E-ISSN: 25826336

International Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences: 5(1); 29-33: 2020

MARKETING ANALYSIS OF TOMATO DISTRICT VARANASI UTTAR PRADESH

LATA MISHRA* AND DR. RAMCHANDRA

Department of Agricultural Economics

Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj- 211007 (U.P.) India

Research Scholar* E-mail: mishralata22@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: There are three existing marketing channels identified in Varanasi regulated market. Most popularized marketing channel; Producer-Wholesaler-Retailer-Consumer, channel –III was found in marketing of tomato because in this channel price spread was obtained Rs. 1206/ha as sale price of retailers to consumers and producer's share in consumer's rupee is Rs. 45.91 with the marketing efficiency was 1.62 per cent. The average yield and gross return per hectare were higher in case of large size farm size groups followed by small and medium farm size groups respectively. It was found that the channel –I, Producer-consumer, sale price of the consumer was Rs. 1000/qtl and the price spread was Rs. 142.00/ha with marketing efficiency 1.04 per cent. In channel-II, the producer net share was 64.70 in consumer price; Producer sale price to the consumer was Rs. 1700/qtls and the price spread was Rs. 742.00/qtls. This study was conducted on "An Economic Analysis of Marketing of Tomato in Varanasi District of Uttar Pradesh" during the year 2018-19.

KEY WORDS: Tomato, Marketing, cost and returns.

Tomato is an herbaceous sprawling plant growing to 1-3 m in height with a weak woody stem. The flowers are yellow in color and the fruits of cultivated varieties vary in size from cherry tomatoes, about 1–2 cm in size to beefsteak tomatoes, about 10 cm or more in diameter. Most cultivars produce red fruits when ripe. Indeterminate tomato plants are perennials in their native habitat but are cultivated as annuals. The marketing component is important to ensure remunerative prices to the farmers ' which will eventually work as an incentive for them to bring more area under cereals. Marketing can also help in inducing an element of incentive to fanner through participation in processing and distribution of Pearl millet through direct marketing, farmers market or cooperative marketing to get higher share in the consumer's price. Marketing innovations like group marketing will help in improving the bargaining powers of small and marginal farmers.

Tomato is one of the major horticulture crops of the country. With an estimated production of 20.51 MT in 2017-18, India is one of the largest producers of tomatoes in the world, second only to China. Around 11per cent of the total world production of tomatoes is cultivated in India. The major Tomato producing states in the country are Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Gujarat, Odisha, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Bihar, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, and Tamil Nadu. These states are account for 91per cent of the total production of the country. The production of tomato during the year 2017-18 (First Advance Estimate) is estimated to be 2 per cent (20.51 MT) higher as compared to the previous year (19.76 MT). However, as compared to the past 5 year's average production, it is 20 per cent higher. Tomato is one of the essential commodities of the Indian market. The total area under tomato cultivation in India is about 4.97 lakh hectares, which is about 7.3 per cent of the total cropped land under vegetables. The annual production of tomatoes in India is 16,826.38 thousand tons. India is ranked 3rd after China and the US as far as the production of tomatoes is concerned. India has experienced a considerable increase in the production of tomatoes over the past 10 years.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data on area, production and productivity was collected from Varanasi District. Out of which Harhua and Baragaon Mandals from Varanasi district is the major tomato growing Mandals. Therefore these two Mandals were purposively selected for the present study. For selection of respondents were categorized into three groups on the basis of area under tomato cultivation in all the selected villages.

Small size farm group -having area of cultivation less than 1 ha

Medium size farm group- having area of cultivation of 1-2 ha

Large size farm group- having area of cultivation more than 2ha

There were three marketing channels in tomato marketing in Varanasi are given below

Channel –I: producer – consumer

Channel –II: producer – village merchants/ retailer – consumer

Channel –III: Producer – commission agent/ wholesaler – retailer - consumer

The data was collected through personal interview bench mark survey method. The data was collected a predesigned tested schedule with personal interview. The schedule was divided into two major parts. First section included profile of respondents and second section questions was related to economic analysis of production of tomato. Data was analyzed by using tabular analysis and input output ratio (B.C Ratio), gross income, marketing cost, Marketable surplus are worked out.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The average marketing cost of tomato was found Rs. 142.00/qtl in channel (I). There was a huge amount charged for sorting and grading (Rs. 30.00/qtl) and transportation (Rs. 40.00/qtl) which was highest percentage of the total cost. Whereas the miscellaneous charges were Rs. 20.00 loading and unloading cost Rs. 12.00 l and market fee Rs. 20.00 per quintal, respectively. The producer net share was 85.8o per cent in consumer's price. Producers sale price to the consumers was Rs. 1000/qtl and the price spread was Rs. 142.00/ha with marketing efficiency of 1.04per cent as given in table- 1..

Table-1: Marketing cost, marketing efficiency and price spread (Rs./qtl)

Particulars	**Rs/quintal**
(A) The cost incurred by the producer	
Transport charges	40 (4.0)
Sorting and grading charges	30(3.0)
Loading and unloading charges	12(1.2)
Packaging charges	20(2.0)
Mandi fees	20(2.0)
miscellaneous charge	20(2.0)
The total cost incurred by the producer (1-7)	142
Producer sale price to consumer	1000 (100)
Net price received by the producer	858
Price spread	142
Producer share in consumer rupee	85.80
Marketing efficiency	7.04

The average marketing cost of tomato incurred by the producer and village merchant for the channel (II) in the study area as Rs. 142.00/qtl and Rs. 160.00/qtl respectively. The producer's net share was 64.70 in consumer price; producers sale price to the consumers was Rs. 1700/qtls and the price spread was Rs. 742.00/qtls. This channel was also considered as the good channel with a minimum number of market functionaries hence the marketing efficiency was 2.29% better than the channel III as represented in table- 2.

The channel (Channel-III) is longest channel for tomato marketing. Therefore, most of the growers do not prefer to sale their produce through this channel due to the maximum involvement of middlemen's. Four intermediaries (Producer, Village merchant, wholesaler and retailers finally to consumer) were identified in this channel through which tomato produce reaches the consumers. This is identified as the longest channel in the study area. The producer sells his produce to the village merchant who sell to the wholesalers, who in turn sell it to retailers in the market and finally the retailer sell to ultimate consumer. The average marketing cost when producers sold their produce to the wholesaler Rs. 146.00/qtl, wholesaler to retailer was Rs. 185.00/qtl, retailer to ultimate consumer was found to be Rs. 175.00/qtl respectively. Price spread Rs.1206/qtl and sale price of retailers to consumers and producers share in consumer's rupee was 45.91. The marketing efficiency 1.62 per cent in channel-III was lower as compared to the channel-I and channel-II respectively. Hence, this channel was considered as the poorly performing channel to follow for the producers.

Estimated marketing cost marketing efficiency and price spread in different channels of the study areas:

It revealed that the total marketing cost marketing margin, price spread, Producers share in consumer rupee and marketing efficiency in all the three marketing channels. The total market cost (Rs.506.00) was higher in channel III as compared to channel-I (Rs.142.00) and channel-II (Rs. 302.00) respectively. A total marketing margin and price spread Rs. 742.00 and Rs. 1206.00 was realized in channel II and III respectively, which was higher in channel-III than channel-II. This was because in channel-III, there was three intermediates involved, whereas in the channel-I and channel-II. Where as in the channel-I and channel-II there was a single intermediately and two intermediate involved. The producers share in consumer's rupee was also higher in channel-I (85.80%) than channel-II (64.70%) and channel-III (45.91%) respectively. Likewise the marketing efficiency was found higher in channel-I (7.04%) than channel-II (2.29%) and channel-III (1.62%) respectively as depicted in table- 4.

Table-2: Marketing cost, marketing efficiency and price spread (Rs./qtl)

Particulars	**Rs./quintal**
(A) The cost incurred by the producer	
Transport charges	40 (2.35)
Sorting and grading charges	30 (1.76)
Loading and unloading charges	12 (0.70)
Packaging charges	25(1.47)
Mandi fees	20(1.17)
miscellaneous charge	20(1.17)
The total cost incurred by producer (1-6)	142
Net price received by producer	958
The sale price of the producer to village merchant	1100
(B)Cost incurred by the village merchant	
Transport charge	40 (2.35)
Weighing charges	20 (1.17)
Loading /Unloading charge	15 (0.88)
Market Fees	20 (1.17)
Sorting charges	30 (1.76)
Miscellaneous charges	35(2.05)
The total cost incurred by village merchants (1-6)	160
Village merchant margin	440
The sale price of village merchant to consumer	1700
Price spread (Total marketing cost +margins)	742
Producer share in consumer rupee	64.70
Marketing efficiency	2.29

Table- 3: Marketing cost, marketing efficiency and price spread in study area. (Rs./qtl).

Particulars	**Rs./quintal**
(A) Cost incurred by the producer	
Transport charges	40 (2.04)
Sorting and grading charges	30 (1.53)
Weighing charges	20 (1.02)
Mandi fees	20 (1.02)
Loading and un loading charges	16 (0.81)
miscellaneous charge	30 (1.53)
Total cost incurred by producer (1-6)	146
Net price received by producer	754
Sale price of producer to village merchant	900
B. cost incurred by the wholesaler/Commission agent	
Transport charges	40 (2.04)
Gunny bag charges	15 (0.76)
Sorting and grading charges	20(1.02)
Weighing charges	20 (1.02)
Loading and un loading charges	30 (1.53)
Mandi commission	15 (0.76)
Other	45 (2.29)
Total cost incurred by wholesaler (1-7)	185
Wholesaler margin	400
Sale price of wholesaler to retailers	1485
c. cost incurred by the retailers	
Transport charges	40 (2.04)
Sorting and grading charges	30 (1.53)
Weighing charges	15(0.76)
Loading and un loading charges	20 (1.02)
Mandi commission	20 (1.02)
Other	50 (2.55)
Total cost incurred by retailer (1-6)	175
Retailers margin	300
Sale price of retailers to consumers	1960
Price spread (total marketing cost + margin)	1206
Producer share in consumer rupee	45.91
Marketing efficiency	1.62

Table- 4:Marketing cost marketing efficiency and price spread in different farm size groups (Rs. /qtls)

Particulars	**Channel-I**	**Channel-II**	**Channel-III**
Total marketing cost	142	302	506
Total marketing margins	0	440	700
Price spread	142	742	1206
Producer share in consumer rupee in %	90	64.70	45.91
Marketing efficiency in %	7.04	2.29	1.62

CONCLUSION

The marketing of Tomato in district Varanasi was analyzed and found that socio- economic status of tomato growers was higher in first category of marketing channel as compared to cannel – II and III in different size farm groups. It was found from the study that economics of tomato production are more profitable in large farms as compared to medium and small farm size groups.

Among the Three marketing channels identified in Varanasi district regulated market, the channel–III, i.e. Producer-Wholesaler-Retailer-Consumer was found more popular in marketing of tomato. The average per hectare yield and gross return were maximum on large size farm Followed by small and medium Size respondents. The prices of tomato have not influenced by the arrivals in Varanasi market. The maximum prices of tomato were observed during the month of January Thus, the sellers prefer these months for selling of tomato in Varanasi market. The important constraints faced by the sample tomato cultivators were high wages for labor, non-availability of labor in peak period, high costs of seed, high costs of manures and fertilizer, incidence of pests and diseases and non-availability of loan in time While, in case of marketing of tomato, the problems faced by the farmers were problems of high commission charges, price variation in the different markets followed by high transport charges, high market commission rates. Tomato growers faced various financial, social and infrastructural constraints. The adoption behavior in the marketing practices was also found to be less because of similar type of constraints.

REFERENCES

Dudhati, B. L. and Khunt, K. A., 2007,
Economics of production and marketing of groundnut seeds in junagadh district of Gujarat. Indian *J. Agric. Mktg*., 21 (2): 30-38.

G.P. Reddy, M. M. (2010).
Value Chains and Retailing of Fresh Vegetables and Fruits, Andhra Pradesh. Agricultural Economics Research Review, 23, 455-460.

Grover, D. K. and Singh., 2007,
Sesamum cultivation in Punjab. Status, potential and constraints. *Agric. Econ. Res. Rev*., 20 (4): 299-313.

J KrishiVigyan (2016);
“Socio-economic Status and Constraints Faced by Tomato Growers in Kheda District”, 5(1): 114-116.

Jansirani, R., Somasundram. S. and Ranganathan, G., 2001,
Prospects and problems of betelvine cultivation. *Indian J. of Extn. Edun*. 12(3):8200-3200.

Killedar, Labor, N.S., Babar, V.S. and Ingarale, M.T. (2002),
“Economics of production and marketing of Ginger in Satara district of them Maharashtra”. *Indian journal of agricultural marketing;* 16(2), 76-77.

Kumar, S., Prasanna, P.A.L. and Wankhade, S. (2011),
“Potential Benefits of BT Brinjal in India: An Economic Assessment”, Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 24, Jan-Jun., pp. 82-99.

Kumara, B. R., Hosamani, S. B., Mamle desai, N. R., Megeri, S. N. and Hosamani, M. H., 2012,
Costs and returns of major cropping systems in northern transition zone of Kamataka. Karnataka *J. Agric. Sci*., 25 (2): (208-211).

Lahoti, S. R., Chole, R. R. AND Rathi, N. R., 2010.
Constraints in Adoption of Sugarcane Production Technology. Agricultural Science Digest. 30 (4):270-272.

Reddy, S. Y., and Reddy, G. P., 2005,
“Production and marketing constraints of sunflower cultivation in Andhra Pradesh”. *Indian J. Agric. Mktg*., 19 (3) : 20-27.

Sharma, S.M. and Dahiya R.H.(2013),
“Economics of tomato cultivation in Jaipur District of Rajasthan. 6(1 l):1-11.

Shelke, S.D., Nagure, D.V and Patil, SN. (2009),
“Price spread and marketing pattern of groundnut in Maharashtra State” 4(3/4): 376-378.

Singh, G., Shanna, V.K. and Singh, S. (2015).
Production and marketing of green peas in punjab. 29(1): 71-80

Singh, S.N., Singh, V.K., Singh, R.K. And Rakesh, K. Singh., 2007,
Adoption constraints of pigeon pea cultivation in Lucknow district of Central Uttar Pradesh. **Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu. 7 (1): 34-36.**

Srimanee, Y., &Routray, J. K. (2012).
The fruit and vegetable marketing chains in Thailand: policy impacts and implications. International Journal of

Retail & Distribution Management, 40 (9), 656-675.

SukvinderJassi, A. P. (2011).
United Kingdom Food Supply Chain. Heslington: Improve Limited.

Sushil, K., Ghasi, R. And Sanjeev, P., 2009,
Economic analsis of Productivity and profitability of Rice Production in India. Agric. Situ. India, 66(1):3-7

Thomber A. P. Ghulghule J. N. and more 2009,
"Constraints faced by pulse growers in production and marketing and suggestions made by them in Marathwada region of Maharastra" *Department of Agri. Economic, Marathwada Agricultural university, Parbham' (MS), India. Agriculture;* 4: 1/2:73-75.

Tripathi, A.K., Manda], Subhasis, Datta, K.K. and Verma, MR. (2006),
"A study on marketing of ginger in Ri-Biho district of Meghalaya". Indian Journal of marketing, 20 (2): 106-115.