



Study of Marketing of Milk in Hardoi District of Uttar Pradesh, India

Harshit Pandey ^{a++*}, Nitin Barker ^{a#} and Pranil Sunil Kale ^{a†}

^a Department of Agricultural Economics, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2024/v42i52424

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114915>

Received: 24/01/2024

Accepted: 29/03/2024

Published: 01/04/2024

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this study is to thoroughly examine milk marketing dynamics within Shahabad Block, Hardoi District, Uttar Pradesh, focusing on the different channels used for milk marketing. The research aims to categorize cattle owners, investigate demographic trends among them, and understand how these factors correlate with milk marketing strategies and efficiency. This research employs a descriptive and analytical design to explore various aspects of milk marketing and cattle ownership. The study was conducted in the Shahabad Block of the Hardoi District, Uttar Pradesh, focusing on the current state of milk marketing and cattle ownership demographics. The methodology includes a survey of cattle owners in the Shahabad Block, classifying them into small, medium, and large-scale operations based on the number of cattle owned. The study also assesses the age, gender, education level, and social categories of cattle owners, alongside a comprehensive analysis of milk marketing channels, including costs, pricing spreads, marketing margins, and market efficiency.

The survey found 250 cattle owners, with a predominance of small-scale operations (72%). A significant demographic of cattle owners is young, aged 18-35 (80%), with a notable distribution across male (140) and female (110) owners. Education level shows a correlation with the size of

⁺⁺ P.G. Student (MBA Agribusiness);

[#] Assistant Professor;

[†] Research Scholar, Ph.D. (Agri-Business Management);

*Corresponding author: E-mail: pandey15harshit@gmail.com;

cattle operations, with lower education levels more common among smaller-scale operations. Socioeconomic analysis indicates that small-scale operations prevail across all social categories, including General, OBC, and SC/ST. Marketing analysis reveals a preference for the second channel involving producers, private dairy companies, retailers, and end users, providing insights into marketing efficiency and consumer preferences.

Keywords: *Milk marketing dynamics; cattle ownership demographics; marketing channels; marketing efficiency.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the heart of Uttar Pradesh (UP), India's largest milk-producing state, Hardoi District stands as a pivotal area for examining dairy sector intricacies. This research delves into milk marketing within Hardoi, shedding light on the socio-economic attributes of stakeholders, diverse marketing pathways, cost dynamics, and prevalent obstacles. With India housing approximately 308 million cattle as of 2022 and UP's dairy output surpassing 27 million tonnes annually through a vast network of over 80,000 dairy cooperatives, the state's contribution to national dairy production is significant. This decentralized milk production and distribution model is rooted in UP's fertile Indo-Gangetic plains, making dairy farming in Hardoi a community-centered endeavor that goes beyond mere economic activity [1].

Dairy operations in Hardoi are mainly led by cooperative societies and small-scale farmers, highlighting a model where the socio-economic backgrounds of these farmers play a crucial role in determining their operational and marketing strategies. Marketing channels vary, encompassing direct farmer sales to interactions with intermediaries and larger dairy companies, with cooperatives essential for facilitating market access [2].

Challenges such as infrastructural deficits, logistical issues, fluctuating demand, and quality concerns, alongside the small scale of many farms, impact the sector's efficiency [3,4]. Government initiatives like the Nand Baba Milk Mission aim to bolster the industry by enhancing production, infrastructure, and farmer incomes. Addressing these issues is vital for improving profitability, marketing efficiency, and overall sustainability in Hardoi's dairy landscape, making this study an essential contribution to understanding and advancing the district's dairy sector [5].

Key focuses include the socio-economic profiles of dairy farmers, the efficiency of marketing channels, and the intricate marketing cost

structures impacting profitability and efficiency [6-8]. The research aims to identify and analyze these elements, understanding their effects on the dairy industry's socio-economic fabric. It seeks actionable insights to enhance marketing strategies, improve farmer incomes, and contribute to the sector's sustainable growth, addressing the need for better marketing practices and economic development in Hardoi.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS


Through a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to address challenges and opportunities within the dairy sector. Utilizing both primary and secondary data—gathered from structured interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups with stakeholders like farmers, cooperative members, and industry experts, along with literature and official records—this study offers in-depth insights into dairy marketing. The selection process involved purposive choices for the district and block, and random selections for villages and respondents, ensuring a diverse and representative sample. A total of 300 participants from various villages provided data through interviews, surveys, and focus groups, analyzed using statistical tools and thematic analysis while adhering to ethical standards like informed consent and confidentiality.

Hardoi, known for its agriculture, was chosen for its unique socio-economic attributes. The "Shahabad" block was specifically selected, with 3 of its 418 villages randomly chosen for detailed study. Respondents were categorized by the size of their cattle holdings into small (1-10), medium (11-20), and large (>20), with a stratified sample ensuring broad representation across different dairy farming scales. The Mehtab Singh Market in Shahabad was identified for focused market analysis, selecting market functionaries randomly to gather insights into marketing costs and practices. Data collection blended personal interviews and reviews of agricultural publications, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of Hardoi's milk marketing dynamics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Distribution Channels

3.1.1 Channel I.



Channel I involves direct sales from producers to consumers, eliminating intermediaries, which can reduce costs and potentially increase producer profits while allowing consumers to access fresh products.

3.1.2 Channel II



Channel II connects producers with consumers through cooperative societies and retailers, adding layers of quality control and potentially broader distribution but increasing the final product cost due to added margins at each step [9].

3.1.3 Channel III



Channel III sees producers selling to private dairy companies, which then distribute the milk through retailers to consumers. This channel often involves significant processing and branding, possibly improving quality and consumer trust at the cost of higher prices.

3.1.4 Channel IV



Channel IV entails producers selling their milk to village vendors or local collectors, who then sell directly to consumers. This channel can offer local, often unprocessed milk at lower prices but may lack the quality assurance and consistency of more structured channels [10].

3.1.5 Preferred marketing channel




Fig. 1. Revealed the preferred marketing channel by respondents

The survey revealed preferences among 250 respondents for milk marketing channels: 35.2% favored direct sales (Channel I), 21.2% preferred cooperative societies to retailers (Channel II), 14% chose sales through private dairy companies (Channel III), and 29.6% opted for village vendors/local collectors (Channel IV).

3.2 Marketing Cost, Price Spread, Marketing Margin, and Market Efficiency of Different Channels

In Channel I, where producers sell directly to consumers, the sale price and final price to the customer are identical at INR 55 per liter, indicating no marketing costs or price spread. This model suggests a direct, efficient transaction without added margins, highlighting its simplicity and potential cost-effectiveness for both parties.

In Channel II, the producer sells milk to cooperative societies at INR 30 per liter, with various costs totaling ₹18 and a cooperative margin of INR 10. This increases the price to retailers to INR 58, and after adding a retailer margin of INR 2, the final customer price is INR 60. This channel incurs a 100% price spread from producer to consumer, reflecting the added value and costs through packaging, labor, transportation, storage, processing, and

miscellaneous expenses, resulting in a 2% marketing efficiency.

In Channel III, producers sell milk to private dairy companies at INR 30 per liter. The companies then incur costs totaling INR 20 for packaging, labor, transportation, storage, processing, and miscellaneous expenses, adding a margin of INR 12. This elevates the price to retailers to INR 62, and with a retailer margin of INR 3, the final price for consumers reaches INR 65. The 100% price spread indicates significant value addition and costs associated with this channel, leading to a 1.85% marketing efficiency. This channel reflects the substantial investment in processing and distribution infrastructure by private dairy companies.

In Channel IV, producers sell milk to village vendors or local collectors for INR 32 per liter. These intermediaries incur costs of INR 13 for labor, transportation, and miscellaneous expenses, and add a margin of INR 15. This sets the consumer price at INR 55 per liter. The total marketing cost and vendor margin lead to a 41.8% price spread from producer to consumer, reflecting the operational and logistical costs involved in this channel. With a marketing efficiency of 1.96%, this channel shows a balance between added costs and the convenience of local distribution, highlighting its role in making milk accessible to consumers through local networks.

Table 1. Marketing cost, price spread, marketing margin, and market efficiency of Channel I

S.No.	Particulars	Value in INR/Ltr.
1.	Producers selling Price to Consumers	55
2.	Final Price to Customer	55
A.	Total Marketing Cost	00
B.	Total Market Margin	-
C.	Marketing Efficiency	-
D.	Price Spread	0

Table 2. Marketing cost, price spread, marketing margin, and market efficiency of Channel II

S.No.	Particulars	Value in INR/Ltr
1.	Producers selling Price to Cooperative Societies	30
Cost Incurred by Cooperative Societies		
i.	Packaging Cost	3.0
ii.	Labour Cost	2.0
iii.	Transportation Cost	4.0
iv.	Storage Cost	5.0
v.	Processing Cost	2.0
vi.	Miscellaneous Charges	2.0
Total Marketing Cost (i-vi)		18
vii.	Margin of Cooperative Societies	10
2.	Cooperative sale price to Retailer	58
i.	Margin of Retailer	2.0
3.	Final Price to Customer	60
A.	Total Marketing Cost	18
B.	Total Market Margin	12
C.	Marketing Efficiency	2.0%
D.	Price Spread	100%

Table 3. Marketing cost, price spread, marketing margin and market efficiency of Channel III

S.No.	Particulars	Value in INR/Ltr
1.	Producers selling prices to Private Dairy Companies	30
Cost Incurred by Private Dairy Companies		
i.	Packaging Cost	4.0
ii.	Labour Cost	2.0
iii.	Transportation Cost	5.0
iv.	Storage Cost	5.0
v.	Processing Cost	3.0
vi.	Miscellaneous Charges	1.0
Total Marketing Cost (i-vi)		20
vii.	Margin of Private Dairy Company	12
2.	Dairy companies sell price to Retailer	62
i.	Margin of Retailer	3.0
3.	Final Price to Customer	65
A.	Total Marketing Cost	20
B.	Total Market Margin	15
C.	Marketing Efficiency	1.85%
D.	Price Spread	100%

Table 4. Marketing cost, price spread, marketing margin and market efficiency of Channel IV

S. No.	Particular	Value in INR/Ltr
1.	Producers Selling Price to Village Vendor/Local Collector	32
Cost Incurred by Village Vendor/Local Collector		
i.	Labour Cost	5.0
ii.	Transportation Cost	3.0
iii.	Miscellaneous Charges	5.0
Total Marketing Cost (i-iii)		13
iv.	Margin of Village Vendor/local Collector	15
2.	Village Vendor/Local Collector to Consumer Price	55
A.	Total Marketing Cost	13
B.	Total Market Margin	15
C.	Marketing Efficiency	1.96%
D.	Price Spread	41.8%

Table 5. Constraints in marketing of milk

S. No.	Constraints	Frequency	Ranking
1.	High cost of transportation	33	IV
2.	Low Prices	41	III
3.	Perishability	68	II
4.	Quality of Milk	10	V
5.	Low margins	98	I

The survey highlights the primary constraints faced in milk marketing, ranked by the frequency of mentions by respondents. Low margins emerge as the top issue (98 responses), indicating significant pressure on profitability for producers and marketers alike, making it the most critical challenge. Storage problems rank second (68 responses), reflecting difficulties in preserving milk quality and preventing spoilage, which is crucial for maintaining product integrity. Low prices receive the third-highest concern (41 responses), suggesting that the selling price often doesn't cover production and marketing costs, affecting the economic sustainability of dairy operations. High transportation costs are the fourth concern (33 responses), pointing to the impact of logistics on overall expenses. Lastly, milk quality issues are ranked fifth (10 responses), indicating that while it's a concern, it's less prevalent compared to economic and logistical challenges. This ranking provides insight into the key areas where interventions could significantly improve the efficiency and profitability of milk marketing.

4. CONCLUSION

This study illustrates the diverse milk marketing channels in Hardoi District, highlighting Channel II (Producer > Cooperative Societies > Retailer > Consumers) as the most favored due to its structured approach despite higher marketing costs and price spreads. Channels I and IV, offering direct sales to consumers, show varied efficiency and cost benefits, with Channel I being the most cost-effective but less common. The analysis reveals that while all channels have their unique costs and margins, the presence of intermediaries increases the final price to consumers. Constraints such as low margins, storage issues, and high transportation costs significantly impact marketing efficiency and farmer profitability, underscoring the need for strategic improvements in the milk marketing system to address these challenges.

CONSENT

As Per International Standards or University Standards, Participants' Written Consent Has Been Collected and Preserved by The Author(S).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Hemme T, Garcia O, Saha A. A review of milk production in India with particular emphasis on small-scale producers (PPLPI Working Paper No. 2); 2003. Available:<https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/23777>
2. Verma SK, Singh R, Yadav APS, Shakya AK, Kumar K. Economics of production and resource use efficiency in wheat cultivation in Hardoi district of Uttar Pradesh. Environment and Ecology. 2023; 41(1A):284–291. Available:<https://doc.article-environmentandecology.com/external/file/It463e71a0cdf97224438a127810c9db80e9a>
3. Dairy Development Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh. (n.d.). Milk Production and Marketing in Uttar Pradesh. Retrieved from Available:<http://www.updd.gov.in/>.
4. Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of Uttar Pradesh. Annual Report 2021-2022; 2022. Retrieved from Available:https://upldb.up.gov.in/annual_reports.
5. Rajendran K, Mohanty S. Dairy cooperatives and milk marketing in India: Constraints and opportunities. Journal of Food Distribution Research. 2004, July; 35(2):34–41. Available:<https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/27233>

6. Kumar A. A study of milk marketing practices in Hardoi District of Uttar Pradesh (master's thesis); 2018.
7. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance; 2019. Retrieved from Available:https://eands.dacnet.nic.in/PDF/agricultural_statistics_at_glance_2019.pdf.
8. National Dairy Development Board (NDDB). Dairy Industry in India; 2020. Retrieved from Available:<https://www.nddb.coop/information-services/dairy-industry>
9. Basavarajappa DN, Chinnappa B. Distribution channels, price spread and constraints in marketing of milk-evidences from Karnataka. Research Journal of Animal Husbandry and Dairy Science. 2012;3(2),63–66. Available:[http://www.researchjournal.co.in/online/RJAHDs/RJAHDs%203\(2\)/3_A-63-66.pdf](http://www.researchjournal.co.in/online/RJAHDs/RJAHDs%203(2)/3_A-63-66.pdf)
10. Mishra KV, Goyal CK. Marketing channels used by small-scale milk producers: A study in Azamgarh District. UNNAYAN, II; 2015, January.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114915>*