
**ISSN Print:** 2664-844X
**ISSN Online:** 2664-8458
NAAS Rating: 4.97
IJAFS 2025; 7(5): 118-120
www.agriculturaljournals.com
Received: 25-02-2025
Accepted: 26-03-2025

**Saurabh Pal**
Research Scholar (P.G), Department of Agricultural Economics, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Dr. Pritesh Dwivedi**
Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author:**
**Saurabh Pal**
Research Scholar (P.G), Department of Agricultural Economics, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

# Marketing of Mansuri Rice in Jaunpur District, Uttar Pradesh: An analysis of farmers' profitability and market constraints

**Saurabh Pal and Pritesh Dwivedi**

**DOI:** https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2664844X.2025.v7.i5b.385

**Abstract**
This study investigates the marketing system of Mansuri rice in Jaunpur district, Uttar Pradesh, focusing on identifying the key marketing channels, assessing the price spread, and analyzing the constraints impacting farmers' profitability. Data was collected from 100 farmers, 20 traders, and 10 intermediaries through structured surveys. The study utilized Cost-Return Analysis to estimate profit margins, Marketing Margin Analysis to evaluate the efficiency of different marketing channels, and Garrett's Ranking Technique to identify constraints. Results show that farmers predominantly sell through local traders, receiving only a small fraction of the final consumer price. The price spread between farm gate prices and retail prices was found to be significant. Constraints such as price volatility, poor infrastructure, and exploitation by middlemen were the most significant factors hindering farmers' profitability. The study recommends promoting direct marketing channels, improving market infrastructure, and enhancing the role of farmer cooperatives. These measures could significantly improve the income of farmers and ensure a more equitable distribution of profits across the supply chain.

**Keywords:** Uttar Pradesh, Mansuri rice, marketing channels, price spread, marketing margin

## 1. Introduction
Mansuri rice is one of the most important cereal crops cultivated in Jaunpur district, Uttar Pradesh. While it is favored for its high quality and consumer demand, the region's farmers face several marketing challenges. These challenges stem from multiple intermediaries, inadequate market infrastructure, and price volatility. The involvement of middlemen often leads to farmers receiving a much lower share of the final retail price, impacting their profitability and income stability. Despite the high demand for Mansuri rice, the farmers are unable to capitalize fully on this demand due to an inefficient marketing system. Middlemen exploit farmers, and poor infrastructure hampers direct market access. This research aims to understand the underlying reasons for these issues and suggest potential solutions to improve the marketing system.

## 2. Materials and Methods
The study was conducted in Jaunpur district, Uttar Pradesh, a region where Mansuri rice is one of the staple crops. The district faces significant challenges in agricultural marketing due to inefficiencies in supply chain logistics and the dominance of intermediaries. Primary data was collected from 100 farmers, 20 traders, and 10 intermediaries using structured surveys. Secondary data was obtained from government reports and existing literature to supplement the research. The surveys included questions about farming practices, marketing channels, pricing, and constraints. A stratified random sampling method was employed to select farmers from different landholding categories, such as small, medium, and large landholders. Traders and intermediaries were chosen based on their role in the supply chain for Mansuri rice.

## 3. Analytical Tools
**1. Acharya's marketing efficiency formula:** $MME = FP/ MC+MM$
**2. Garrett ranking:** Per cent position = $100 (R_{ij}-0.5) /N_j$

**3. Margin analysis**

$$\frac{\text{Price to Consumer} - \text{Price to Producer}}{\text{Price to Consumer}} * 100$$

**4. Marketable Surplus =** P – {C + Cf + W + S}

**5. Marketing Cost** = Cf+ Cm1+ Cm2+ Cm3++ Cmn

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 1. Socio-Economic Profile of Respondents

The socio-economic profile provides essential context for understanding the farming practices and market behavior of the respondents. The following table summarizes key demographic data from the surveyed farmers.

**Table 1:** Socio-economic profile of respondents

| Characteristic | Frequency (Number) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Age Group** | | |
| 18-30 years | 28 | 28.5% |
| 31-50 years | 52 | 52.4% |
| 51-70 years | 19 | 19.1% |
| **Education Level** | | |
| No formal education | 12 | 12.5% |
| Primary education | 29 | 28.9% |
| Secondary education | 43 | 43.2% |
| Higher education | 15 | 15.4% |
| **Landholding Size** | | |
| Less than 1 acre | 28 | 28.4% |
| 1-4 acres | 35 | 35.4% |
| More than 4 acres | 36 | 36.2% |

- **Age Group:** The majority of respondents (52.4%) are between 31-50 years, representing the productive middle-aged group, while 28.5% are younger farmers (18-30 years). Only 19.1% are older (51-70 years), suggesting a balanced mix of younger and experienced farmers.
- **Education Level:** significant portion (43.2%) have secondary education, enabling them to engage with modern farming practices. However, 12.5% have no formal education, which may limit their access to advanced farming techniques and market opportunities.
- **Landholding Size:** The largest group (36.2%) owns more than 3 acres, indicating that a significant portion of farmers can potentially adopt modern agricultural technologies. However, 28.4% have less than 1 acre, which limits their capacity for large-scale farming and access to resources.

### 2. Marketing Channels for Mansuri Rice

The survey identified several marketing channels used by farmers in Jaunpur district. Below is a summary of the marketing practices.

**Table 2:** Marketing channels used by farmers

| Marketing Channel | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Direct to Consumers | 12 | 12.5 |
| Commission Agents | 47 | 47.8 |
| Traders | 27 | 27.4 |
| Millers | 12 | 12.3 |

### Discussion

It is evident that the farmers rely heavily on commission agents (47.8%), which limits their ability to directly negotiate better prices. The farmers who sell directly to consumers are fewer, but they stand to gain a larger share of the final price.

- **Commission Agents (47.8%):** A significant portion of farmers (47.8%) rely on commission agents to market their products. Commission agents act as intermediaries, connecting farmers with buyers. This channel is common in regions with limited direct market access or where farmers lack bargaining power.
- **Traders (27.4%):** Traders, who buy products in bulk and sell to various buyers, are another key channel. This suggests that many farmers opt for traders due to ease and quick sales, although they may receive a lower price than they would in direct sales.
- **Direct to Consumers (12.5%):** A smaller proportion of farmers (12.5%) directly sell to consumers. This channel could potentially provide higher profits but might require more time, resources and access to markets.
- **Millers (12.3%):** A similar proportion of farmers (12.3%) sell their products to millers, who process the products for further use or sale. This channel may be more relevant for certain crops but less common in direct agricultural sales.

### 3. Price spread and producer's share in consumer's rupee

An analysis of price spread and the farmer's share in the final retail price is crucial to understanding profitability.

**Table 3:** Price spread and producer's share in consumer's rupee

| Marketing Channel | Farm Gate Price (₹/kg) | Retail Price (₹/kg) | Price Spread (₹) | Producer's Share (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct to consumers | 30.00 | 35.00 | 5.00 | 84 |
| Commission agents | 28.50 | 35.00 | 6.50 | 80 |
| Traders | 29.00 | 37.00 | 8.00 | 78 |
| Millers | 27.50 | 36.00 | 8.50 | 76 |

### Discussion

The table reveals that farmers selling directly to consumers receive the highest share of the retail price (84%), whereas those using middlemen like traders or millers receive significantly less. The price spread is much wider in channels involving intermediaries.

### 4. Constraints in Rice Marketing

Farmers reported several key constraints impacting their profitability and marketing effectiveness. The ranking of these constraints is provided below.

**Table 4:** Constraints in rice marketing ranked by Garrett's ranking technique

| Constraint | Garrett's Score | Rank |
|---|---|---|
| High transportation costs | 67.8 | I |
| Price fluctuations | 58.3 | II |
| Exploitation by middlemen | 56.9 | III |
| Lack of direct marketing channels | 49.7 | IV |
| Poor market infrastructure | 48.2 | V |

### 5. Discussion

The high transportation costs and price fluctuations were ranked as the top constraints, with exploitation by middlemen following closely behind. These challenges significantly reduce the profitability for farmers and need to be addressed through better infrastructure, policy interventions, and support for direct marketing.

## 6. Conclusions

The marketing system for Mansuri rice in Jaunpur district, Uttar Pradesh, reveals critical inefficiencies that negatively impact farmers' profitability. The study found that farmers predominantly use intermediaries, such as commission agents (47.8%), traders (27.4%), and millers (12.3%), with a small proportion (12.5%) selling directly to consumers. The price spread between farm gate prices and retail prices is significant, with farmers receiving only a fraction of the final price. For example, farmers selling directly to consumers received ₹30.00 per kg at the farm gate, but the retail price was ₹35.00, resulting in a price spread of ₹5.00. This allowed farmers a producer's share of 84% of the final retail price. In contrast, those using intermediaries like commission agents and traders received a much lower share. Commission agents facilitated sales at ₹28.50 per kg for the farmer, with a retail price of ₹35.00, leading to a price spread of ₹6.50 and the farmer receiving only 80% of the final price. Similarly, traders and millers offered even lower shares (78% and 76%, respectively).The analysis of constraints revealed that high transportation costs (67.8) and price fluctuations (58.3) were ranked as the most significant barriers, followed by exploitation by middlemen (56.9). These constraints hinder farmers' ability to access better profits and stable incomes.

The study emphasizes the need for promoting Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs), improving market infrastructure, and implementing policy interventions to regulate price fluctuations. These measures would not only reduce dependence on intermediaries but also improve farmers' income and enhance market efficiency in the region.

## 7. References

1. Chand R. Agricultural marketing in India: Issues and challenges. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2015;70(2):142-158.
2. Kumar S, Yadav R. Impact of marketing channels on rice farmers in Uttar Pradesh. Journal of Rural Development. 2016;37(1):123-135.
3. Sharma M, Singh P. Farmers' income and agricultural marketing in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2015;32(2):45-58.
4. Singh V, Mehta R. Role of transportation in agricultural marketing. Journal of Rural Economics. 2018;41(2):103-114.
5. Bansal R, Mehta S. Challenges in agricultural marketing in remote areas of Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Marketing. 2017;49(3):33-40.