



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.



Study on Promotional Strategy of Syngenta Product Amistar in Hoshiarpur District of Punjab, India

Ranjeet Singh Kumawat ^{a++*} and Nitin Barker ^{a#}

^a Department of Agricultural Economics, Naini Agriculture Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj-211 007, U.P., India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2023/v41i102156

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/102827>

Original Research Article

Received: 27/06/2023

Accepted: 01/09/2023

Published: 04/09/2023

ABSTRACT

Bases on information gathered from 176 respondents, a study carried out in the Hoshiarpur area of Punjab state discovered numerous Amistar fungicide promotional methods. The study's main goal was to determine how best to market fungicide to farmers. It is revealed that out of total respondent's major number falls under the age group of 30- 50 years that is 94 respondents, and it was found land holding has a direction relation between the income level of the respondents and also the education level. The study showed that respondents gave the primary preference to Amistar Fungicide of by Syngenta Market potential is the maximum amount of sales that might be available to all the firms in a pesticide industry during a given period, under a given level of pesticide industry marketing efforts and environmental conditions. Grain crops is the major crop in Mukerian Block in which Amistar is used for use, so the market potential is calculated considering Maize crop acreage.

⁺⁺ Research Scholar;

[#] Assistant Professor;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: ranjeetsinghkumawat5@gmail.com;

when it comes the preferred promotional tools, the response was in the favour of farmer meeting. Demonstration, company's person visit, wall poster, literature display, phone call, van campaign were ranked second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh respectively. The response was in the favour of billboards with a total number of 57(32.40%) followed by the television, radio and social media. Other sources were television, radio, newspaper and social media.

Keywords: Promotional strategy; fungicides; promotional tools.

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective management of inputs including high yielding variety seeds, irrigation, fertilisers, and crop protection agents is essential to supplying the world's growing demand for food and feed. Fungicide act as a protective umbrella for the other inputs and they play a crucial role in crop protection because in the absence of recommended chemical usage, the beneficial effects of these inputs become nullified if there is a serious attack of pests and diseases on the crop [1].

Fungicides are pesticides that kill or prevent the growth of fungi and their spores. They can be used to control fungi that damage plants, including rusts, mildews and blights. They might also be used to control mold and mildew in other settings. Fungicides work in a variety of ways, but most of them damage fungal cell membranes or interfere with energy production within fungal cells [2-4].

Over the past ten years, the rural market has undergone significant upheaval. The rural market was less organised ten years ago, and business did not prioritise it as a target market. Very few businesses, primarily those with an agricultural focus, were specialising in these areas. There are no cutting-edge marketing initiatives or techniques. There existed a distribution system, but it was weak. Other issues contributing to the inadequate reach of goods and lesser level of knowledge among peasants included illiteracy and a lack of technology [5-7]. Corporate gradually came to the realisation that demand was growing in rural areas while the metropolitan market was becoming saturated, competitive, and cluttered. They began concentrating on these underserved, high potential areas after realising the enormous potential of the 75% of Indians who live in rural areas. As a result, retail establishments that stock goods from diverse brands and categories have appeared in almost all of the settlements. Furthermore, since large groups of the target demographic can be reached at the same time and location, high congregation venues like fairs, haats, markets,

etc. are proving to be effective marketing tools. Marketing heavily relies on location [8-12].

Syngenta has a rich legacy originating from a tradition that goes back several decades in India. The track record starting from CIBA, Sandoz, ICI to its present form has been one of the exemplary corporate citizenships and partnerships in India. We are amongst the first few companies to improve farm productivity and lives of Indian farmers offering services from 'Kashmir to Kanyakumari'. As Syngenta we have been operating in India since the year 2000.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

There are 23 District in Punjab state and district name Hoshiarpur. Hoshiarpur District of Punjab was selected purposively for the present study and summer internship training on the basis of maximum area under Maize cultivation. There were 10 Blocks in district Hoshiarpur block Mukerian was selected purposively for the study. Because it occupies prestigious place in maize cultivation. Then all the villages were arranged in descending order on the basis of cultivated area of maize and 5 were selected randomly.

From the selected village list of all the maize cultivators obtained from the village development office in each selected village. For the selection of cultivators from families were listed and about 10% farmers were randomly selected from each village and then farmers were classified in to five groups.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 revealed that size of the farms group in numbers for marginal, small, semi- medium, medium and large size farms Group were 19, 35, 58, 43, and 21 farms group respectively. Altogether 176 farms group were selected for study.

The Table 1 shows that in the studied area respondents of age group 20-30 were 28 farmers, age group 30-40 were 50 farmers, age group 40-50 were 44 farmers, age group 50-60

were 31 farmers and age group above 60 were 23 farmers.

The data about literacy level of respondent in the study area. There were 49 farmers illiterate from which 9 farmers were marginal, 13 farmers were small, 15 farmers were semi-medium, 7 farmers were medium and 5 farmers were large group, and 127 farmers literate from which 10 farmers were marginal, 22 farmers were small, 43 farmers were semi-medium, 36 farmers were medium and 16 farmers were large group in the study area. 24 farmers have education primary school level from which 5 farmers are marginal, 5 farmers are small group, 8 farmers are semi-medium, 4 farmers are medium group and 2 farmers are large group in the study area.

In this Table 1 46 farmers were 8 marginal size land holding, 10 small size land holding, 15 farmers were semi- medium size land holding group, 9 farmers were medium size land holding group and 4 farmers were large size land holding up to 100000 thousand income/year.

Up to 100000-200000 income/ year there were 71 farmers in study area from which 7 farmers

were marginal, 17 farmers were small, 27 farmers were semi-medium, 15 farmers were medium and 5 farmers were large group. 200000 and above income/year there were 59 farmers in the study area from which 4 farmers were marginal, 8 farmers were small, 16 farmers were semi-medium, 19 farmers were medium and 12 farmers were large group.

Primary occupation for marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of farm group was 9.52%, 20%, 33.34%, 25.71% and 11.43% respectively. secondary occupation for marginal, small, semi- medium, medium and large size of farm group was 12.68%, 19.72%, 32.39%, 22.53% and 12.68% respectively.

In this Table 1 there were 133 farmers that comes under irrigated area from which 14 farmers were marginal, 26 farmers were small, 43 farmers were semi-medium, 33 farmers were medium and 17 farmers were large group. 43 farmers comes under partially irrigated area from which 5 farmers were marginal, 9 farmers were small, 15 farmers were semi-medium, 10 farmers were medium and 4 farmers were large group.

Table 1. Socio profile of respondents

| S. No. | Gender | Size group | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Marginal | | Small | | Semi-medium | | medium | | Large | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| I | Male | 12 | 9.75 | 24 | 19.51 | 40 | 32.52 | 31 | 25.2 | 16 | 13.02 |
| II | Female | 7 | 13.22 | 11 | 20.75 | 18 | 33.96 | 12 | 22.64 | 5 | 9.43 |
| Age of respondents | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | 20-30 | 4 | 21.05 | 5 | 14.29 | 9 | 15.52 | 7 | 16.28 | 3 | 14.29 |
| II | 30-40 | 5 | 26.32 | 11 | 31.43 | 16 | 27.59 | 12 | 27.91 | 6 | 28.57 |
| III | 40-50 | 4 | 21.05 | 8 | 22.86 | 15 | 25.86 | 10 | 23.26 | 7 | 33.33 |
| IV | 50-60 | 3 | 15.79 | 6 | 17.14 | 11 | 18.97 | 8 | 18.60 | 3 | 14.29 |
| V | 60 & above | 3 | 15.79 | 5 | 14.29 | 7 | 12.07 | 6 | 13.95 | 2 | 9.52 |
| Education level | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Illiterate | 9 | 18.36 | 13 | 26.53 | 15 | 30.61 | 7 | 14.28 | 5 | 10.22 |
| 2 | Literate | 10 | 7.87 | 22 | 17.35 | 43 | 33.85 | 36 | 28.34 | 16 | 12.59 |
| I | Primary school | 5 | 20.83 | 5 | 20.83 | 8 | 33.33 | 4 | 16.66 | 2 | 8.33 |
| II | Junior high school | 5 | 16.12 | 6 | 19.35 | 10 | 32.25 | 7 | 22.58 | 3 | 9.67 |
| III | high school | 3 | 6.12 | 10 | 20.4 | 17 | 34.69 | 14 | 28.57 | 5 | 10.2 |
| IV | intermediate | 4 | 11.11 | 8 | 22.22 | 12 | 33.33 | 8 | 22.22 | 4 | 11.11 |
| V | graduate | 2 | 5.55 | 6 | 16.66 | 11 | 30.55 | 10 | 27.77 | 7 | 19.44 |
| Annual Income | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | Up to 100000 | 8 | 17.39 | 10 | 21.74 | 15 | 32.61 | 9 | 19.57 | 4 | 8.69 |
| II | 100000 to 200000 | 7 | 9.86 | 17 | 23.94 | 27 | 38.03 | 15 | 21.12 | 5 | 7.05 |
| III | 200000 and above | 4 | 6.78 | 8 | 13.56 | 16 | 27.12 | 19 | 32.21 | 12 | 20.33 |
| Occupation Pattern | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | (Primary occupation) | 10 | 9.52% | 21 | 20% | 35 | 33.34% | 27 | 25.71% | 12 | 11.43 |
| II | (Secondary occupation) | 9 | 12.68% | 14 | 19.72 | 23 | 32.39% | 16 | 22.53% | 9 | 12.68 |
| Cropping Pattern | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | Irrigated | 14 | 10.52 | 26 | 19.54 | 43 | 32.33 | 33 | 24.81 | 17 | 12.79 |
| II | Partially irrigated | 5 | 11.62 | 9 | 20.93 | 15 | 34.89 | 10 | 23.25 | 4 | 9.3 |

Table 2. To analyse promotional strategies involved in marketing of Amistar

| Promotional tools | Number | Percentage |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Farmers meeting | 222 | 40% |
| Demo | 74 | 13% |
| Phone call | 60 | 11% |
| Literature display | 70 | 12% |
| Van camping | 45 | 8% |
| Wall painting/postering | 38 | 7% |
| Company people/ person | 51 | 9% |
| Production Method | Frequency | Percentage |
| Newspaper | 25 | 14.2 |
| Radio | 28 | 15.9 |
| Television | 32 | 18.19 |
| Social Media | 25 | 14.2 |
| Billboards | 57 | 32.4 |
| Others (If any) | 9 | 5.11 |

Table 3. Brand awareness of Amistar

| S. No. | Attributes | Number | Percentage |
|--------|------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| 1 | Have not heard about it | 45 | 12.86% |
| 2 | Have heard about it but never used | 95 | 27.14% |
| 3 | Seen result in other farmers field | 70 | 20% |
| 4 | Used it | 140 | 40% |
| | Total | 350 | 100% |

Table 4. Constrains encountered by marketers in marketing of Amistar fungicide

| S. No. | Particular | Percentage |
|--------|--|------------|
| 1 | Knowledge of quality | 55.21% |
| 2 | frequent price fluctuation | 61.27% |
| 3 | High transportation cost | 44.91% |
| 4 | Lack of availability of market information at farm level | 63.33% |
| 5 | lack of storage facility | 57.48% |
| 6 | Lack of amenities and facilities | 39.68% |

3.1 To Analyses Promotional Strategies Involved in Marketing of Amistar

Out of total sample size, 40 percent farmers responded that farmer meeting is the best source of information to them. The more fascinating fact is that 98.5 percent of farmers who considered Farmer meeting as the best source also believed that Company People (Individual Contact) helps them to update their knowledge regarding recent agronomic practices in mentha. When asked specifically regarding the Demo, 100 percent of the respondent said that every company must practice it and Demo creates good will among Farmers. The respondents did not know much about Display items such as Cut-outs, Promo gates, Poster, cubes etc. as they had not observed such items at the shop of retailer. Wall paintings and trolley paintings are virtually inexistent in Case of pesticide market.

The above clarified that out of total respondents' billboards are the most preferred method in the studied area which are more visible to the respondents with the frequency of 57. After this

television, radio holds second and third while newspaper and social medial combinely holds fourth position while few told others promotional methods.

3.2 Brand Awareness of Amistar

By interviewing and observation, it was seen that out of three hundred fifty farmer 40% percent of surveyed population is using whereas other 27.14% of farmers have either heard about it but never used. there are still 12.86% of population have not heard about the product, and 20% of farmers have seen results in other farmers field.

3.3 The Constrains Encountered by Marketers in Marketing of Amistar Fungicide

Most of the Respondents expressed that major constraint was identified that Lack of availability of market information at farm level and was assigned first rank followed frequent price fluctuation, lack of storage facility (III), Knowledge of quality (IV), High transportation

cost (V), and finally Lack of amenities and facilities which assigned least rank i.e. (VI) respectively.

4. CONCLUSION

It is concluded that the study showed that respondents gave the primary preference to Amistar Fungicide of by Syngenta Market potential is the maximum amount of sales that might be available to all the firms in a pesticide industry during a given period, under a given level of pesticide industry marketing efforts and environmental conditions. Grain crops is the major crop in Mukerian Block in which Amistar is used for use, so the market potential is calculated considering Maize crop acreage. when it comes the preferred promotional tools, the response was in the favour of farmer meeting. Demonstration, company's person visit, wall poster, literature display, phone call, van campaign were ranked second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh respectively. The response was in the favour of billboards with a total number of 57(32.40%) followed by the television, radio and social media. Other sources were television, radio, newspaper and social media.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Brithal et al. Beneficial effects of these inputs become nullified if there is a serious attack of pests and diseases on the crop; 2003.
2. Aggarwal C, Subbian K. Evolutionary network analysis: A survey. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR). 2014;47(1):1-36.
3. Barik. Cotton statistics at a glance. Directorate of cotton development, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, Mumbai, Maharashtra; 2010.
4. Pandey G. Evaluation of sales promotional tools adopted by sinochem India Company Private Limited in Kapurthala district of Punjab. Summer Internship Report submitted to IABM, SKRAU, Bikaner; 2009.
5. Kolishetti N, Dhar S, Valencia PM, Lin LQ, Karnik R, Lippard SJ, Farokhzad OC. Engineering of self-assembled nanoparticle platform for precisely controlled combination drug therapy. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107(42):17939-17944.
6. Anonymous. Agrochemical; 2014. Available: [http:// en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Agrochemical](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agrochemical) on 17th October, 2019.
7. Barik. Cotton statistics at a glance. Directorate of cotton development, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, Mumbai, Maharashtra; 2010. Available: www.dacnet.nic.in on 8th July 2019.
8. Bhardwaj T, Sharma JP. Impact of pesticides application in agricultural industry: An Indian scenario. International Journal of Agriculture and Food Science Technology; 2013.
9. Ghaswa R, Tripathy S, Sharma B. Knowledge adoption and constraints of soil health card-based fertilizer application in ratlam district, M.P., Indian Journal of Extension Education; 2019.
10. Kothari CR. Research methodology: Methods and techniques. (3rd Edition, New Age International (P) Ltd., New Delhi); 2013.
11. Solanki VV, Patel JB, Jani Sunny. Relationship between reading behavior of krushijivan farm magazine subscriber livestock owners and their profile; 2016.
12. Venugopal Pingali, Kaundinya Ram. Agri-input Marketing in India (1st Edition, SAGE Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi); 2014.

© 2023 Kumawat and Barker; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/102827>