Agri Express: **02** (01), *Article No.* V02I01.46 *E - ISSN No. 2584 - 2498*

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON MARKETING OF MAIZE IN GHAZIPUR DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH

Mayank Singh[1] and Jayant Zechariah [2]

[1]MBA (Agribusiness), Department of Agricultural Economics

Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, U.P.

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics

Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, U.P.

Corresponding author: mayanksasana43@gmail.com

https://doie.org/10.0519/AE.2024157356

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in Ghazipur district of Uttar Pradesh as it has a huge impact on maize cultivation and production in Uttar Pradesh. The aim of this study is to understand the market value, market value, value distribution and economic efficiency of growers in the selected region. Manihari blocks were selected where 5% of the villages were selected and then 10% of the respondents were selected from the selected villages that had been growing crops for several years. 110 participants were selected through interviews. Information was collected in the form of a preliminary interview schedule. Research shows that different sectors have their own economic, cost differences, market value and economic benefits. In this study, it was found that marketing of maize involves three marketing channels of which channel III (P-W-R-C) was most preferred by the respondents in the study area. Channel I does the best work, followed by Channel II and Channel III. The prevalence in Pathway III is higher due to the increase in intermediates in Pathway III.

Keyword: Marketing Cost, Marketing Margin, Price Spread, Marketing Efficiency

INTRODUCTION

Corn is one of the most important grain products after wheat. The general use of corn has many advantages: Its husk is bird and rain proof, it can be harvested for a long time because it can be dried in the field until it is easy to harvest, it can be stored for a long time, and it provides many important features. It is the most preferred food compared to sorghum and other millets. It is the most important crop in the region during the monsoon season. It is grown for grain and fodder purposes. Corn is the main source of starch. Corn starch (cornmeal) is an important ingredient in home cooking and many other foods. Corn is also an important source of cooking oil (corn oil) and corn gluten. Corn starch is hydrolyzed and processed with enzymes to produce syrups, especially high fructose corn syrup, a sweetener, and fermented and distilled grain alcohol. Corn wine is traditionally made from bourbon. (A.K. Asea 2014) Corn is sometimes used as starch in beer. It is also beneficial for adults of all ages. Green straw is suitable for silage. Corn is grown all over the world, and more corn is produced each year than any other grain. Global production in 2009 was 817 million tons, more than wheat (678 million tons) and wheat (682 million tons). In 2009, the cultivated area in the world exceeded 1 million hectares and

the yield per hectare exceeded 5 tons. Corn is one of the most important grains in the world. Global measurement. India ranks 11th in production after the USA, Brazil, China and Mexico. (B Suresh Reddy 2018) In addition to wheat, rice, sorghum and pearl millet, corn is cultivated in India on 7.7 million hectares with a production of 15.1 million tons and a productivity of 2.0 tons/ha. Although it is eaten all over the country, it is a staple food in the hills and valleys of northern India. As food and grain crops. It is widely grown in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Karnataka.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Random sampling was used to obtain responses from eligible respondents. The study was conducted in Ghazipur district which was deliberately selected as it offers a lot of convenience to the researcher in terms of accessibility, local knowledge, time, money and quantitative effort. The research period covered the agricultural year 2023-24. The district consists of sixteen blocks and Manihar block was purposively selected based on the maximum number of respondents engaged in maize cultivation. 10 percent of the respondents were selected as the sample of corn farmers, and the selected respondents were divided into five groups based on land ownership. Secondary data on corn area and production were collected from the Department of Agriculture and Regional Development Offices. Primary data was collected from selected households and market intermediaries in the study area through a personal survey based on a pre-test schedule to determine marketing costs, marketing margins, marketing efficiency and price dispersion.

TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

Marketing Cost: C = Cf+ Cm1+ Cm2+ Cm3+ .... + Cmn
Market Margin: AMI=Pri-(Ppi+Cmi)
Price Spread: PS= MC + MM
Marketing Efficiency: MME = FP/ MC+MM

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CHANNEL I: Producer -Customer
Channel II: Producer, Wholesaler, and Consumer make up
Channel III: Producer, Wholesaler, Retailer, and Consumer make up

Table 1: Reveals which marketing channel respondents prefer.

Sr. No.	Channel Type	No of respondent	Percentage
1	Channel – I	17	15.45
2	Channel -II	39	35.45
3	Channel-III	54	49.09
	Total	**110**	**100**

Table 1, During the course of the study, it is observed that out of 110 sample respondents, 17 (15,45%) chose channel-I for buying and selling of maize, 39 (35,45%) preferred channel-II for buying or selling of maize, and remaining 54 (49,09%) preferred channel-III for buy or sell of maize within the study area.

Table 2: Expenses for promoting, profit made from marketing, effectiveness of marketing efforts, and price difference of Maize in Channel-I.

CHANNEL-I: Producer-Customer

Sr. No.	Particulars of cost	(Rs. /qt.)
1	**Farmer**	
	Price received	**2170**
a.	Loading &unloading	**21**
b.	Transportation cost	**44**
	Total (a-b)	**65**
	Net price received	**2035**
	Sale Price of Farmer to Consumer	**2105**
	Total Marketing Cost	**65**
	Marketing Efficiency	**33.38%**
	Price Spread	**65**

Table 2, It is shown that the producer sold Maize channel-I to consumers for Rs.2170/quintal, while receiving a net price of Rs.2035. The producer spent Rs on marketing expenses. 65. Rewrite the text with the same language and the same number of words: At last, the final cost for the consumer was Rs. 2170/quintal of corn. In the end, the overall cost of marketing in channel I is Rs. In channel 1, the price difference observed is Rs. 65. Efficiency of marketing on Channel-I is 33.38 percent

Table 3: Cost of marketing, profit margin in marketing, effectiveness of marketing, and price difference of Maize in Channel-II.

CHANNEL-II: P- W – C.

Sr. No.	Particulars of cost	(Rs. /qt.)
1	**Farmer**	
	Price received	**2155**
a.	Loading &unloading	**42**
b.	Transportation cost	**78**
	Total (a-b)	**120**
	Net price received	**2035**
2	**Wholesaler**	
	Purchase price	**2155**
a.	Loading &unloading	**35**
b.	Transportation cost	**94**
c.	Miscellaneous charges	**110**
	Total (a-c)	**239**
	Margin of Wholesaler	**349**
	Sale price of Wholesaler	**2743**
3	**Consumer**	
	Purchase price of Consumer	**2743**
A.	**Total Marketing Cost**	**359**
B.	**Total Marketing Margin**	**349**
C.	**Marketing Efficiency**	**3.04%**
D.	**Price Spread**	**708**

Table 3, It is disclosed that the producer supplied Maize to the wholesaler at the marketing price of Rs. in channel -II. 2155 rupees per quintal is the amount spent by the farmer on marketing expenses for their produce. Producer in channel-II receives a net price of Rs. 120.00. In 2035, the wholesaler in channel -II spent Rs.239 on marketing costs and made a profit of Rs.349 on the sale of 1 quintal of maize, resulting in a consumer price of Rs. 2743 Two thousand seven hundred and forty-three. Finally, Pathway II's total market capitalization is approximately Rs. In Channel-II, total trading profit is Rs 359, spread is Rs 708 and trading margin is 3.04%.

Table 4: Cost of marketing, profit margin in marketing, effectiveness of marketing, and price difference of corn in Channel-III.

CHANNEL-III - P- W – R– C.

Sr. No.	**Particulars of cost**	**(**Rs. /**qt.)**
1	**Farmer**	
	Price received	**2155**
a.	Loading &unloading	**42**
b.	Transportation cost	**78**
	Total (a-b)	**120**
	Net price received	**2035**
2	**Wholesaler**	
	Purchase price	**2155**
a.	Loading &unloading	**35**
b.	Transportation cost	**94**
c.	Miscellaneous charges	**110**
	Total (a-c)	**239**
	Margin of Wholesaler	**340**
	Sale price of Wholesaler	**2734**
3	**Retailer**	
	Purchase price	**2734**
a.	Loading and unloading charges	**19**
b.	Transportation cost	**09**
c.	Miscellaneous charges	**11**
	Total Cost (a-c)	**39**
	Margin of Retailer	**157**
	Sale price of Retailer	**2930**
4	**Consumer**	
	Purchase price	**2930**
A	**Total Marketing Cost**	**398**
B	**Total Marketing Margin**	**497**
C	**Marketing Efficiency**	**2.40%**
D	**Price Spread**	**895**

Table 4, It is disclosed that the cost of marketing Maize in channel -III, from the producer to the wholesaler, was Rs. Marketing expenses amount to Rs. 2155 per quintal for the farmer's produce. The producer receives a net price of Rs. 120.00 in channel-II. In 2035, the marketing expenses for wholesalers in channel -III were Rs.239, with a margin of Rs.340 for each quintal of maize sold, resulting in the sale price to retailers being Rs.2734. Two thousand seven

hundred and thirty-four. The seller's market price for 1 quintal of maize was Rs 39 and his profit was Rs 157, so the selling price to the consumer was Rs 196. Two thousand nine hundred and thirty. In the end, the overall marketing expense in channel-III is Rs 398, while the total marketing profit in channel-III is Rs. 497, channel-III has a price spread of 895 and a marketing efficiency rate of 2.40%.

CONCLUSION

The marketing of corn in Ghazipur, Uttar Pradesh, is a complicated problem that is affected by agricultural and weather conditions, as well as poor infrastructure. Conventional advertising strategies lead to price instability and exploitation, with local market conditions being influenced by worldwide fluctuations in commodity prices and government policies. Farmers encounter difficulties in dealing with market unpredict abilities and obtaining timely information. Upgrading infrastructure and encouraging ethical trading practices are essential investments needed to tackle these issues. Ghazipur's corn market is encountering difficulties as demand increases for food processing, animal feed, and ethanol production. Technology and creativity have the potential to establish direct connections between farmers and consumers, guaranteeing fair compensation. Utilizing sustainable farming methods and participating in certification programs can assist farmers in accessing premium markets and receiving higher prices. Various factors, including infrastructure limitations, global market trends, and government regulations, impact maize marketing in Ghazipur. The full potential of maize farming can be achieved through modernization, market-oriented interventions, and value chain integration, leading to equitable growth and prosperity for farmers and stakeholders.

REFERENCE

A.K. Asea (2014) "Factors Influencing Maize Marketing among Small holder Farmers in Uganda" Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics, Vol. 6, No. 9.

B. Sudhakara Reddy (2006) "Market Structure and Price Spread in the Marketing of Maize in Andhra Pradesh, India" Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 61, No. 1.

B Suresh Reddy (2018) "Maize Value Chain Analysis in India: A Case Study in Andhra Pradesh" Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 73, No. 4.

Gouri Sankar Mishra (2016) "Marketing Efficiency of Maize in Odisha, India: A Translog Profit Function Approach" Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 29, No. 2.

L. Bhagyavati (2013) "Marketing Efficiency and Constraints in Maize Marketing in Karnataka, India" Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 26, No. 2.

Mahesh Kumar (2012) "An Economic Analysis of Maize Marketing in Bihar" Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 25, No. 2.

Mary K. Mathenge, Milu Muyanga et al. (2013) "The Role of Intermediaries in Maize

Marketing: Evidence from Kenya" Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Vol. 45, No. 3.

Pardeep Singh (2017) "Role of Cooperatives in Maize Marketing in India: A Case Study of FCI and NAFED" Journal of Agricultural Marketing, Vol. 1, No. 2.

Pratibha Singh1 and J. Rai (2019) Economics of Marketing of Maize in Etah District (U. P).*Lumle Regional Agricultural Research Centre Review Paper*, 95 (01): 23

Raghavendra S. Vedavyasa (2010) "An Economic Analysis of Maize Marketing in Karnataka, India" Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 65, No. 3

*****