



RESEARCH ARTICLE

VEGETABLES MARKETING - A CASE STUDY OF JAIPUR MARKET RAJASTHAN

¹Dr. Neha Sharma and ²*Monika Dhaka

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies, the IIS University, Jaipur- Rajasthan, India

²Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, the IIS University, Jaipur-Rajasthan

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 04th December, 2017

Received in revised form

05th January, 2018

Accepted 17th February, 2018

Published online 28th March, 2018

Key words:

Marketing efficiency,
Marketing channels,
Marketing costs,
Cole crops
Price-Spread.

ABSTRACT

India is the second largest producer of vegetables (Next to China) in the world with a production of 40 million tonnes from four million hectares of land area. This high level of production can supply only 120gms of vegetables per capita per day as against the recommended dietary allowance of 200gms vegetables per capita per day. The study of vegetable marketing in terms of marketing channels, price spread in Jaipur district of Rajasthan indicates that farmers mostly adopt channel 2 in marketing of their surplus produce having mashakhores as one of the intermediaries. Farmers transport their surplus to Jaipur mandi through road by hiring private truck which ply regularly on this route.

Copyright © 2018, Dr. Neha Sharma and Monika Dhaka. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Dr. Neha Sharma and Monika Dhaka, 2018. "Vegetables marketing - A case study of Jaipur market (Rajasthan)", *International Journal of Current Research*, 10, (03), 66805-66807.

INTRODUCTION

Vegetable marketing is different from marketing of other agricultural commodities because of their high perish ability, concentration of trade in a few hands and a large number of producers. The produce has to be carefully handled for transportation, assembling and packaging. The cultivation of vegetables is most suitable in a country like ours with preponderance of small land holding, varied climatic conditions and surplus family labour. There is need to bring improvement in the marketing efficiency for vegetable marketing. The efforts made by the government to improve the marketing system could improve the efficiency and help in increasing the producer's share in the consumer's rupee in the case of Food grains, oilseeds, and fiber crops to a great extent but very little has been done for improving the marketing efficiency in the case of fruits, vegetables, flowers, and other perishable commodities. Vegetables are grown extensively in the state of Rajasthan all the year round. Among the different groups of vegetables, cole crops have their own importance in terms of their cultivation by all vegetable growers as well as in consumption by all of the sections of the consumers.

Objectives

Keeping in view the present study was undertaken with the following objectives:

- To study the institutions, agencies and channels involved in marketing of cole crops, and
- To assess the price-spread in marketing of cole crops through different marketing channels.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two villages namely Mahapura and Bhankrota falling under the command area of Krishi Upaj Mandi Samiti (Fruits and Vegetables) Jaipur were purposively selected as farmers of these villages grow cauliflower and cabbage as main crops in the winter season. From the list of vegetable growers of these two villages, a total number of 50 farmers from different size groups were selected at random. The selected farmers were 18 from small size, 12 from semi-medium, 16 from medium size and 4 from large size group. The data were collected by personal interview method with the help of schedules for the winter season. The marketing costs incurred by attending 183 auctions for both the vegetables during the season spread over a period of 45 days. The marketing channels were identified after studying the sale pattern of the selected farmers. The marketing costs, margins of middlemen and producer's share were calculated using the standard formula.

*Corresponding author: Monika Dhaka,

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, The IIS University, Jaipur-Rajasthan, India.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results are presented under the following sub-heads:

Marketing Channels

Following marketing channels were identified in the study area in marketing of cauliflower and cabbage:

- Producer- Commission agent- Retailer-Consumer;
- Producer- Commission agent- Mashakhores- Retailer-Consumer.

Channel-1 was adopted by 25.8 and 35 percent farmers in sale of cauliflower and cabbage. Channel-2 was adopted by 74.2 and 65 percent farmers in sale of cauliflower and cabbage respectively. Channel-2 is an important channel in sale of vegetables for the farmers of the area in spite of more number of middlemen involved in this. The size group-wise results are presented in Table 2. Channel 1 was adopted by 33.3 percent small, 28.6 percent semi-medium and 27.3 percent medium sized farmers in sale of cauliflower and by 41.7 percent small, 30.0 percent semi-medium, 35.7 percent medium and 25.0 percent large farmers in sale of cabbage. None of the large sized farmers sold their cauliflower through this channel. Channel-2 was adopted by the different size groups of farmers.

Table 1. Marketing Channels adopted by different sized farmers in sale of cole crops

Size groups	In sale of cauliflower			In sale of cabbage		
	Channel-1	Channel-2	Total	Channel-1	Channel-2	Total
Small	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)	9 (100)	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	12 (100)
Semi-medium	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	7 (100)	3 (30.0)	7 (70.0)	10 (100)
Medium	3 (27.3)	8 (72.7)	11 (100)	5 (35.7)	9 (64.3)	14 (100)
Large	-	4 (100)	4 (100)	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	4 (100)
Total	8 (25.80)	23 (74.2)	31 (100)	14 (35.0)	26 (65.0)	40 (100)

Table 2. Costs in Marketing of Cauliflower and Cabbage in Channel 1

Particulars	Costs borne in sale of cauliflower by			Costs borne in sale of cabbage by		
	Producer	Retailer	Total	Producer	Retailer	Total
1. Transportation cost	7.68 (79.3)	6.15 (18.5)	13.83 (32.3)	8.15 (80.4)	6.76 (22.6)	14.91 (37.2)
2. Packing cost	0.84 (8.7)	1.74 (5.2)	2.58 (6.0)	0.83 (8.2)	1.32 (4.4)	2.15 (5.4)
3. Loading and unloading charges	1.16 (12.0)	1.54 (4.6)	2.70 (6.3)	1.16 (11.4)	1.47 (4.9)	2.63 (6.6)
4. Weighing charges	---	0.63 (1.9)	0.63 (1.5)	---	0.63 (2.1)	0.63 (1.6)
5. Commission charges	---	11.94 (36.0)	11.94 (27.8)	---	11.64 (38.9)	11.64 (29.1)
6. Market fee	---	4.78 (14.4)	4.78 (11.2)	---	4.65 (15.6)	4.65 (11.6)
7. Quantity loss	---	6.41 (19.3)	6.41 (15.0)	---	3.44 (11.5)	3.44 (8.6)
Total	9.68 (22.6)	33.19 (77.4)	42.87 (100)	10.14 (29.3)	29.91 (74.7)	40.05 (100)

Table 3. Costs in Marketing of cauliflower and cabbage through channel-2

Particulars	Costs borne in cauliflower by				Costs borne in sale of cabbage by			
	Producer	Mashakhore	Retailer	Total	Producer	Mashakhore	Retailer	Total
1. Transportation costs	7.68 (79.34)	1.81 (9.01)	5.88 (33.62)	15.37 (32.52)	8.15 (80.37)	2.34 (11.40)	6.09 (48.03)	16.58 (38.25)
2. Packing charges	0.84 (8.68)	---	1.80 (10.29)	2.64 (5.59)	0.83 (8.19)	---	1.41 (11.12)	2.24 (5.17)
3. Loading and unloading charges	1.16 (11.98)	---	1.59 (9.09)	2.75 (5.82)	1.16 (11.44)	---	1.41 (11.12)	2.57 (5.93)
4. Weighing charges	---	0.61 (3.04)	---	0.61 (1.29)	---	0.61 (2.97)	---	0.61 (1.41)
5. Commission charges	---	11.85 (58.98)	---	11.85 (25.07)	---	11.82 (57.57)	---	11.82 (27.26)
6. Mandi fee	--	4.74 (23.53)	---	4.74 (10.03)	--	4.72 (22.99)	--	4.72 (10.89)
7. Value of quantity loss	--	1.08 (5.38)	8.22 (47.00)	9.30 (19.68)	--	1.04 (5.07)	3.77 (29.73)	4.81 (11.09)
Total	9.68 (20.48)	20.09 (42.51)	17.49 (37.01)	47.26 (100)	10.14 (23.39)	20.53 (47.36)	12.68 (29.25)	43.35 (100)

Table 4. Price-Spread in Marketing of Cole crops through different channels

Particulars	Channel-1		Channel-2	
	Cauliflower	Cabbage	Cauliflower	Cabbage
1. Marketing costs incurred by-				
• Producer	9.68(1.8)	10.1491.9)	9.68(1.8)	10.1491.9)
• Mashakhore	--	--	20.09(3.7)	20.53(3.9)
• Retailer	33.19(6.1)	29.91(5.7)	17.49(3.2)	12.68(2.4)
total Costs	42.87(7.9)	40.05(7.6)	47.26(8.7)	43.35(8.2)
2. Margins earned by-				
1) Mashakhore	--	--	62.45(11.5)	56.24(10.7)
2) Retailer	203.59(37.5)	196.02(37.4)	150.45(27.7)	149.06(28.5)
Total Margin	203.59(37.5)	196.02(37.4)	212.90(39.2)	205.30(39.2)
3. Producer's share	296.54(54.6)	287.57(55.0)	282.84(52.1)	274.99(52.6)
4. Price paid by the consumer	543.00(100)	523.64(100)	543.00(100)	523.64(100)

Marketing Costs

The marketing cost is sum total of all costs incurred in movement of the produce and includes such costs as transportation, loading and unloading, weighing, packing, commission, mandi fee and quantity loss in the process of sale. The total cost of marketing in sale of cauliflower and cabbage through different channels is shown in Table 2 and table 3. Total marketing cost in sale of cauliflower and cabbage through channel-1 is rs.42.87 and 40.05 per quintal respectively. Charges for transport, commission, value of quantity loss and market fee are the main cost item as this together account for 36 percent of the total marketing cost in these crops. Total marketing costs in sale of cauliflower and cabbage crops through channel-2 having three middlemen are presented in Table-3. Total marketing cost in sale of cauliflower and cabbage in this channel is Rs. 47.26 and Rs. 43.35 per quintal, Transport, commission, value of quantity loss and mandi fee are the main cost items as these together accounted for over 87 percent of total marketing costs in these crops. These costs are shared by producer, mashkhores and retailers. The costs incurred on the part of retailer for cauliflower is high by Rs. 4.81 per quintal due to more loss in quality of cauliflower compared to cabbage. Among the channels, the cost is higher in channel-2 due to more number of middlemen involved.

Price Spread

Price-spread in marketing of cauliflower and cabbage through the two identified channels presented in Table 4. Marketing costs accounted for 8 to 9 percent of the total consumer's price for both the crops in the two identified channels. The marketing margins were 37 percent in channel-1 and 39 percent in channel-2. The margin of mashakhores was around 11 percent and that of retailers 28 percent in the sale of these crops. The producer's share in consumer's rupee was around 55 percent in channel-1 and 52 percent in channel-2. The producer farmers got higher share in sale of cole crops when

channel-1 was adopted compared to channel-2 as the total margin of the intermediaries is higher in channel-2 for both the vegetable crops.

Conclusion and Suggestions

The study of vegetable marketing in terms of marketing channels, number of agencies and price-spread in Jaipur district of Rajasthan indicates that farmers mostly adopt channel-2 in marketing of their surplus produce having mashakhores as one of the intermediaries. The estimation of price-spread for the cole crops indicates lower share of farmers due to both higher marketing costs and margin charged by the intermediaries. The marketing margins are as high as 37 to 39 percent in sale of these crops. The study thus suggested that in order to promote efficient vegetable production, the regulatory measures to protect the interests of vegetables growers should be rationally modified by the government.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, N.L. and Dhaka, J.M.1998. Relationship between Arrivals and Prices of Spices in Rajasthan. *Indian journal of Agricultural Marketing.Confrence Special*, 12(3):152-154.
- Agarwal, N.L. and Meena, B.L. 1997, Agricultural Marketing in India: Performance of Cumin Marketing in Rajasthan, *Bihar Journal of Agricultural Marketing*, 5(3):319-328.
- Brahmbhatt, D.H., 1989. Export and Marketing of Seed Spices, Proceedings of First National Seminar on Seed Spices, Jaipur, October, 24-25:pp.497-498
- Naidu, M.R., Brahmiah, R.P. and Rawat, S.K. 1999. Production and marketing of Chillies in Azamgarh District of Utter Pradesh. *Bihar Journal of agricultural Marketing*. 7 (1):37-41
- Raju, V.T. and Rao, D.V.S.1995. Marketing Cost and Margins of Important Agricultural Commodities in Andhra Pradesh. *India Journal of Agricultural Marketing. confrence Special*: 56
