



## Research Article

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON DIFFERENT VEGETABLES MARKETING CHANNELS

PRAJAPATI PRAMOD KUMAR\*, JIRLI BASAVAPRABHU, HASHIM MOHAMMAD AND SINGH MEENA RAGHUVVEER

Department of Extension Education, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India

\*Corresponding Author: Email-prajapatilamahi@gmail.com

Received: March 21, 2018; Revised: March 27, 2018; Accepted: March 28, 2018; Published: March 30, 2018

**Abstract-** India is second in vegetables production in world but farmers are not got regular and right price of their produce due to number of middle man intervention and lack of proper information regarding the current price. This study was conducted at Lamahi, Fakhirpur, Adampur, Banawaripur four village of Varanasi district and total 40 vegetable growing farmers particular Brinjal, Tomato, Cauliflower and Cabbage and 30 ultimate consumer were selected and personally interviewed with the help of interview schedule to know the daily price of vegetables from September to December 2012 Farmers along with that price of the same commodity were also compare with other district like Agra, Meerut, Lucknow, Bareilly, Faizabad, Gorakhpur respectively by Agmark Net online daily price and it was show that the maximum difference and price fluctuation were found in tomato as compare to other crops. This study can clear show that most of benefits were taken by middle man instead of the real producer.

**Keywords-** Agmark Net, Middle-men, Marketing channels.

**Citation:** Prajapati Pramod Kumar, *et al.*, (2018) A Comparative Study on Different Vegetables Marketing Channels. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 10, Issue 6, pp.-5605-5607.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2018 Prajapati Pramod Kumar, *et al.*, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Introduction

In India, the small size of farms is striking feature of farming. This creates difficulties in introducing better methods of cultivation and marketing. For this, the successful vegetable growing requires specific knowledge, skill, accuracy and thoroughness in production and marketing. Farmers are not getting appropriate price of their produce that he was expecting from the consumer side. Because of number of marketing channels are available in the market. Different price is received by the different farmer of the same commodity at a time in different district of Uttar Pradesh. These differences are occurred due to the no. of marketing intermediary middleman or marketing channels are involved in the marketing commodity from producer to ultimate consumer. The present share of Uttar Pradesh in total horticulture production of the country is approximately 26%. U.P. ranks third in fruits, second in vegetable and first in potato production among all states. The major vegetables grown in the state are, peas, chilies, okra, tomato, brinjal, cauliflower, cabbage, spinach, melon, radish, carrot, turnip and cucurbits. The state has about 30.00 lac ha under various horticultural crops. Uttar Pradesh is the second largest producer of vegetables in the country after West Bengal. Significant increase in area under vegetables has been recorded on small and marginal farms. As regards productivity, the productivity of fruits was 11.5 MT/ha during 2008-09 which is likely to increase to 12.18 MT/ha during 2009-10. Productivity of vegetables is likely to increase to 18.09 MT/ha from 17.28 MT/ha during 2008-09 and 18.3MT/ha in 2012-13. NHB, 2013[1]

## Materials and Methods

In this study 40 vegetables growing farmers were selected from Lamahi, Fakirpur, Adampur and Banawaripur who grown brinjal, Cauliflower, Cabbage and tomato, 30 wholesalers and 50 ultimate consumers was selected from Lamahi and Lalpur sabji mandi for collection of all the information. For collecting all the relevance information from the respondent (farmers, wholesaler and ultimate consumer) researcher had used personal face to face interview method for collection of

primary data.

## Result

### Major findings

Producer price of brinjal is 1363 Rs/q and ultimate consumer price were 1578 Rs./q. and differences between it 215 Rs. according to the data taken by the researcher. And secondary data were taken from the three-different district namely Agra, Faizabad, Lucknow of Uttar Pradesh from Agmarknet and Dacknet and it was too much different among them. Price of brinjal in three districts were 764 Rs/q, 573Rs/q and 801Rs/q respectively. There was more variation in price were got. Similar report was reported by Anwarul Haq, A.S.M. 2005 [2].

Producer price of tomato was 2269 Rs/q and ultimate consumer price 3373Rs/q and differences between it 1104 Rs/q these prices were goes to the middleman. Secondary data were taken from the three-different district namely Faizabad, Varanasi, Gorakhpur of Uttar Pradesh from Agmarknet and Dacknet and it was too much different among them. Price of tomato in three districts were 995Rs/q, 1170Rs/q, 1043Rs/q respectively. Adhikari A. 2003 [3].

Producer price of cabbage was 229 Rs/q and ultimate consumer price 332Rs/q and differences between it 42 Rs/Q these prices were goes to the middleman and secondary data were taken from the three-different district namely Lucknow, Bareilly, Meerut of Uttar Pradesh from Agmarknet and Dacknet and it was too much different among them. Price of cabbage in three districts were 681Rs/q, 460Rs/q, 317Rs/q respectively. There was more variation in price were got. Apama B., 2008 [4].

It is evident from the primary data their quiet variation in the producer price but as far as consumer price is concerned there is lot of variation in case of cabbage the consumer price was highest in channel i & iv however retailer charge was highest in channel iii least in channel. Producer price of cabbage was 405 Rs/q and ultimate consumer price 475 Rs/q and differences between it 70 Rs/q these

price was gone to the middleman. And secondary data were taken from the three-different district namely Agra, Meerut, Lucknow of Uttar Pradesh from Agmarknet and Dacknet and it was too much different among them. Price of tomato in three

districts were 848 Rs/q, 1102 Rs/q, 1392 Rs/q respectively. There was more variation in price were got.

**Table -1 Different channels of brinjal.**

S. No.	Particulars	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III	Channel IV
1.	Farmer's Price (Rs./qtl)	1363			
2.	Marketing Cost (Rs./qtl)				
2.1	<i>Producer's</i>				
	Loading & unloading charges	20	20	20	20
	Transportation	30	30	30	30
	Others	50	50	50	50
	Sub total	100	100	100	100
2.2	<i>Commission agent/Arhatia</i>				
	Commission (6%)	--	--	--	81.78
	Sub total				
2.3	<i>Wholesaler</i>				
	Grading & Packaging	--		48.67	
	Loading charges	--		20	
	Commission Charges	--		20	
	Transportation	--		30	
	Market fee	--		6	
	Sub Total			124.67	81.78
2.4	<i>Retailer</i>				
	Weighing Charges	-	46.25	46.25	46.25
	Packing	-	100	100	100
	Market fee	-	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Sub total		152.25	152.25	152.25
	Grand total	100	252.25	376.92	186.25
2.5	Consumer's Price	1578	1600	1500	1560

**Table 2 Different channels of tomato**

S. No.	Particulars	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III	Channel IV
1.	Farmer's Price (Rs./qtl)	2259			
2.	Marketing Cost (Rs./qtl)				
2.1	<i>Producer's</i>				
	Loading unloading charges	20	20	20	20
	Transportation	30	30	30	30
	Others	50	50	50	50
	Sub total	100	100	100	100
2.2	<i>Commission agent/Arhatiya</i>				
	Commission (6%)	--	--	--	135.54
	Sub total				135.54
2.3	<i>Wholesaler</i>				
	Grading & Packaging	--		48.67	
	Loading charges	--		20	
	Commission Charges	--		20	
	Transportation	--		30	
	Market fee	--		6	
	Sub Total			124.67	
2.4	<i>Retailer</i>				
	Weighing Charges	-	46.25	46.25	46.25
	Packing	-	100	100	100
	Market fee	-	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Sub total		152.25	152.25	152.25
	Grand total	100	252.25	376.92	206.25
2.5	Consumer's Price	3373	3450	3568	3025

Producer price of cabbage was 405 Rs/q and ultimate consumer price 475 Rs/q and differences between it 70 Rs/q these prices were goes to the middleman. Secondary data were taken from the three different district namely Agra, Meerut, Lucknow of Uttar Pradesh from Agmarknet and Dacknet and it was too much different among them. Price of tomato in three districts were 848 Rs/q, 1102 Rs/q, 1392 Rs/q respectively. There was more variation in price were got.

#### Comparative analysis of channels (i)

On the basis of above information margin getting by the (i) channels in brinjal Rs 215/Q, in tomato 1114 Rs/Q, cabbage Rs 42/Q and cauliflower Rs 70/Q.

#### Comparative analysis of channels (ii)

On the basis of above information margin getting by the (ii) channel in brinjal, tomato, cabbage and cauliflower are Rs 237/Q, Rs 1191/Q, Rs 15/Q and Rs 50/Q respectively.

#### Comparative analysis of channels (iii)

On the basis of above information given in the [Table-2] margin getting by the (iii) channel Rs 137/Q, Rs 1309/Q, Rs 25/Q and Rs 55/Q in Brinjal, Tomato, cabbage, and cauliflower respectively.

#### Comparative analysis of channels (iv)

On the basis of above information given in the [Table-3] margin getting by the (iv) channel Rs 197/Q, Rs 766/Q, Rs 42/Q and Rs 65/Q in Brinjal, Tomato,

cabbage, and cauliflower respectively

#### Different marketing channels available in Varanasi.

**Channel-1**= Farmers —Consumers (F-C)

**Channel-2** = Farmers —Retailers —Consumers (F-R-C)

**Channel-3**= Farmers —Collection center — Wholesalers (Varanasi) — Retailers Consumers (F-C-R-C)

**Channel-4**=Farmers —Collection centre-Wholesalers (Varanasi)-Retailers - Consumers (F-C-W-R-C)

Channels Number 3 [Farmers —Collection center — Wholesalers (Varanasi) — Retailers Consumer (F-C-R-C)] are more dominated in the area where these research work were done. Near about 70% consumer were got commodity through these channels.

#### Difference in price paid by consumer and price obtained by producer

On the basis of data observed by the researcher data were contradicted with the producer price and consumer price of different district price.

In Cauliflower producer price were Rs 405 /Q and consumer price Rs 475/Q and difference between them were Rs 70/Q.

In Cabbage producer price were Rs 290/Q and consumer price Rs 332/Q and difference between them were Rs 42/Q.

In Tomato producer price were Rs 2259/Q and consumer price Rs 3373/Q and difference between them were Rs 1114/Q.

In Brinjal producer price were Rs 1363/Q and consumer price Rs 1578/Q and difference between them were Rs 215/Q.

On the basis of following information maximum difference were takes place in case of tomato and lower difference in cabbage.

**Table -3 Different channels of cabbage**

S. No.	Particulars	Channel I	Channel II	Channel III	Channel IV
1.	Farmer's Price (Rs./qt)	290			
2.	Marketing Cost (Rs./qt)				
2.1	Producer's				
	Loading and unloading charges	20	20	20	20
	Transportation	30	30	30	30
	Others	50	50	50	50
	Sub total	100	100	100	100
2.2	Commission agent/Arhatia				
	Commission (6%)	--	--	--	17.4
	Sub total				17.4
2.3	Wholesaler				
	Grading & Packaging	--		48.67	
	Loading charges	--		20	
	Commission Charges	--		20	
	Transportation	--		30	
	Market fee	--		6	
	Sub Total			124.67	
2.4	Retailer				
	Weighing Charges	-	46.25	46.25	46.25
	Packing	-	100	100	100
	Market fee	-	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Sub total		152.25	152.25	152.25
	Grand total	100	252.25	376.92	186.25
2.5	Consumer's Price	332	305	320	332

#### Conclusion

The study has examined the nature and extent of different marketing channels of vegetable supply chain in the Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. The maximum aggregate differences have been found in tomato, followed by brinjal, cauliflower and cabbage. The marketing efficiency of all vegetable under study was highest in shortest marketing channel (Producer-Consumer) and lowest in longest marketing channel (Producer-Wholesaler-Retailer-Consumer).

**Application of research:** The based on the findings of the study, it is suggested to establish an electronic information centre at every market to display the information to the farmers.

**Research Category:** Vegetables Marketing

#### Abbreviations:

F-C: Farmers-Consumers

**Acknowledgement / Funding:** Author thankful to Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh

**\*Research Guide or Chairperson of research:** Prof Basavaprabhu Jirli

University: Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh

Research project name or number: MSc Thesis

**Author Contributions:** All author equally contributed

**Author statement:** All authors read, reviewed, agree and approved the final manuscript

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

**Ethical approval:** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

#### References

- [1] Anwarul Haq A.S.M. (2005) *Economic Affairs*, 50(1), 60-64.
- [2] National Horticulture Board (2013) <http://nhb.gov.in/area-pro/Indian%20Horticulture%202013.pdf>
- [3] Adhikari A. (2003) Analysis of Vegetable Marketing Practices in Palpa district Nepal. An MSc thesis presented to Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal.
- [4] Aparna B., Shareef S. M., Raju V. T. and Mahadeviab G. S. (2008) *Agricultural situation in India*, 65, 597-600.