#### JOURNAL: PRIMAX INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

ISSN: Print ISSN: 2321-3604 Online ISSN: 2321-3612 & Open Access



**Impact Factor: 7.184** 

PRIMAX IJCMR VOLUME NO.11, ISSUE NO-3, OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2023 Research Article

# A STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF BRAND PERCEPTION AND CUSTOMER SERVICE ON BRAND LOYALTY

#### Pavan Kalyan G \*

PG Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies Global Academy of Technology, Bengaluru

Dr. Shreelatha H R \*

Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies Global Academy of Technology, Bengaluru

\*Corresponding authors | Received: 10/10/2023 | Accepted: 22/10/2023 | Published: 14/11/2023

Abstract: A study conducted at SKDRDP, Hosakote, revealed that agriculture loans provided by the organisation have had a positive impact on farmers' economic conditions. Farmers benefited from improved agricultural practices, such as adopting organic methods, new crop varieties, and enhanced irrigation techniques. Assistance and training from SKDRDP contributed to increased productivity and improved yields, benefiting farmers' overall economic well-being. The study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews with farmers and quantitative analysis of loan data. Recommendations include continuing efforts to provide accessible and affordable agriculture loans, strengthening financial literacy programs, and offering tailored loan products for specific agricultural activities to enhance the impact of these loans.

Keywords: SKDRDP, Agriculture loans, Economic condition, Farmers, Improved agricultural practices

### Introduction

The study aims to assess the impact of agriculture loans provided by SKDRDP on the economic condition and productivity of farmers in Hosakote, India. It recognizes the importance of credit access for farmers to invest in their farms and purchase necessary inputs. SKDRDP has played a significant role in introducing advanced agricultural practices, including organic methods, new crop varieties, and improved irrigation techniques in Hosakote. Farmers have received training and assistance from SKDRDP to adopt these practices, resulting in increased yields and improved economic conditions.

#### **Statement of problem**

Agriculture loans provided by SKDRDP, Hosakote, have played a significant role in improving the economic condition of farmers. These loans have enabled farmers to overcome financial constraints and invest in modern farming techniques, leading to increased productivity and improved livelihoods. By providing access to necessary funds, agriculture loans have contributed to the economic empowerment of farmers in Hosakote.

# **Objectives**

To assess the extent of Agriculture loan utilization by farmers in HOSAKOTE.

To examine the impact of Agriculture loans on the income of farmers.

To analyse the effect of Agriculture loans on the productivity of farmers.

To identify the factors influencing the repayment of Agriculture loans by farmers.

### **Review of Literature**

MN Santhi, TR Ganesan (2022) The study investigated the impact of agricultural loans provided by the State Bank of India (SBI) on farmers' socioeconomic status in Tamil Nadu, India. The findings indicated that SBI's rural loans had a positive effect on farmers' financial status, with loans being utilized effectively and repaid on time. However, the study did not delve deeply into the specific effects of the loans on farmers' income, productivity, and access to advanced farming techniques. Further research is recommended to gain a comprehensive understanding of the precise impact of these loans on farmers' livelihoods, emphasizing the need for more comprehensive evaluations of rural credit programs.

Gaikar Vilas B, Joshi Bharat, Ephrem Habte Michael Redda (2021) This study examines the development and impact of the Kisan Credit Card (KCC) program in India from 2017 to 2021. Using secondary data and statistical analysis, the study evaluates the effects of the KCC scheme on agricultural productivity and farmers' access to credit. Previous research suggests that the KCC program has significantly increased farmers' access to credit, enabling them to purchase agricultural inputs and meet production-related expenses. The study contributes to the existing knowledge on the relationship between the KCC scheme, agricultural productivity, and credit accessibility in India.

V. M. Chaudhari, Mayuri Farmer (2021) The research examines the impact of land ownership on the approval of agricultural loans by The Gujarat State Co-Operative Agricultural & Rural Development Bank Ltd. (GSCARDB) in Gujarat, India. Data from 450 regular loan borrowers from different regions of Gujarat were analysed using descriptive analysis, Chi-Square test, correlation analysis, and ANOVA. The findings indicate that medium and large farmers have a better understanding of the bank and rate its loan services higher, while marginal farmers are more likely to take multiple agricultural loans. Loan amounts also vary significantly among different farmer segments.

**Poonam Mahajan (2018)** This research examines the factors influencing public and private sector bank profitability in India using Market Power Theory and Signalling Theory. The study identifies variables such as spread ratio, credit-deposit ratio, non-performing asset

ratio, and others to predict bank profitability. The findings suggest that factors like loan-deposit ratio, non-interest income, business per employee, and capital adequacy ratio significantly impact bank profitability in India, providing valuable insights for policymakers and industry practitioners.

Sunil Saroj, P.K. Joshi, Anjani Kumar and Ashok K and Mishra (2016) This study examines the impact of social safety net programs and formal credit on farm income and household expenditures in India. The findings indicate that formal credit significantly contributes to increasing net farm income and household expenses, while the availability of social safety net programs like MGNREGA can have a negative impact. The study highlights the importance of formal credit in promoting the financial well-being of farm households and calls for further research to understand the complex relationships between institutional credit, social safety net programs, and farm family outcomes in the agriculture sector.

### **Research Methodology**

This study utilizes an exploratory research design to investigate the impact of SKDRDP agriculture loans on farmers' economic conditions. A qualitative research approach, involving in-depth personal interviews with farmers, will be employed to gather valuable insights on the benefits, challenges, and outcomes of the loans. Primary data from the interviews will be supplemented with secondary data from SKDRDP and other sources, and content analysis will be conducted to identify patterns and themes. Overall, this research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how agriculture loans contribute to long-term rural development by examining the effects on farmers' financial situations.

#### **Hypothesis**

**H0:** There is no significant impact of Agriculture loans of SKDRDP on the economic conditions of farmers.

**H1:** There is a significant impact of Agriculture loans of SKDRDP on the economic conditions of farmers.

# Limitations of the study

- Study only limits to SKDRDP, Hosakote
- Study period limited to 8 weeks.

# **Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Table 1: Purpose of Agriculture Loan taken

|                                 | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Purchase seeds and fertilizers  | 6         | 6       |
| Purchase of equipment/machinery | 78        | 78      |
| Land cultivation                | 12        | 12      |
| Purchase of livestock           | 2         | 2       |
| Others                          | 2         | 2       |
| Total                           | 100       | 100     |

Among the surveyed participants, 78% of the agriculture loans were utilized for purchasing equipment and machinery to enhance productivity. 12% of the loans were dedicated to land cultivation, while 6% were used for purchasing seeds and fertilizers. Additionally, 2% of the loans were allocated for livestock acquisition, with the remaining 2% falling under miscellaneous purposes.

Table 2: Agricultural loan Improves farmer's income

|                   | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Strongly agree    | 100       | 100.0   |
| Agree             | 0         | 0       |
| Neutral           | 0         | 0       |
| Disagree          | 0         | 0       |
| Strongly disagree | 0         | 0       |
| Total             | 100       | 100     |

The analysis shows that all respondents unanimously believe that agriculture loans are crucial for improving farmers' income. This unanimous agreement reflects a strong consensus among the participants on the positive impact of agriculture loans on income. The comprehensive assessment, considering all responses, highlights the unanimous belief in the importance of agriculture loans for income improvement.

**Table 3: Impact of Agriculture Loan on Income of farmers** 

|                              | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Yes, significantly increased | 1         | 1.0     |
| Yes, moderately increased    | 11        | 11.0    |
| No change                    | 11        | 11.0    |
| Decreased                    | 10        | 10.0    |
| Do not know                  | 67        | 67.0    |
| Total                        | 100       | 100.0   |

The analysis shows that among valid responses, 1% of farmers experienced a significant increase in income after taking the agriculture loan, while 11% reported a moderate increase. On the other hand, 11% reported no change in income, and 10% experienced a decline in income after taking the loan. These findings highlight the varying effects of the loan on farmers' income, with a subset experiencing positive impacts, while others faced challenges or unfavourable outcomes.

Table 4: Satisfaction level of farmer with increasing income

|                   | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Strongly agree    | 86        | 86      |
| Agree             | 0         | 0       |
| neutral           | 11        | 11      |
| disagree          | 0         | 0       |
| Strongly disagree | 3         | 3       |
| total             | 100       | 100.0   |

The analysis reveals that 86% of farmers who took agriculture loans are satisfied with the increase in income they have experienced, indicating a positive impact of the loans on their financial well-being. A small proportion of respondents (3%) expressed dissatisfaction with the increase in income, while 11% reported being slightly satisfied, reflecting a mixed sentiment among farmers. Overall, the findings suggest that many farmers have benefited from agriculture loans, leading to an improvement in their income and economic conditions.

## **Regression Analysis**

Table 5: Impact of agricultural loan on the farmers

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| 1     | .121ª | .015     | 016               | .4543      |

#### **ANOVA**

| Model |            | SoS    | DF | Mean Square | F    | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|--------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | .293   | 3  | .098        | .473 | .702 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 19.817 | 96 | .206        |      |                   |
|       | Total      | 20.110 | 99 |             |      |                   |

The analysis results indicate that the regression model, including the explanatory variables, does not have a significant impact on the income of farmers who took agriculture loans from SKDRDP. The low coefficient of determination (R-squared) value and the non-significant ANOVA analysis suggest that the model does not fit the data well and fails to predict the income accurately. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) of no significant impact is accepted.

**Table 6: Change in monetary position of farmers** 

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |  |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1     | .221ª | .049     | .019              | 1.0247                     |  |

### **ANOVA**

| Model |              | SoS     | DF | Mean Square | F     | Sig.              |
|-------|--------------|---------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1     | 1 Regression |         | 3  | 1.732       | 1.649 | .183 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual     | 100.805 | 96 | 1.050       |       |                   |
|       | Total        | 106.000 | 99 |             |       |                   |

The analysis results suggest that the regression model, including the explanatory variables, does not have a significant impact on the percentage of income increase for farmers who took agricultural loans from SKDRDP. The low coefficient of determination (R-squared) value and the non-significant ANOVA analysis indicate that the model does not fit the data well and fails to predict the income increase accurately. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) of no significant rise in income percentage is accepted.

**Table 7:** Change in income level of farmers

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .151 <sup>a</sup> | .023     | 008               | 1.1115                     |

**ANOVA** 

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F    | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 2.781          | 3  | .927        | .750 | .525 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 118.609        | 96 | 1.236       |      |                   |
|       | Total      | 121.390        | 99 |             |      |                   |

The analysis results indicate that the regression model, including the explanatory variables, has a low coefficient of determination (R-squared) value, suggesting that only a small portion of the variation in the response variable can be explained by the model. The adjusted R-squared value also indicates that the model does not fit the data well. The non-significant ANOVA (analysis of variance) analysis further supports the lack of statistical significance in the model, indicating no meaningful change in the income level of farmers from the agricultural loan provided by SKDRDP (Sri Kshethra Dharmasthala Rural Development Project). Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) of no significant impact on income is accepted.

Table 7: Shows that change in the productivity of farmers

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .142a | .020     | .000              | 1.1192                     |

### **ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F     | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 2.506          | 2  | 1.253       | 1.000 | .372 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 121.494        | 97 | 1.253       |       |                   |
|       | Total      | 124.000        | 99 |             |       |                   |

The analysis results indicate that the regression model, including the explanatory variables, has a low coefficient of determination (R-squared) value, suggesting that only a small percentage of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. The adjusted R-squared value indicates that the model does not fit the data well. The non-significant ANOVA analysis further supports that there is no statistically significant difference or change in the productivity of farmers after taking the loan. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no significant impact on farmers' productivity.

Table 8: Change in the productivity of farmers

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .128ª | .016     | 004               | .8914                      |

#### **ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F    | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 1.281          | 2  | .641        | .806 | .449 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 77.079         | 97 | .795        |      |                   |
|       | Total      | 78.360         | 99 |             |      |                   |

The analysis indicates that the regression model, with the included explanatory variables, has a low coefficient of determination (R-squared) value, suggesting that only a small percentage of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. The adjusted R-squared value reinforces that the model does not fit the data well. The non-significant ANOVA analysis further supports that there is no statistically significant change in farm productivity after taking the loan. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no significant impact on farm productivity.

# Findings, Suggestions and Conclusions

#### **Findings**

- Loan Usage: Many respondents (98%) reported using the loan amount entirely for the specified agricultural purposes, indicating appropriate utilization of funds.
- Loan Repayment: A significant majority of respondents (98%) did not encounter any difficulty in repaying the agricultural loan, while a small percentage (2%) reported difficulties.
- Guidance and Training: All respondents (100%) received guidance or training on managing the agriculture loan repayment, indicating support provided by SKDRDP.
- Impact on Income: The agricultural loan taken from the SKDRDP does not have a substantial impact on the income of the farmers.
- Income Change: The observation found that there was a minimal percentage of farmers who experienced a notable change in income after taking the agricultural loan.
- Productivity: The Regression analysis indicate that there was no notable alteration in the productivity of the farmers on the land/farm following the loan acquisition.

#### **Suggestions**

- Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to identify specific challenges faced by farmers and understand their needs for income growth and productivity enhancement.
- Strengthen extension and training services to provide farmers with knowledge and skills in modern farming techniques, sustainable practices, post-harvest management, and market linkages.
- Foster access to markets by establishing market linkages, supporting value addition, and processing initiatives, and promoting collective marketing efforts.
- Improve farmers' financial literacy and management skills through training programs focused on budgeting, record-keeping, financial planning, and investment decision-making.
- Enhance access to quality agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides
  by addressing availability and affordability challenges through collaborations with
  input suppliers.
- Establish a robust monitoring and evaluation system to track loan program
  performance, collecting data on key indicators like loan utilization, repayment rates,
  income growth, and productivity improvements.
- Foster research and innovation in agriculture by collaborating with research institutions and supporting studies to identify innovative approaches and technologies for enhancing income and productivity.

#### **Conclusions**

Based on the analysis conducted, it can be concluded that the agricultural loans provided by SKDRDP did not have a significant impact on the income and productivity of the farmers. Many respondents did not experience a substantial change in their income after taking the loan, and the regression analyses did not show any significant improvements in productivity. This suggests the presence of underlying factors or limitations that hindered the loans' effectiveness. Additional measures such as addressing barriers, enhancing training programs, and improving access to resources may be necessary to enhance the loan program's impact. Continuous evaluation and refinement of the program are crucial to support farmers and promote their long-term economic growth.

#### References

- Anandasayanan, S., Subramaniam, V. A., Srirangan, A., & Raveeswaran, M. (2013). The Determinants of Leverage of the Listed Companies in Sri Lanka: An Empirical Study. International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, 3(1), 15-19
- Godara, R. L., Singh, P., & Singla, S. (2014). Agriculture credit in India: An analytical study. International Journal of Latest Trends in Engineering and Technology, 3(3), 26-35.
- Yadav, P., & Sharma, A. K. (2015). Agriculture credit in developing economies: A review of relevant literature. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 7(12), 19-24.
- Penny, D. H. (2005) Farm credit policy in the early stages of agricultural development. Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 12(1), 32-45.
- Ahangar, G. B., Ganie, A. H., & Padder, M. J. (2013). A study on institutional credit to agriculture sector in India. International Journal of current research and academic review, 1(4), 72-80.