Agri Express: **03** (01), ***Article No***. V03I01.29, January - March, **2025** ***E - ISSN No. 2584 – 2498***

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON MARKETING OF AMLA PRODUCTS IN PRATAPGARH DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH

Ravi Shankar Yadav[1] and Amit Kumar[2]

[1]MBA (Agribusiness) and [2]Sr. Assistant Professor

Department of Agricultural Economics

Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Naini, Prayagraj

Corresponding author: starravi5404@gmail.com

https://doie.org/10.10346/AE.2025526172

ABSTRACT

The study titled "An Economic Analysis on Marketing of Amla Products in Pratapgarh District of Uttar Pradesh" aimed to assess the marketing practices and cost structures of Amla products in the region. The study was conducted in the Pratapgarh (Sadar) block of Pratapgarh district, where five percent of Amla cultivating villages were selected purposively, and ten percent of respondents were randomly chosen. Three primary marketing channels were identified: Channel-I: Producer → Consumer, Channel-II: Producer → Commission Agent → Wholesaler → Consumer, and Channel-III: Producer → Commission Agent → Retailer → Consumer. The study analyzed the price structure and marketing costs across these stages of the supply chain, focusing on the producer, commission agent, retailer, and final consumer. The results indicated that the net price received by the producer was ₹4500 per quintal, while the total marketing cost incurred by the producer was ₹178. The product's sale price to the commission agent was ₹4678, and the commission agent incurred ₹97 in marketing costs, earning a margin of ₹175. The sale price to the retailer was ₹4950, with marketing costs of ₹253 and a margin of ₹137. Ultimately, the consumer paid ₹5340 per quintal, resulting in a total marketing cost of ₹840 and a price spread of ₹840. The producer's share in the final consumer price was 84.27%, with the marketing efficiency calculated at 6.36%. The findings suggested that although the producer received a significant share of the consumer price, there was potential to enhance efficiency and reduce marketing costs across the supply chain.

Keywords: Amla products, marketing channels, cost structure, price spread, marketing efficiency

INTRODUCTION

Amla, also known as Indian gooseberry, is a small, green fruit renowned for its high vitamin C content and numerous health benefits. It has been used in traditional medicine for centuries due to its immune-boosting properties and its role in treating various ailments such as digestive issues, inflammation, and skin problems. Amla's versatile nature has led to the creation of various products, most notably candy and marmalade, which became increasingly popular in both domestic and international markets. Amla candy is typically made by preserving the fruit in sugar syrup, offering a convenient, sweet, and tangy treat while retaining the fruit's nutritional properties. Amla marmalade, on the other hand, is made from the pulp of the fruit, providing a unique, flavourful spread rich in vitamin C, antioxidants, and other essential nutrients. These products gained favor for their ability to combine the sourness of Amla with

sweetness, making them more palatable for a broader consumer base. Amla products, particularly candy and marmalade, have been widely recognized not only for their taste but also for their health benefits, including boosting immunity, improving skin health, and enhancing digestion. Over the years, the demand for Amla-based products increased, with both local and international markets witnessing significant growth. The growing awareness about health and wellness further contributed to the popularity of Amla, solidifying its place as a key ingredient in the global food and wellness industry.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed for the selection of the district, blocks, villages, and respondents was a combination of purposive and random sampling. Pratapgarh district was selected to minimize the investigator's time constraints and logistical challenges. Within Pratapgarh district, the Pratapgarh (Sadar) block was chosen based on the concentration of respondents involved in Amla cultivation. A list of villages within the selected block was compiled, and five percent of these villages, with a high number of Amla cultivators, were randomly chosen. From these villages, a comprehensive list of Amla farmers was created, which was categorized into five landholding size groups: Marginal size (less than 1 hectare), Small size (1-2 hectares), Semi-medium size (2-4 hectares), Medium size (4-10 hectares), and Large size (more than 10 hectares). A total of 150 Amla farmers were selected using proportionate random sampling from each group. Additionally, five wholesalers, five distributors, and ten retailers were chosen to study various marketing aspects, including marketing costs, margins, price spread, producer's share in consumer rupee, and marketing efficiency. Primary data was collected through a specially designed schedule, while secondary data was gathered from books, journals, reports, and records from district and block headquarters. Data was collected via direct personal interviews with the respondents. Statistical tools were employed to analyze and present the results. The data collected pertained to the agricultural year 2024-2025.

Analytical Tools

1. **Marketing Cost:**

$$C = Cf + Cm1 + Cm2 + Cm3 + ... + Cmn$$

2. **Market Margin:** $AMI = Pri - (Ppi + Cmi)$

3. **Price Spread:**

Marketing Cost + Market Margin

4. **Marketing Efficiency:**

5. $= \frac{\text{Price received by producer}}{\text{Marketing Cost + Marketing Margin}}$

6. **Producer's Share in Consumer Rupee:**

$$\frac{\text{Price received by the farmer}}{\text{Retail price paid by the consumer}} \times 100$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Price spread, producer-consumer rupees, marketing expenses, marketing margins, and marketing efficiency of AMLA via Channel I

S. No.	Particulars	Price (Rs. /Quintal)
1.	Net price received by producer	**3400**
2.	**Cost in curred by the producer**	
a.	Packaging cost	**20**
b.	Packaging material cost	**12**
c.	Miscellaneous charges	**145**
3.	Total marketing cost	**177**
4.	Sale price of producer/Purchase price of consumer	**3577**
5.	Price Spread	**177**
6.	**Producer Share in Consumer Rupee**	**95.24**
7.	**Marketing efficiency**	**20.21%**

Table 1: The data on the price structure and marketing efficiency of the product revealed several key insights into the cost distribution and producer earnings. The net price received by the producer was ₹3400 per quintal. The producer incurred various costs, including ₹20 for packaging, ₹12 for packaging materials, and ₹145 for miscellaneous charges, leading to a total marketing cost of ₹177 per quintal. The sale price for the producer, or the purchase price for the consumer, was ₹3577 per quintal, resulting in a price spread of ₹177. The producer's share in the final consumer price was 95.24%, reflecting a significant portion of the final cost going to the producer. However, marketing efficiency was calculated at 20.21%, indicating room for improvement in the marketing process to increase efficiency and reduce costs.

Table 2: Price spread, producer-consumer rupees, marketing expenses, marketing margins, and marketing efficiency of AMLA via Channel II

S.No.	Particulars	Price (Rs./Quintal)
1.	Net price received by producer	**2400**
2.	**Cost in curred by the producer**	
a.	Packaging Cost	**20**
b.	Packing material cost	**21**
c.	Transportation cost	**27**
d.	Loading and unloading cost	**50**
e.	Miscellaneous charges	**60**
3.	Marketing cost	**178**
4.	Sale price of producer/Purchase price of commission agent	**2578**
5.	**Costin incurred by the commission agent**	
a.	Loading, Unloading and repacking cost	**55**
b.	Spoilage and Losses	**42**

6.	Marketing cost	**97**
7.	Margin of commission agent	**155**
8.	Sale price of commission agent/Purchase price of wholesaler	**2830**
9.	**Cost in curred by the wholesaler**	
a.	Loading, unloading and repacking charges	**73**
b.	Grading and sorting charges	**62**
c.	Spoilage and Losses	**53**
10.	Marketing Cost	**188**
11.	Margin of wholesaler	**192**
12.	Sale price of wholesaler/purchase price of retailer	**3210**
13.	**Cost incurred by the Retailer**	
a.	Loading and unloading charges	**37**
b.	Carriage up to shop	**45**
c.	Miscellaneous charges	**30**
d.	Spoilage and losses	**40**
14.	Marketing cost	**152**
15.	Margin of retailer	**143**
16.	Sale price of retailer/purchase price of consumer	**3505**
17.	Total Marketing Cost	**1105**
18.	Net Margin	**490**
19.	**Price Spread**	**1105**
20.	**Producer Share in Consumer Rupee**	**68.47**
21.	**Marketing Efficiency**	**3.18**

Table 2: The data on the price structure and marketing costs across various stages of the supply chain highlighted several key points. The net price received by the producer was ₹2400 per quintal, and the total marketing cost incurred by the producer was ₹178 per quintal. The sale price of the producer, or the purchase price by the commission agent, was ₹2578. The commission agent incurred marketing costs of ₹97 and earned a margin of ₹155, leading to a sale price of ₹2830 to the wholesaler. The wholesaler's incurred costs amounted to ₹188, and their margin was ₹192, resulting in a sale price of ₹3210 to the retailer. The retailer incurred marketing costs of ₹152 and earned a margin of ₹143, leading to a final sale price of ₹3505 to the consumer. The total marketing cost across all stages was ₹1105, with a net margin of ₹490. The price spread amounted to ₹1105, and the producer's share in the consumer rupee was 68.47%, indicating that the majority of the consumer price was absorbed by intermediaries. The marketing efficiency was calculated at 3.18%, reflecting a low level of efficiency in the overall marketing system. The findings suggested that the supply chain involved high marketing costs and margins at multiple stages, pointing to potential inefficiencies that could be addressed to improve the profitability of producers and reduce consumer prices.

Table 3: Price spread, producer-consumer rupees, marketing expenses, marketing margins, and marketing efficiency of AMLA via Channel III

S.No.	Particulars	Price (Rs. /Quintal)
1.	Net price received by producer	**4500**
2.	**Cost in curried by the producer**	
a.+	Packing cost	**20**
b.	Packing material cost	**21**
c.	Transportation cost	**27**
d.	Loading and unloading charges	**50**
e.	Miscellaneous charges	**60**
3.	Marketing cost	**178**
4.	Sale price of producer/Purchase price of commission agent	**4678**
5.	**Cost incurred by the commission agent**	
a.	Loading, unloading and repacking cost	**55**
b.	Spoilage and losses	**42**
6.	Marketing cost	**97**
7.	Margin of commission agent	**175**
8.	Sale price of commission agent/purchase price of retailer	**4950**
9.	**Cost incurred by the Retailer**	
a.	Loading and unloading charges	**37**
b.	Carriage up to shop	**45**
c.	Grading and sorting charges	**75**
d.	Miscellaneous charges	**30**
e.	Spoilage and losses	**66**
10.	Marketing cost	**253**
11.	Margin of retailer	**137**
12.	Sale price of retailer/Purchase price consumer	**5340**
13.	Total Marketing Cost	**840**
14.	Net Margin	**312**
15.	Price Spread	**840**
16.	Producer Share in Consumer Rupee	**84.27**
17.	**Marketing Efficiency**	**6.36**

Table 3: The data on the price structure and marketing costs for the given product through various stages of the supply chain revealed significant insights into cost distribution and margins. The net price received by the producer was ₹4500 per quintal, with a total marketing cost of ₹178 incurred by the producer. The sale price to the commission agent was ₹4678. The commission agent incurred marketing costs of ₹97 and earned a margin of ₹175, leading to a sale price of ₹4950 to the retailer. The retailer incurred marketing costs of ₹253 and earned a margin of ₹137, resulting in a final sale price of ₹5340 to the consumer. The total marketing cost across all stages was ₹840, and the price spread amounted to ₹840. The net margin from the entire process was ₹312, with the producer receiving 84.27% of the final consumer price. The marketing efficiency was calculated at 6.36%, which was relatively higher compared to other studies. These results indicated that the producer received a significant share of the final consumer price, while the marketing costs and margins were distributed across intermediaries. However, the study highlighted the need for improving efficiency at different stages of the supply chain to reduce marketing costs and enhance profitability for both producers and consumers.

CONCLUSION

the study on the marketing of Amla products (candy and marmalade) in Pratapgarh district of Uttar Pradesh provided valuable insights into the marketing structure and cost dynamics across various stages of the supply chain. The findings revealed that the producer received a significant share of the final consumer price, with 84.27% of the consumer rupee going to the producer. However, the study also highlighted that substantial marketing costs were incurred by intermediaries such as commission agents, wholesalers, and retailers, which led to a price spread of ₹840 and marketing inefficiency. The marketing efficiency was calculated at 6.36%, indicating room for improvement in the supply chain. The analysis of marketing channels revealed that multiple intermediaries were involved in the distribution of Amla products, with each stage incurring its own set of costs and margins. The pricing structure across the supply chain showed that although the producer earned a considerable price for the product, the involvement of intermediaries contributed to the final price increase. The study emphasized the need for streamlining the marketing process to reduce unnecessary intermediaries, minimize marketing costs, and improve overall efficiency. By addressing these challenges, it was suggested that the income of producers could be enhanced, and the cost to consumers could be reduced. This would not only improve the economic viability of Amla cultivation but also make Amla products more affordable and accessible to a larger consumer base, thereby ensuring the sustainability and growth of this sector.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, A., & Sharma, R. (2019). Consumer buying behavior towards herbal products in India. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science, 5*(8), 10-15.

Ahmad, M., & Iqbal, M. (2020). Marketing of organic agricultural products in India: An analysis of consumer behavior. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Marketing, 34*(1), 21-32.

Ali, M. H., & Kumar, R. (2018). Consumer perceptions of traditional and modern retail stores in India.*Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 40*, 102-110.

Anitha, R., & Murugan, P. (2021). Consumer buying behavior towards herbal and organic food products in India. *Journal of Food Products Marketing, 27*(2), 171-185.

Bansal, A., & Gupta, N. (2022). Consumer awareness towards organic food: A case study of Haryana. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 46*(3), 303-311.

Behera, A. K., & Patnaik, S. (2021). Market potential of Amla (Phyllanthus emblica) products in Odisha.*Indian Journal of Horticulture, 78*(4), 549-556.

Bhagat, S., & Rai, P. (2019). Consumer perception of packaged food products in urban India. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology, 54*(7), 1886-1892.

Bhatti, M. A., & Khan, M. H. (2018). Marketing channels for organic food in India: A case study of Delhi. *Agribusiness Research, 18*(2), 111-120.

Choudhary, P., & Sharma, R. (2020). An assessment of buying behavior of consumers in rural areas. *International Journal of Rural Marketing, 12*(2), 35-40.

Dand, S., & Verma, R. (2021). Consumer purchasing behaviour and marketing strategies for functional food products. *International Journal of Consumer Behavior Studies, 45*(1), 13- 20.

Gupta, P., & Sharma, S. (2022). A study of consumer perceptions towards organic food products in North India. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, 12*(4), 202- 208.

Gupta, V., & Kumar, R. (2021). Consumer behavior towards health and wellness products: A review. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(10), 345-352.

Hasan, M. F., & Khan, A. R. (2021). Impact of advertisement on consumer buying behavior of health products in India. *International Journal of Advertising and Marketing Studies, 16*(2), 51-60.

Hussain, M. A., & Ali, Z. (2019). Consumer perception towards natural health products in India. *Journal of Natural Products, 45*(1), 44-52.

Jain, P., & Kumar, V. (2020). Health-conscious consumer behavior towards natural products. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 39*(4), 233-240.

Kaur, S., & Rajput, N. (2022). A study on consumer perception of functional foods in urban India. *Journal of Food Products Marketing, 28*(1), 32-42.

*****