A STUDY OF PERCEIVED MARKETING PERFORMANCE OF COIR INDUSTRIES IN THANJAVUR DISTRICT.
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Abstract- production constrains and marketing abilities have significant influence on the perceived marketing performance (PMP) and these study variable explains 32% variance of Coir owner PMP and financial factor is only variable has negative influence on PMP.
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Introduction

The coir industry in India has its origin in Kerala, which is considered as the home of Indian coir industry where the raw material is available at blandly. Other state like, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa etc., shows rapid growth in last three decades. Where the industry is mostly confined to extraction of fiber from raw Coconut husk by Mechanical decortications with the determinant effort, encouragement and assistance provided by the concerned state government, central government and the efforts of the enterprising entrepreneurs in these regions. India’s main coir products are; Coir pith, Coir Fibre, Tufted mat, Handloom mat, Geo textiles, Cured coir, Coir yarn, Handloom matting, Rubberized coir, and Coir Rope.

Research problem

India has a long coastline with spread coconut palms, growth of coir industry in other coastal states has been insignificant. Not more than 50 per cent of the coconut husks is utilized in the coir industry, the remaining being used as fuel in rural areas. The board plans to enhance the raw material utilisation to a level of 60% of its availability in next five years. Radhakrishnan said, the coir industry has to undergo a paradigm shift towards technology advancement, increasing productivity and improvement in working conditions (https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/).

Theoretical background of the study

Coir industries several marketing problems issues being noticed and address by many authors namely : selling through govt agencies not being profitable for coir units (Pillai, Muralidhar,& Naidu., 1986; Bordoloi, 2020); Poor commercialization is the main coir units issue (Rosairo, Kawamura, & Peiris, 2004); coir product marketing is affected by increased
cost of transportation and dealer margins (Saranya, 2016); supply chain issues (Karuppiah & Gomathinayagam, 2017); coir units follows outdated marketing methods (Mohamed & Hameed, 2003); marketing performance of coir units being affected by intermediaries (Pillai, 2000). Another major issues is domestic market dropped that rate to below 40% and this is much supportive for coir industry (website http://coirboard.gov.in/?page_id=127). The composite average growth rate was only 1.5% for last 13 years and this not accepted as leading country in coir export. In the year 2006, Indian coir export was 5, 09, 500 tones even after 13 years it has reached only 5, 89, 250 tones only. The present research found gap in literature, especially perceived production performance and how it being affected by the various production issues such as production constrains, financial constraints, labour factor, and owner personal factor.

Objective of this research

To study the major factors influence in perceived marketing performance of Coir units

To offer suggestions for improving the marketing and overall performance of coir industry.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Study Area

The study is carriedout in Thanajvur District and it has eight Talukas; the present study centered four Talukas and considered this are key area to collected sample. The three Talukas are Pattukkottai, Peravurani, and Orathanadu,
Sample size

The primary data were together from 157 responses from Coir units (Entrepreneurs) but 0 154 were finalized for analysis (rest of them was imperfect). The information was collected through questionnaire method

Measured structural equation model (MSEM)

The present research also applies MSEM. Before run MSEM, explorative factor analysis and confirmative factor analysis (CFA) need to run and both of this analysis was executed with help of AMOS and SPSS software. These provide to conformation in loading particular variables. CFA was executed to confirm convergent and discriminant validities in order to validate the extent to which measures of a construct mutual their variance and how they are different from one another.

Questionnaire construction - The present study depends on primary data and which is collected through the questionnaire. Questionnaire consist of two part. Frist part consist 12 questions which t are related demographic variable and marketing facilities/ available to them and part two consist of 30 question which reflecting the hypothesized variable. Second part question were adopted from various source,such as, MA,LA,FA were adopted from Sarkar and Sana (2013) and PC and MC were adopted from vignesh and sekaran (2014).
Master validity Table

Hypotheses of this study

H1). Owner’s personal constraints will negatively influence perceived marketing performance of the coir industries
H2). Knowledge level will positively influence perceived marketing performance of the coir industries.
H3). Marketing ability will positively influence perceived marketing performance of the coir industries.
H4). Financial ability will positively influence perceived marketing performance of the coir industries.
H5). Production constrains negatively influence perceived marketing performance of the coir industries
Measured Structural Equation Model

Figure 1
Hypotheses Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.no</th>
<th>Endogenous variables &lt; Exogenous variables</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Perceived marketing performance &lt; Production constrains</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Perceived marketing performance &lt; Knowledge Level</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>4.236</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Perceived marketing performance &lt; personal constraints</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Perceived marketing performance &lt; Marketing Ability</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Perceived marketing performance &lt; Financial Factors</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : AMOS output

Model Fit Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN</td>
<td>297.359</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PClose</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : AMOS software
Cutoff Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&lt;0.90</td>
<td>&lt;0.95</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>&gt;0.10</td>
<td>&gt;0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&gt;0.08</td>
<td>&gt;0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PClose</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hu and Bentler (1999) recommend five important criteria for MSEM, the present study follows their recommendation. The present study uses, Gaskin and Lim (2016) AMOS Plugins to get that above tabled output.

Results and Interpretation:

The majority of respondent are male and the coir unit in the area are led by male population. The commercial loan availed by minimum number of respondent and 80% respondent interest in commercial banks loans. H1 is accepted and it suggest that PMP of the coir units significantly influenced by Personal constrains of coir owner. H2 is accepted and it shows that coir owner knowledge level have significant influence on PMP of coir units. H3 is accepted and it shows that marketing ability have significant influence on the PMP. H4 is supported @ P. value .027 and it suggest that financial ability significantly (negative) influencing the PMP of coir owners. H5 is rejected at the @ p value of .108 and it means that PMP not being significantly influenced by Production constrains but it near to significant level.

Conclusion

We hypothesized five dependent variable and these variable explains 32% variance of Coir owner PMP and financial factor is only variable has negative influence on PMP.
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