
5. Zhao.Y, (1994), "**Price dispersion and Retailer Behavior**", doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, vol.7(2), pp.1-8.
6. Devi Prasad Kotni (2012), " Prospects and Problems of Indian rural markets", **Zenith International Journal of Business Economic and Management Research**,2(3), pp.200-213.
7. Ranjananasharma (2014), "Rural marketing in India: opportunities and challenges", **Zenith International Journal of Business Economics and Management Research**,4(1), pp.17-22.
8. Ahmed Ashfaque (2013), Rural marketing strategies for selling productsservices:ismes& challenges", **Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research**, 2(1), pp.55-60.
9. Kalotra, Anil (2013), "Rural marketing potential in India-an analytical study", **International journal of advanced research in computer science and software engineering**, 3(1), pp.1-10.
10. Pedhiwal, A.C, Pantay Arora, J,H,vyas(2009), "Changing rural market and role of marketers", **International Referred Research Journal**, 2(9), pp.29-30.
11. Shubangi Rajput, Bhanat Siddhartha and Sanjeev. Shukala (2011), "Problems and Prospects for marketing of rural products: an empirical study

of tribal regions (India), **VSRD International Journal of Business & Management Research**, 1(10), pp.616-623.

12. Phanidrakumar and Swamy, “Indian rural market opportunities and challenges” **TRAS Asian Journal of Marketing and Management Research**, 2(2), pp.40-47.