



ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; 12(4): 637-639
© 2023 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 20-02-2023
Accepted: 31-03-2023

Anjali Verma
Ph.D. Scholar, College of
Agriculture, IGKV, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

MR Chandrakar
Professor, College of Agriculture,
IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh,
India

VK Choudhary
Professor, College of Agriculture,
IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh,
India

Roshni Verma
Ph.D. Scholar, College of
Agriculture, IGKV, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

Shashank Sharma
Ph.D. Scholar, College of
Agriculture, IGKV, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

Corresponding Author:
Anjali Verma
Ph.D. Scholar, College of
Agriculture, IGKV, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh, India

Marketing of soybean in plain region of Chhattisgarh state: An economic analysis

Anjali Verma, MR Chandrakar, VK Choudhary, Roshni Verma and Shashank Sharma

Abstract

The present study was carried out to examine the marketing pattern of soybean in Bemetara and Kabirdham district of Chhattisgarh. The total production per farm was maximum in large farms i.e., 23.48 QT/farm, overall being 20.42 qt/farm. The farm retentions are mainly required for seed purpose and it is more in marginal farms (5.79%) as compared to small, medium and large farms. Marketable surplus was highest in large farms 152.19 qt./farm followed by medium 63.96 qt./farm, small farm 28.16 qt./farm and lowest in marginal farms as 9.75 qt./farm. The quantity used for home consumption was decreased and marketable surplus was increased with increase in land holdings simultaneously. There are 2 channels of marketing, in channel-I the product was sold to APMC. In channel II the product is sold to commission agent then to Producer- Poultry Vendors The per quintal cost of marketing of soybean for Channel-I was ₹ 177 and in case of Channel II it was ₹ 35 respectively. Producers share in consumer rupee was 96.77% and 99.18% in channel-I and channel-II respectively.

Keywords: Marketable surplus, commission agent, APMC, poultry vendors

Introduction

Agricultural marketing plays a significant role in the movement of commodity from the producer to the consumer and in stabilizing the prices. The planned agricultural output must be co-ordinated with changes in the demand and supply for agricultural commodities and marketing. This can be fruitful only when producer's share in consumer's rupee increases considerably irrespective of the volume of the marketable surplus produced with the farmers. Therefore, marketing is rightly considered as essential input in addition to improved seed and fertilizer in modern agriculture.

Soybean (*Glycine max*) is known as the-Golden bean and-Miracle crop of the 20th century because of its varied uses. Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh are the two major soybean producing states and currently contribute more than 80 per cent to the total area and production of soybean in India (Anonymous, 2012). In Chhattisgarh, soybean is mainly grown in the districts of Rajnandgaon, Bemetara and Kabirdham. Since, the information of marketing is important, the present investigation was taken up to study the marketing pattern of soybean in Kabirdham and Bemetara district of Chhattisgarh

Methodology

Marketing Pattern and Marketable Surplus Disposal Pattern

To examine the marketing pattern of soybean at different categories of farms, simple analysis was done. To estimate the marketable surplus of produce, total quantity used for different purposes is deducted from total production of crop.

MS = Total quantity – Quantity used at home Produced for different purposes.

Marketable Surplus

$$MS = P - (C + W + f)$$

Were,

MS = Marketable Surplus

P = Total Production

C = Family Consumption

W = Quantity use for Wage

f = Quantity used for cattle feed.

Result and Discussions

Production and Disposal Pattern of Soybean on Sample Farm

Production

The average production of soybean produced on the sample farms, selected for the study is presented in the Table 1.

Table 1: Average Production of Soybean

Sr. No.	Size group	No. of sample farmers	Average area under soybean (ha)	Production of soybean per ha (qt.)
1	Marginal	140	0.53	19.53
2	Small	80	1.47	20.18
3	Medium	55	3.09	21.67
4	Large	25	6.78	23.48
5	Overall	300	2.72	20.42

It is seen from the Table 1 that, average area under soybean increased with an increase in the size of holdings from 0.53 to 6.78 hectares. The average production of soybean was highest in large size group of holdings (23.48 q/ha) followed by medium (21.67 q/ha), small (20.18) and marginal (19.53 q/ha) size group. The production of soybean increased with increase in size group of holdings.

Table 3: Disposable pattern of soybean

Sr. No.	Particulars	Size group				Overall
		Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	
1	Marketable surplus	9.75 (100)	28.16 (100)	63.96 (100)	152.19 (100)	37.64 (100)
2	Agricultural Produce Marketing committee (APMC)	9.75 (100)	28.16 (100)	61.22 (95.71)	140.58 (92.37)	36.88 (97.98)
3	Poultry vendor	--	--	2.74 (4.29)	11.61 (7.63)	0.76 (2.02)

(Figures in parentheses are the percentages to marketable surplus)

Marketing Practices of Soybean

Marketing system for agricultural commodities and inputs plays a very crucial role. Agricultural marketing plays an important role not only in stimulating production and consumption, but in accelerating the pace of economic development. For this reason, it has been described as the most important multiplier of agricultural development. Marketing is one of the important activities in the production process which facilitates the movement of goods from site of production to the consumer. Soybean is taken to threshing yard, where it is threshed and cleaned. Most of the farmers preferred gunny bags for packaging of soybean. Farmers normally used bullock carts for transportation of soybean from field to villages, where farmers can store their produce if they want to store it and take it directly to market if they want to sell it.

Marketing Functions Carried out by Sample Soybean Farmers

The important marketing functions observed in sale of soybean in the study area are packaging and transport.

Packaging

Packaging is an important function in case of soybean. An

Marketable surplus of Soybean

The information regarding the Marketable surplus of soybean among different size groups is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Marketable surplus of Soybean

Sr. No.	Particulars	Size group				Overall
		Marginal	Small	Medium	Large	
1	Per farm production	10.35 (100)	29.66 (100)	66.96 (100)	159.19 (100)	55.54 (100)
3	Family consumption	0.60 (5.79)	1.50 (5.05)	3.00 (4.48)	7.00 (1.88)	3.00 (5.40)
5	Marketable surplus	9.75 (94.21)	28.16 (94.95)	63.96 (95.52)	152.19 (98.12)	52.54 (94.60)

(Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the per farm production)

It is seen from the Table 3, it was observed that, the majority of the produce (94.60 per cent) was available as marketable surplus for selling in market. The farm retentions are mainly required for seed purpose and it is more in marginal farms (5.79%) as compared to small, medium and large farms. Marketable surplus was highest in large farms 152.19 qt./farm followed by medium 63.96 qt./farm, small farm 28.16 qt./farm and lowest in marginal farms as 9.75 qt./farm.

Disposable pattern of soybean

ideal package results into reduction of losses in transport, less decaying in storage, maintain the quality of produce and ultimately leads to better return. More than 90 per cent farmers used gunny bags for packaging of soybean because it is easily available, cheap as compared to other material, easy to carry and also reusable.

Transportation

Quick and efficient transportation of produce to the desired place has direct influence on the operational efficiency in the marketing. Transportation is essential for creation of place utility, which helps in timely supply of a particular commodity to the different markets. Transport efficiency depends upon the timely availability of vehicles, condition of roads, etc. The mode of transport varies with the nature of commodity and distance to be covered. Majority of the farmers preferred the tractor and different vehicles as transportation medium to transport soybean from village to market.

Method of sale Farmers follow different methods of sale of soybean

APMC is one of the places where farmers can sell their produce through licensed intermediaries. Also, they sell some

amount of their produce their soybean directly to poultry vendors.

Different marketing channels in soybean marketing

Marketing channel are the way through which the commodity flow from producer to consumer. Producers prefer different marketing channels. Marketing channels followed by soybean producers in study area are as follows,

Channel-I: Producer-APMC

Channel-II: Producer- Poultry Vendors.

The sample soybean farmers sold their produce through the Channel I and II.

Marketing Cost

The different marketing functions *viz.*, packing, transportation and handling of produce, etc., are required to be performed in the marketing of soybean. The cost incurred for performing these operations is very important in soybean marketing because, it reflects on the consumer's price and the returns to the producer. The cost incurred on performing the operations such as packing, transportation, hamali, tolai, loading and unloading are worked out and presented in Table 4.

It can be seen from the Table that, the per quintal cost of marketing of soybean for Channel-I was ₹ 177 and in case of Channel II it was ₹ 35 respectively. Thus, per quintal cost of marketing was highest in Channel-I (Producer-APMC). Among the marketing cost transportation and Commission charges were the major items and contributed the highest share in the total cost of marketing.

The per quintal packing cost was ₹ 10 and ₹ 5 in Channel I and Channel II, respectively. The per quintal transportation charge were 45 and 30 in Channel I and Channel II respectively. The commission charge is 1.5% of total monetary value of produce charged by commission agents in APMC i.e., ₹ 82 when produce was sold at ₹ 5489. The cost of loading and unloading was ₹5 for both, Mandi fees was 2 per quintal.

Table 4: Channel wise Per Quintal Marketing Cost of Soybean (₹/q)

Sr. No	Particulars	Channel I (P-APMC)	Channel II (P-PV)
1	Selling price	5489	5500
2	Packaging charges	10	5
3	Transport charges	45	30
4	Hamali	16	--
5	Tolai	12	--
6	Mandi fees	2	--
7	Unloading	5	--
8	Loading	5	--
9	Commission charges	82	--
10	Total market cost	177	35
11	Price received by farmer	5312	5455
12	Producer's share in consumer's rupee	96.77%	99.18%

Conclusion

- The findings of the study clearly shows that the total production per farm was maximum in large farms i.e., 23.48 qt./farm, overall being 20.42 qt./farm. The farm retentions are mainly required for seed purpose and it is more in marginal farms (5.79%) as compared to small, medium and large farms. Marketable surplus was highest in large farms 152.19 qt./farm followed by medium 63.96 qt./farm, small farm 28.16 qt./farm and lowest in

marginal farms as 9.75 qt./farm. The quantity used for home consumption was decreased and marketable surplus was increased with increase in land holdings simultaneously.

- There are 2 channels of marketing, in channel-I the product was sold to APMC. In channel II the product is sold to commission agent then to Producer- Poultry Vendors.
- The per quintal cost of marketing of soybean for Channel-I was ₹ 177 and in case of Channel II it was ₹ 35 respectively.
- Producers share in consumer rupee was 96.77% and 99.18% in channel-I and channel-II respectively.

References

- Banafar KNS. Economics of processing of soybean in sehere district of Madhya Pradesh. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2003;58(3):610.
- Patel IS, Thakar KP, Sadhu BR, Patel VM, Jadav KS. Price spread and marketing of mustard in Banaskantha district of Gujarat state. International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics. 2012;3(2):219-221.
- Chavhal SH, Katkade JL, Kauthekar PU, Chavan RV, Sudewad LS. Marketing cost, marketing margin and price spread of soybean in Parbhani district of Maharashtra. International Journal of Commerce and Business Management. 2014;7(2):334-337.
- Jawane AA. Economics of production and marketing of soybean in Western Maharashtra. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpublished) submitted to MPKV, Rahuri, Ahmednagar (MH); c2012.
- Farkade VR, Choudhari SA, Amale AJ, Tilekar SN. Economic analysis of production and marketing of soybean in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. Indian Journal on Agricultural Marketing. 2011;25(2):122-134.
- Mahalle SL, Shastri S, Kumar S. Behavioral study of market arrivals and prices of pigeon pea in Maharashtra. Indian Journal of Economics and Development. 2014;10(1):86-94.
- HAZARI S, KHOBARKAR V. Production and Marketing of Soybean in Akola District of Maharashtra: An Economic Analysis. SOYBEAN RESEARCH; 48:48.
- Solanki M, Srivastava SC, Jaulkar AM, Raghuvanshi JS. Economics of soybean cultivation and its marketing pattern in Malwa plateau of Madhya Pradesh. International Journal of Farm Sciences. 2014;4(2):192-201.
- Bodade VM, Deshmukh RG, Prema B. Soybean price movement across major markets of Madhya Pradesh. International Research Journal of Agricultural Economics and Statistics. 2017;8(1):162-169.
- Wankhade RN, Dhanwate SP, Bhende AM, Malthane GB. Marketing of soybean in Amravati district of Maharashtra, International Journal of Applied Agricultural Research. 2010;5(2):215-220.