

## Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology

34(4): 1-8, 2019; Article no.AJAEES.42375

ISSN: 2320-7027

# A Conjoint Analysis on Consumers' Revealed Preferences for Products from Coconuts in Madurai City India

J. Harshini<sup>1\*</sup> and A. Daniel Viswasam Samuel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Agriculture College and Research Institute (TNAU), Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India. <sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics, Agriculture College and Research Institute (TNAU), Madurai, Tamil Nadu, 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/2019/v34i430204

Editor(s)

(1) Prof. Fotios Chatzitheodoridis, Department of Agricultural, Technology-Division of Agricultural Economics, Technological Education Institute of Western Macedonia, Greece.

Reviewers:

(1) Sergei N. Polbitsyn, Ural Federal University, Russia.
(2) Gerald Aranoff, Ariel University Center of Samaria, Israel.
(3) Banu Dincer, Galatasaray University, Turkey.
Complete Peer review History: <a href="http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/42375">http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/42375</a>

Short Research Article

Received 05 September 2018 Accepted 15 November 2018 Published 06 August 2019

#### **ABSTRACT**

India *per se* being leader nation in coconut production, only 2 per cent hardly utilised for value addition. To discern the pull factors causing consumer preference for coconut products, a study was conducted among different income group of consumers from Madurai city of Tamil Nadu. Five coconut value-added products like desiccated coconut, processed tender coconut, skimmed coconut milk, skimmed coconut milk powder and neera were selected for the study. The objective of the study is to evaluate the performance and specific factor influencing the marketing of selected coconut products and to study the market opportunities of the selected coconut product based on the consumer preference. Conjoint analyses, Multi-log linear function, Dummy variable model, ANOVA with two qualitative variable model were used in the study to find the factors influencing the marketing of selected coconut product. The result from all the analysis conclusively showed that income is the main factor influencing the market opportunities of selected coconut products.

Keywords: Consumer preference; income groups; market opportunities and conjoint analysis.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

Coconuts are a that scientists believe came from the South Pacific region. The sailors aboard Vasco da Gama's ships gave the coconut its name. They called it "Coco", named after a grimacing face or hobgoblin. When the "Coco" came to England, the suffix of nut was added and that's how the name came about. Coconut palm (Cocos nucifera Linn.) is known to use from time immemorial. It is nobly described in ancient Indian Literature as 'Kalpavriksha' (tree of paradise), the tree that grants all that one wishes of the palm. Each and every part of the palm is utilised in one or the other way in our national and domestic economy.

#### 1.1 Global Perspective

The coconut is mainly a tropical crop grown currently in about 90 countries spread over Asia Pacific, Africa and America [1]. Ninety % of the world coconut production comes from.

The tropical belt [2] During 2014, world area and production of coconut are estimated to be 12196 million hectares and 69836.36 million nuts respectively (Asian and Pacific Coconut Community (APCC) Statistical Year Book 2014). (31.02%), Indonesia (23.41%) Philippines (21.04%) are the major producers of coconut in the world, and together they account for about 75% of the total world production. Other important coconut growing countries Srilanka, Mexico, Vietnam, Thailand, Brazil and Ivory Coast. The study trend is particularly in alternative prominent food markets. characterised by the emergence of eco- or socially labelled products and participation in alternative food marketing channels where locally or regionally produced foods are available, such as farmers markets and community supported agriculture programs [3].

#### 1.2 Indian Scenario

In India, ipso facto coconut possesses a documented history of nearly 3000 years. The crop is extensively grown in the Western Coasts and has a profound influence on the economy of many southern states. During 2016, area and production are estimated to be 2088.44 million hectares and 22167.45 million nuts respectively (Coconut development board). Kerala (33.5%), Tamil Nadu (27.83%) and Karnataka (23.13%)

are the major producers of coconut in India, and together they account for about 85 per cent of the total production. Other coconut growing states are Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Odisha and Gujarat. Previous research using the same data considered how the values consumers place on these labels may vary by where consumers shop, which may be at least partly explained by drivers commonly considered in the consumer psychology literature [4,5].

It is a well-acknowledged fact that India is one of the largest producers of coconut. Coconut in India is predominantly a smallholders crop contributing about Rs.83,000 million annually which is about 2% of the contribution of agriculture & allied sectors with more than 10 million farming families si-nequa non-dependent on the crop for their livelihood [6]. Even though a major producer of coconut, India consumes more than 50% of its coconut production (15.84 billion nuts per annum as raw nuts) for culinary and religious purposes. 35% of the production is utilised for conversion to copra, 11% for tender nuts, 2% for seed purposes and hardly 2% is utilised for value addition and industrial purposes. As such, there is a need for the country to devote more intensive research & technology transfer on utilisation and product diversification in both food and non-food uses, so that the practice of fixing the price of coconut based on the existing market price of coconut oil could be done away with.

The objective of the study is to evaluate the performance and specific factor influencing the marketing of selected coconut products and to study the market opportunities of the selected coconut product based on consumer preference.

#### 1.3 Literature for Foresight

Myszczszyn [7] analysed the food demand and change in consumer preference for food in households of Poland. The study revealed that the average income of Polish, in general, has been increasing, particularly among the nonfarming population, since 1994. The demand for food products had been relatively stable although it remained 5 per cent lower than in 1988. The structure of demand was changing with the increasing preference for processed foods and greater awareness of health and dietary factors among the consumer population. The study also suggested the producers to face

new set of challenges to meet stricter food quality standards.

Garibay and Jyotiz [8] analysed the market opportunities and challenges for India organic product. He said that major domestic markets are cities like Mumbai, Bangalore, Delhi, Chennai and Hyderabad. Organic consumers are generally found in the urban upper-middle class or upper class, though some sellers do state that lower-middle-class families in smaller towns, especially families with children, also number among their clients. Organic vegetables and fruits are the major organic products desired by Indian customers. The market has not grown large so far due to lack of marketing initiatives from key players (producers, traders, NGOs, etc.), the low awareness of organic products from customers and their higher price. However, there seems to be increasing health awareness spreading among the literate part of the Indian population, and pesticides were broadly discussed in the media as a likely source of various health problems.

Dhamotharan et al. [9] stated that geographic origin plays other more direct roles in determining consumer behaviour through symbolic or cultural values attached to the region.

Onozaka and McFadden [10] studied the increasing use of sustainability labels in the marketplace. this study analyses differential values and interactive effects of sustainable production claims (organic, fair trade, and carbon footprint) and location claims through a conjoint choice experiment. Locally grown is the highest valued claim, and its value is further enhanced with fair trade certification, but carbon-intensive local products are discounted more severely than those sourced from other locations. Some negatively valued claims (imports and carbon footprint) can be mitigated by combining them with other claims (organic and fair trade).

#### 2. METHODOLOGY

#### 2.1 Choice of the Study Area

Madurai city of Tamil Nadu state was purposively selected for the study considering the development and trade environment for range of products. It is a consumer based study, hence the urban areas of Madurai city were selected. K-pudhur and Surveyor colony

were selected for low-income group, Thallakulam and BB kulam were selected for middle-income group, K. K. nagar and Annanagar were selected for high income and working women groups.

#### 2.2 Sampling

About 105 consumers were selected from in and around Madurai city to represent low income, middle income and high-income group of 30 each. Fifteen households of working women group were selected. The respondent preference of coconut product namely, desiccated coconut, processed tender coconut, coconut skimmed milk, coconut skimmed and neera for the study. The respondent was selected through Simple random sampling technique.

#### 2.3 Data Collection

The present study was based on the primary data collected by survey method. Primary data is collected from the respondents by contact them personally using interview schedule.

#### 2.4 Analytical Tools

Conjoint analysis, Multi-log linear function, Dummy variable model, ANOVA with two qualitative variable model was used in the study to find the factors influencing the marketing of selected coconut product.

#### 2.5 Conjoint Analysis

Conjoint analysis is a marketing research technique that can provide valuable information for new product development and forecasting, market segmentation, pricing decisions, advertising, distribution, competitive analysis and repositioning. Consumers are forced to make trade-offs as they decide which products to purchase. Green and Rao (1971) and Green and Wind (1975) applied conjoint analysis as a new technique in decision making and advanced conjoint analysis models were developed by Louviere [4] and Green and Srinivasan (1990) in the past.

Conjoint analysis decomposes the judgment data into components, based on the qualitative attributes of the products. Numerical part-worth utility value is computed for each level of each attribute. Large part-worth utilities are assigned to the most preferred levels, and small part-worth utilities are assigned to the least preferred levels. The attributes with the

largest part-worth utility range are considered the most important in predicting preference. Conjoint analysis is a statistical model with an error term and a loss function (Kuhfeld, 2010).

The nonmetric conjoint analysis finds a monotonic transformation of the preference judgments. The model, which follows directly from conjoint measurement, iteratively fits the ANOVA model until the transformation stabilises. The R square increases during every iteration until convergence, when the change in R square is essentially zero. The following formula shows a nonmetric conjoint analysis model for three factors:

The model could be used for different types of coconut product with different attributes and prices. The Yiik term is subject's stated preference for coconut product with i and j level attributes and kth level price. The grand mean is μ and error is εiik. Nonmetritc conjoint analysis finds a monotonic transformation of the preference judgments. The model which follows directly from conjoint measurement iteratively fits the ANOVA model until the transformation stabilises. The R square increases during every iteration until convergence, when the change in R square is essentially zero. The following formula shows a

nonmetric conjoint analysis model for three factors:

$$\Phi(Yijk) = \mu + \beta 1i + \beta 2j + \beta 3k + \beta ijk$$

where  $\Phi(Yijk)$  designates a monotonic transformation of the variable y.

Details of the six classes and six attributes considered for the consumer's preference towards coconut product by conjoint analysis are given in Table 1.

#### 2.6 Multi-log Linear Regression Function

For examining the factors influencing the consumption of selected coconut product multi-log linear regression function of the following form is used

Log Y = F 
$$(X_1, X_2, X_3, D_1)$$

Where,

Y = monthly consumption of coconut

 $X_1$  = monthly income of consumers

 $X_2$  = number of family members

 $X_3$  = monthly coconut expenditure (i.e., amount spent on coconut)

 $D_1$  = food habit (veg or non-veg) Dummy variable

Table 1. Products and attributes

Class	Six products	1 = 'raw coconut'
		2 = 'desiccated coconut'
		3 = 'processed tender coconut'
		4 = 'coconut skimmed milk '
		5 = 'coconut skimmed milk powder'
		6 = 'neera'
Attributes	Taste	1 = 'poor'
		2 = 'moderate'
		3 = 'good'
	Flavour	1 = 'low'
		2 = 'Medium'
		3 = 'high'
	Price	1 = 'low'
		2 = 'medium'
		3 = 'high'
	Availability	1 = 'low'
	•	2 = 'medium'
		3 = 'high'
	Shelf life	1 = 'low'
		2 = 'medium'
		3 = 'high'
	Time consuming	1 = 'yes'
	-	2 = 'no'

#### 2.7 Dummy Variable Model

To analyse the statistical significance difference among the income groups, dummy variable model is used as follows

Y =  $\beta_1$  +  $\beta_2$  D<sub>1</sub> +  $\beta_3$  D<sub>2</sub> +  $\beta_4$  D<sub>3</sub> +  $\mu$ Y = monthly income of the consumers D<sub>1</sub>= 1- middle income group; 0- for others D<sub>2</sub> = 1-high income group; 0- for others D<sub>3</sub> = 1-woking women group; 0- for others

### 2.8 ANOVA with Two Qualitative Variable Model

To analyse the influence of qualitative variable (consumptive habits), ANOVA with two qualitative variable model is used. The specification of the model is given below

$$Y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 D_1 + \beta_3 D_2 + \mu$$

Y = monthly income of the consumers  $D_1$  = food habit (1= non-veg; 0 = veg)  $D_2$  = consumption (1= consumers using value added products; 0= not using)

#### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From Table 2 the part - worth of each attribute is calculated using conjoint analysis through the application of SAS software to translate the respondent's relative importance values or utilities. The most important attribute indicated by the consumer is coconut products. The importance's attached to the products were25.35 per cent. Among these attributes, skimmed coconut milk powder was most preferred. This is reflected by the utility value attached to it (1.389). The skimmed coconut milk was next in the order with the utility value of (0.945). This was followed by desiccated coconut (0.924), raw coconut (0.628). Neera and tender coconut has negative utility. The main reason nitty-gritty could be neera (is a sap product) and processed tender coconut is considered to be health drink and they are not in their convention.

Next to the product, the important attribute indicated by the consumer was price. The importance attached to the price was 24.88 per

cent. Among the three attributes of low, medium, high price, the high price was preferred by the consumer. This was reflected by the utility value attached to it (1.498) and this was followed by medium and low price. However, the inference has to be carefully drawn. In general the consumers for coconut products are comparatively with better paying capacity and hence willing to pay for a 'premium price'.

Next to price, the important attribute indicated by the consumer was time consuming. If the product takes some time-consuming process, it has negative utility (-13.305) on consumer preference over that product. This attribute was followed by flavor with 22.27 per cent and taste 17.21 per cent

Thus it has been understood that from the selected coconut products mainly skimmed coconut milk powder was preferred by the consumers for the taste and flavour irrespective of its price.

From Table 3 the results of multi-log linear analysis conclusively showed that the study has strong evidence of income and amount spent on coconut tour de force for preference by the consumers to make a purchase of coconut product. This has been confirmed by highly significant P- value at one per cent level of significance in both these among other variables. A per cent increase in monthly income and amount spent on coconut increases the monthly consumption of coconut products by 3.35 per cent and 2.13 per cent respectively. Hence, a higher income and the amount spent on coconut is a binding for consumer preference towards coconut products.

From Table 4 the selected groups are analysed through dummy variable model to prove the income difference among the consumers is statistically significant. From the result, it is found that P-value is extremely low in all the variables at 1 per cent level of significance. So we can infer from the intercept value, the mean value of low-income group is 13.926.67 from which the middle, high and working women income groups have an ascent of 2.35, 10 and 9.91 times respectively.

Table 2. Consumer Preference towards Coconut products: Conjoint Analysis of Ranks 1 19:57 Monday, June 14, 1993

#### The TRANSREG Procedure

Monotone(Rank) Algorithm converged.

Root MSE	2.23497	R-Square	0.9704
Dependent Mean	18.50000	Adj R-Sq	0.9550
Coeff Var	12.08092		

Utilities Table Based on the Usual Degrees of Freedom

		Standard	Importance (% Utility	
Label	Utility	Error	Range)	Variable
Intercept	27.271	0.85029		Intercept
Products Raw Coconut	0.628	2.39125	25.352	Class.ProductsRaw_Coconut
Products Desiccated coco	0.924	1.32013		Class.ProductsDesiccated_coco
Products Processed tende	-10.895	1.31603		Class.ProductsProcessed_tende
Products Coconut skimmed	0.945	1.45891		Class.ProductsCoconut_skimmed
Products Coconut skimmed	1.389	1.26983		class.productsCoconut sKimmed
Products Neera	-13.294	1.63290		Class.ProductsNeera
Taste poor	0.000	0.00000	17.212	Class.TasteLow
Taste moderate	3.411	1.04514		Class.TasteMedium
Taste good	4.869	1.50224		Class.TasteHigh
Flavor Low	0.000	0.00000	22.268	Class.flavor Low
Flavor Medium	2.394	1.10517		Class.flavor Medium
Flavor High	3.675	1.30386		Class.flavor High
Price Low	0.296	1.28964	24.885	Class.PriceLow
Price Medium	0.300	2.55925		Class.PriceMedium
Price High	1.498	1.89465		Class.PriceHigh
Available Low	0.000	0.00000	3.558	Class.AvailableLow
Available Medium	-0.858	1.27548		Class.AvailableMedium
Available High	1.138	1.47935		Class.AvailableHigh
Shelf low	0.000	0.00000		class.shelflow
Shelf Medium	0.000	0.00000	0.000	Class.ShelfMedium
Shelf High	0.000	0.00000		Class.ShelfHigh
Timeconsuming Yes	-13.305	2.69126	23.725	Class.TimeconsumingYes
Timeconsuming No	0.000	0.00000		Class.TimeconsumingNo

The standard errors are not adjusted for the fact that the dependent variable was transformed and so are generally liberal (too small).

Table 3. Factors influencing the consumption of selected coconut product

S.No	Variables	b-coefficient	P-value	
1	Intercept	7.0685	1.8187	
2	income	0.0335	0.0006**	
3	family members	-0.026	0.4548	
4	food habit	-0.015	0.7989	
5	amount spent	0.0213	0.0102**	
6	R² value	0.955		

<sup>\*\*</sup> denotes P-value at 1 per cent level of significance

Table 4. The statistical significance difference among the income groups

S.No	Variables	b-coefficient	Standard error	P-value
1	Intercept	13926.67	6687.803	0.0398
2	middle	32740	9457.981	0.0007**
3	high	139406.7	11342.621	0.0003**
4	working	138073.3	11583.613	0.0005**
5	R <sup>2</sup> value	0.748		

<sup>\*\*</sup> denotes P-value at 1 per cent level of significance

#### 3.1 Affected Consumptive Habits

Person's predisposition is the most important factor for influencing consumption of coconut products. To understand it, an ANOVA model with two qualitative variables viz., a vegetarian/non-vegetarian and consumption/non-consumption with the income of the respondent consumers were studied and the result are discussed and presented below,

$$Y_i$$
=30807.89 + 20684.66  $D_{2i}$  + 101806.20  $D_{3i}$   
(0.0045)\*\*(0.0957)\*\*(0.0012)\*\*

Where

Y= monthly income D<sub>1</sub> = food habit (1= non-veg; 0 = veg)

 $D_2$  = consumption (1= consumers using value added products; 0= not using)

\*\* denotes P-value at 1 per cent level of significance

The result conclusively showed that the habits and income has a strong effect on the consumption of coconut products. From the above regression result, an increase monthly income of ≠20685 from the mean monthly income of  $\neq$ 30808 has a positive effect on the consumption of coconut products among non-vegetarian consumers i.e., for an average income of (303808+20685). Similarly among vegetarians, a high income of ≠ 101806 from the mean level i.e.,  $\neq$ 132614 (303808+101806) has a positive effect on the consumption of coconut products. The reason being consumers are much price sensitive to coconuts in general and whenever the price goes up, needless to say for coconut products. However this has impact among high income group, since they have a number of working women want to timings in their cooking activities expressed by the respondents during course of the survey. The results are further confirmed by highly significant P-value including for base category intercept.

#### 4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Ever increasing consumerism, consumer choice and innovation paves way for agroproduct line coconut products in an easy to cook form. In this juncture, a study in Madurai city was conducted to know the underlying

factors at the consumer level for penetration of the products. The result of the study indicated though there is awareness, consumer of the low and middle income group are reluctant to make a purchase. However, the product is well recognised among high and working women group considering its edge over advantage in the creation of productive working hours. To this group, the higher prices in value addition never become serious disincentive. There is little reason for homemakers in culinary art *mutatis mutandis* to enjoy cost effectiveness.

Hence, it is suggested large scale processing of coconut products. Through large scale of economies, cost can be cut down to bring down the price and eventually the market for the coconut product amid consumer expands.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Kleber Del Claro, Paulo S. Oliveira, Victor Rico-Gray. Tropical biology and conservation management, Agriculture. EOLSS Publications. 2009;III:268.
- Kadere TT, Oniang'o RK, Kutima PM, Muhoho SN. Traditional tapping and distillation methods of coconut wine (mnazi) as practised in the coastal region of Kenya. African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development. 2004;4(1).
- Howard PH, Allen P. Beyond organic and fair trade? An analysis of ecolabel preferences in the United States. Rural Sociology. 2010;75(2):244–269.
- Onozaka Y, Nurse G, Thilmany D, McFadden. Defining sustainable food market segments: Do motivations and values vary by shopping locale? American Journal of Agricultural Economics; 2010. DOI: 10.1093/ajae/aaq152
- Onozaka Y, Mcfadden DT. Does local labeling complement or compete with other sustainable labels? A conjoint analysis of direct and joint values for fresh produce claim. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2011;93(3):693–706. DOI: 10.1093/ajae/aar005
- 6. Sivakumar K, Parvez Ahmed PM. Impact of water pollution on coconut cultivation in Vellore district, Tamil Nadu. 2016;3-11. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-27228-3 1

- Myszczszyn J. Factors influencing the level and differentiation of consumption of food products. Floria Universities Agricultural Stetinensis Oeconomica; No. 38. Cab Abstract. 2000;299-306.
- 8. Salvador V. Garibay, Katke Jyoti. Market opportunities and challenges for India organic product. Research Institute of Organic Agriculture; Research Report; 2003.
- Dhamotharan PG, Devadoss S, Selvaraj KN. Estimation of consumers' willingness
- to pay for geographic indications bananas using conjoint analysis. Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing. 2015;27(2):65–78. DOI: 10.1080/08974438.2013.833574
- Yuko Onozaka, Dawn Thilmany, McFadden. Does local labeling complement or compete with other sustainable labels? a conjoint Analysis of direct and joint values for fresh Produce claims. Amer. J. Agr. Econ. 2011;93(3): 693-706.

© 2019 Harshini and Samuel; 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:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/42375