

Chapter XI

PROBLEMS OF JUTE MARKETING AT GROWER'S LEVEL IN COOCH BEHAR DISTRICT

11.1. Introduction

Though income per bigha from jute cultivation is observed to cover cost of production of jute per bigha measured in terms of cost A_1 and cash expenditure it is significantly below the cost of production of jute per bigha while measured in terms of cost B and, above all, cost C. This significant lower level of income relative to cost B and especially cost C is mostly due to the unfairness of jute price which is also revealed earlier from the strikingly lower level of the price per quintal of jute compared to cost C per quintal. The allegation of the jute growers covered in the opinion survey about the fairness of the price per quintal of jute in this district corroborates the above findings. However, the unfairness of jute price confronted by the jute growers in this district is a crucial problem. The unfairness of the price of any agricultural commodity from the theoretical point of view may largely be due to the inefficient functioning of the market for the commodity concerned. For this, it may be worthwhile to make a study about the nature of jute marketing in this district. Here only a modest attempt has been undertaken to identify the problems of jute marketing in this

district at grower's level. The specific objectives in this chapter are to identify the dominant intermediary associated with jute marketing at grower's level, the location/place and time of sale, and inter alia, the implication of these on the nature of the problems of jute marketing at grower's level.

11.2. Identification of Dominant Intermediary and Related Issues

It is observed from the investigation on the sample farmers in the selected blocks of Cooch Behar district that they are selling their output to various intermediaries namely, the farias, the mahajans*, and the Jute Corporation of India. Other types of intermediaries such as primary agricultural cooperative marketing societies etc. are reported not to function in this regard. The relative importance of the stated intermediaries functioning in jute marketing operations at grower's level is shown in Table 11.1. From this table it is evident that in all the selected blocks except Haldibari block and in the district as a whole a major proportion of output is observed to be sold through the farias followed by mahajans and the Jute Corporation of India. This

* Mahajans are associated with larger volume of turn-over than the farias and bale maker. This agency has the direct correspondence with the jute mills.

indicates that the most dominant intermediary at grower's level is the farias and the least dominant intermediary is the Jute Corporation of India. As the Jute Corporation of India holds the lowest position in case of jute marketing at grower's level it has been left out of consideration from the successive analysis.

The table further exhibits dominantly the inverse relationship between the size of holding and the percentage of output sold in case of farias and the direct relationship between these in case of mahajans in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole.

The implication of these relationships is that the larger the size of holding the higher is the incentive to sell output through the mahajans. The underline factor behind this higher tendency is that the sale of output through the mahajans yields significantly higher level of price relative to that through the farias, which is evident from Table 11.2. Thus the agency-wise fragmented¹ jute market in Cooch Behar district is associated with heterogeneity in the case of price formation. And the benefits arising out of this heterogeneity are mostly harvested by the larger sizes of holding.

1. Rudra, A. (1992) Political Economy of Indian Agriculture, K.P. Bagchi and Company, New Delhi-92, pp. 50-53.

11.3. Place of Sale and Its Implications

Among the intermediaries namely the farias and the mahajans, the farias are functioning at the primary or village level market whereas mahajans are observed to function at the secondary market^{*}. Thus agency-wise fragmentation of jute market in Cooch Behar district leads to geographical fragmentation. So it may not be irrelevant to state corresponding to Table 11.1 in this context that the highest share of the output of jute is sold at the primary market at relatively lower level of price in all the selected blocks except Haldibari block and in the district as a whole. Again, the previously exposed inverse relationship between the size of holding and percentage of output sold in the case of farias and the positive relationship between those in the case of mahajans jointly establish the fact that the larger the size of holding the higher the capacity to take advantage of higher price prevailing in the secondary market. So the agency-wise as well as geographically fragmented market of jute in Cooch Behar district is observed to bring forth heterogeneity in price formation. The benefit of this heterogeneity is largely gained by the larger sizes of holding.

* Secondary markets are located in urban centres like block town, sub-divisional town etc.

However, the dominant portion of output which is sold through the farias at the primary or village level market is observed to arrive from remarkably larger number of jute growers compared to that of selling through the mahajans at secondary markets. This may be understood from Table 11.3. This table shows that the stated fact is true for all sizes of holding in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole except small and large sizes of holding in Haldibari block. Therefore, it may be viewed that the majority of jute growing farmers in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole is observed to receive relatively lower level of price from selling their output through the farias at the primary markets, although there prevails higher and better price at the secondary markets. According to the results of opinion survey the notable distance of secondary markets coupled with costly means of transportation creating economic as well as physical hazards is the responsible factor which compels the majority of the jute growing farmers to sell their output at relatively lower level of price through the farias in the primary markets. Besides, the relatively depressing price received by the majority of jute growing farmers from selling their output through the farias at primary markets becomes more depressing when the same is

reduced to net of marketing cost* . All these may be understood clearly from Table 11.4.

The factors responsible for such height of marketing cost may be realised from Table 11.5. Apart from the disunique and multivarious pictures about this respect in the cases of different sizes of holding over the selected blocks of Cooch Behar district; Table 11.5 shows on an average for the district that the height of marketing cost is mostly explained by the processing cost, transportation cost and imputed value of personal labour rendered for selling output in a descending order of importance. A comparative study on the relative shares of these components in the total marketing cost per quintal manifests that the share of transportation cost though less than the dominant contributing factor namely processing cost but it is noticeably high in this district. This may be attributed on the one hand to the distance between farm-gate and location of market and on the other the mode of transportation, which may be explicitated from Tables 11.6 and 11.7 respectively.

Again, the close perusal of Tables 11.8 and 11.9 respectively discloses that the majority of the jute growing

* Marketing cost composed of processing cost, transportation cost, loading and unloading and weighing charges, etc.

farmers in this district has to cover about 2 to 6 kms. to sell their produce and they have to use one of the costly means of transport that is, rickshaw/rickshaw van. Thus it is revealed that the majority of the jute growing farmers in this district is confronted with physical and economic problems originating from the distance between farm-gate and location of market as well as costly means of transportation.

11.4. Time of Sale and Its Implications

At grower's level, in terms of time of sale, jute marketing season in Cooch Behar district may be divided into two periods/seasons namely, harvest period and post-harvest period. Harvest period extends from the middle of the month of July to the end of the month of October. The post-harvest period is composed of the time length between the beginning of the month of November to the middle of the month of April. The pattern of disposal of jute at grower's level in this district corresponding to the marketing seasons may be visualized from Table 11.10. This table shows that at grower's level the dominant portion of output is sold in the harvest period in all the selected blocks except Haldibari block and in the district as a whole. This helps one to hold the view that in Cooch Behar district harvest period of sale of dominant portion of jute output is a notable feature in case of jute marketing at grower's level.

Alike other agricultural commodities harvest period price of jute in this district is strikingly lower than the post-harvest price of it, which is evident from Table 11.11. Therefore, corresponding to the previously exposed feature of jute marketing in this district at grower's level it may be stated that the dominant portion of jute output in this district is sold in the harvest period at a highly lower level of price compared to that prevailing in the post harvest period.

From Table 11.10 it is further revealed that percentage of output sold and the size of holding are inversely related in the harvest period while these two are directly related in the post-harvest period in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole. And again, this table shows that the farmers belonging to large size of holding disposes the dominant portion of their output in the post-harvest period. All these collectively establish the fact that the relatively larger size of holding reaps the benefit of post-harvest period price hike. In other words, in terms of time of sale, jute market in this district is also fragmented and this fragmented jute market is associated with heterogeneity in the price formation and the benefits cropping out of heterogeneity in price formation is appropriated largely in its critical level by the large size of holding.

The results of opinion survey on the sample jute growers over the selected blocks in this district may explain the above findings. The jute growers in this district are compelled to sell dominant portion of their output on account of two reasons which are equally important. However, these two reasons are (a) lack of storage facilities and (b) immediate cash needs originating from purchase of farm inputs for next crop, purchase of consumer goods like rice and other materials, repayment of debt, other works of farm improvement and social ceremonies. Since the capacity to minimise the problems arising out of the stated factors increases with the increase in the size of holding, farmers with the relatively larger size of holding are able to reap the benefits of post-harvest price hike. And again, the problems from lack of storage facilities and immediate cash needs are minimum in case of the jute growers belonging to large size of holding. So they are able to avail the opportunity of post-harvest period price hike or in other words, the benefits of heterogeneity in price formation brought forth by the season-wise fragmented jute market in its maximum possible level.

11.5. Findings

At grower's level jute market or marketing system in Cooch Behar district is fragmented agency-wise vis-a-vis geographically and season-wise. In both the cases the number

of fragments are two generating two levels of prices. The major portion of output of the jute growers in this district are sold at relatively lower level of price generated by the fragmented jute marketing system in terms of both these respects. They sell their dominant portion of output at relatively lower level of price formed by the agency-wise vis-a-vis geographical fragmentation of this market due to economic and physical hazards arising out of the distance and costly means of transportation. This relatively lower level of price becomes more depressing due to the exorbitantly high marketing cost incurred by the farmers. The exorbitantly high marketing cost is largely the consequence of distance and costly means of transportation. Again, the major portion of output is sold by the farmers at relatively lower level of price resulting from season-wise fragmentation of jute market. This is on account of the problems that crop up due to lack of storage facilities and immediate cash needs. The farmers with relatively larger size of holding are to some extent able to minimise the problems arising out of the stated factors and to reap the benefits of this fragmentation. However, as a whole, one may outrightly state that jute market or marketing system at grower's level in Cooch Behar district suffers from the problems arising out of the distance between the farm-gate and market place, costly means of transportation,

lack of storage facilities and immediate cash needs. For all these factors jute marketing at grower's level in Cooch Behar district is functioning inefficiently. Owing to this, jute growers in this district are compulsorily used to receive relatively lower, less fair and less remunerative price from selling the major portion of output though there prevails relatively higher, more fair and more remunerative price in the jute market at grower's level in this district.

Table 11.1 Absolute and Percentage Share of Output Sold to Different Agencies at Grower's Level over Different Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Output sold to agencies			Total (in quintals)
		Farias (in quintals)	Mahajans (in quintals)	Jute Corporation of India (in quintals)	
Haldibari	Marginal	129.68 (68.22)	54.00 (28.41)	6.40 (3.37)	190.08 (100.00)
	Small	111.20 (45.31)	114.60 (46.70)	19.60 (7.99)	245.40 (100.00)
	Large	83.60 (31.96)	157.20 (60.09)	20.80 (7.95)	261.60 (100.00)
	All farms	324.48 (46.55)	325.80 (46.74)	46.80 (6.71)	697.08 (100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	115.60 (82.81)	12.80 (9.17)	11.20 (8.02)	139.60 (100.00)
	Small	106.00 (61.34)	54.40 (31.48)	12.40 (7.18)	172.80 (100.00)
	Large	76.00 (49.87)	56.40 (37.01)	20.00 (13.12)	152.40 (100.00)
	All farms	297.60 (64.03)	123.60 (26.59)	43.60 (9.38)	464.80 (100.00)
Dinhata I	Marginal	81.40 (70.90)	25.00 (21.78)	8.40 (7.32)	114.80 (100.00)
	Small	61.40 (62.65)	25.40 (25.92)	11.20 (11.43)	98.00 (100.00)
	Large	46.00 (58.23)	22.60 (28.61)	10.40 (13.16)	79.00 (100.00)
	All farms	188.80 (64.70)	73.00 (25.02)	30.00 (10.28)	291.80 (100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.1 (Contd..)

Tufanganj II	Marginal	91.20 (74.63)	19.00 (15.55)	12.00 (9.82)	122.20 (100.00)
	Small	63.20 (70.85)	18.80 (21.08)	7.20 (8.07)	89.20 (100.00)
	Large	33.60 (57.54)	16.40 (28.08)	8.40 (14.38)	58.40 (100.00)
	All farms	188.00 (69.68)	54.20 (20.09)	27.60 (10.23)	269.80 (100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	417.88 (73.74)	110.80 (19.55)	38.00 (6.71)	566.68 (100.00)
	Small	341.80 (56.46)	213.20 (35.22)	50.40 (8.32)	605.40 (100.00)
	Large	239.20 (43.38)	252.60 (45.81)	59.60 (10.81)	551.40 (100.00)
	All farms	998.88 (57.96)	576.60 (33.45)	148.00 (3.59)	1723.48 (100.00)

Note : Figures in the parentheses are the respective percentages.

Table 11.2 Price per Quintal of Jute Received by Jute Growing Farmers from Farias and Mahajans in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Price per quintal (in Rs.) received from	
	Farias	Mahajans
Haldibari	476.22	524.12
Cooch Behar II	389.97	446.36
Dinhata I	396.92	447.33
Tufanganj II	409.63	453.41
Cooch Behar district	423.00	491.09

Table 11.3 Number of Farmers in Absolute and Percentage Term Selling Output through Farias and Mahajans over Different Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Number of farmers selling output through		Total
		Farias	Mahajans	
Haldirbari	Marginal	17(89.47)	2(10.53)	19(100.00)
	Small	2(40.00)	3(60.00)	5(100.00)
	Large	1(25.00)	3(75.00)	4(100.00)
	All farms	20(71.43)	8(28.57)	28(100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	26(96.30)	1(3.70)	27(100.00)
	Small	7(77.78)	2(22.22)	9(100.00)
	Large	5(71.43)	2(28.57)	7(100.00)
	All farms	38(88.37)	5(11.63)	43(100.00)
Dinhata I	Marginal	22(78.57)	6(21.43)	28(100.00)
	Small	10(71.43)	4(28.57)	14(100.00)
	Large	6(75.00)	2(25.00)	8(100.00)
	All farms	38(76.00)	12(24.00)	50(100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.3 (Contd..)

Tufangaj II	Marginal	27 (84.38)	5 (15.62)	32 (100.00)
	Small	11 (78.57)	3 (21.43)	14 (100.00)
	Large	3 (75.00)	1 (25.00)	4 (100.00)
	All farms	41 (82.00)	9 (18.00)	50 (100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	92 (86.79)	14 (13.21)	106 (100.00)
	Small	30 (71.43)	12 (28.57)	42 (100.00)
	Large	15 (65.22)	8 (34.78)	23 (100.00)
	All farms	137 (80.12)	34 (19.88)	171 (100.00)

Note : Figures in the parentheses are the respective percentages.

Table 11.4 Magnitude of Marketing Cost per Quintal in Absolute and Percentage Term Incurred by the Farmers in Selling Output through the Farias at Primary Markets and Other Related Information over Different Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Gross price/Price received from the farias at primary markets (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal incurred by the farmers to sell through the farias at primary markets (in Rs.)	Percentage share of marketing cost in gross price	Price received from the farias at primary markets net of marketing cost (in Rs.)
Haldibari	Marginal	467.23	25.92	5.55	441.31
	Small	487.63	25.43	5.22	462.20
	Large	475.00	25.27	5.32	449.73
	All farms	476.22	25.84	5.43	450.38
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	390.31	17.74	4.55	372.57
	Small	375.61	16.45	4.38	359.16
	Large	409.47	22.15	5.41	387.32
	All farms	389.97	18.09	4.64	371.88

Contd..

Table 11.4 (Contd..)

Dinhata I	Marginal	387.53	18.34	4.73	369.19
	Small	399.51	19.69	4.93	379.82
	Large	410.09	24.69	6.02	385.40
	All farms	396.92	19.70	4.96	377.22
Tufanganj II	Marginal	415.31	20.60	4.96	394.71
	Small	405.76	18.94	4.67	386.82
	Large	401.49	22.67	5.65	378.82
	All farms	409.63	20.30	4.96	389.33
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	419.10	20.23	4.83	398.87
	Small	421.93	19.04	4.51	402.89
	Large	431.37	23.47	5.44	407.90
	All farms	423.00	20.32	4.80	402.68

Table 11.5 Absolute and Percentage Share of Different Components in the Marketing Cost per Quintal over Various Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Cost components					Total marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)	
		Transportation cost (in Rs.)	Leading and unloading charges (in Rs.)	Imputed value of personal labour rendered for selling output (in Rs.)	Process-ing cost (in Rs.)	Weighing charges (in Rs.)		Market tolls (in Rs.)
Halāibari	Marginal	6.47 (24.96)	0.35 (1.35)	5.62 (21.68)	11.18 (43.13)	0.90 (3.47)	1.40 (5.40)	25.92 (100.00)
	Small	6.25 (24.58)	-	5.43 (21.35)	12.50 (49.15)	-	1.25 (4.92)	25.43 (100.00)
	Large	7.50 (29.68)	-	6.52 (25.80)	10.00 (39.58)	-	1.25 (4.95)	25.27 (100.00)
	All farms	6.50 (25.15)	0.30 (1.16)	5.65 (21.87)	11.25 (43.54)	0.76 (2.94)	1.38 (5.34)	25.84 (100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	5.28 (29.76)	-	3.94 (22.21)	7.02 (39.57)	0.17 (0.96)	1.33 (7.50)	17.74 (100.00)
	Small	3.18 (19.33)	-	3.97 (24.13)	7.14 (43.41)	0.37 (2.25)	1.79 (10.88)	16.45 (100.00)
	Large	4.70 (21.22)	-	5.55 (25.06)	9.50 (42.89)	0.20 (0.90)	2.20 (9.93)	22.15 (100.00)
	All farms	4.82 (26.64)	-	4.16 (23.00)	7.37 (40.74)	0.21 (1.16)	1.53 (8.46)	18.09 (100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.5 (Contd..)

Dinhata I	Marginal	7.10 (38.71)	-	4.29 (23.39)	5.45 (29.72)	0.09 (0.49)	1.41 (7.69)	18.34 (100.00)
	Small	7.83 (39.77)	-	5.08 (25.80)	4.90 (24.88)	0.50 (2.54)	1.38 (7.01)	19.69 (100.00)
	Large	10.17 (41.19)	-	6.43 (26.04)	6.38 (25.84)	0.17 (0.69)	1.54 (6.24)	24.69 (100.00)
	All farms	7.78 (39.49)		4.84 (24.57)	5.45 (27.66)	0.21 (1.07)	1.42 (7.21)	19.70 (100.00)
Tufanganj II	Marginal	7.65 (37.13)	-	4.72 (22.91)	5.65 (27.43)	0.15 (0.73)	2.43 (11.80)	20.60 (100.00)
	Small	5.86 (30.94)	-	4.45 (23.50)	6.36 (33.58)	-	2.27 (11.98)	18.94 (100.00)
	Large	8.75 (38.60)	-	4.75 (20.95)	6.67 (29.42)	-	2.50 (11.03)	22.67 (100.00)
	All farms	7.25 (35.72)	-	4.65 (22.91)	5.91 (29.11)	0.10 (0.49)	2.39 (11.77)	20.30 (100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	6.63 (32.77)	0.07 (0.35)	4.56 (22.54)	7.01 (34.65)	0.28 (1.38)	1.68 (8.31)	20.23 (100.00)
	Small	5.92 (31.09)	-	4.61 (24.21)	6.47 (33.98)	0.25 (1.31)	1.79 (9.40)	19.04 (100.00)
	Large	7.88 (33.58)	-	5.81 (24.76)	7.72 (32.89)	0.13 (0.55)	1.93 (8.22)	23.47 (100.00)
	All farms	6.61 (32.53)	0.04 (0.20)	4.71 (23.18)	6.97 (34.30)	0.26 (1.28)	1.73 (8.51)	20.32 (100.00)

Note : Figures in the parentheses are the respective percentages

Table 11.6 Per Quintal Transportation Cost and Marketing Cost at Grower's Level According to Distance Range in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Distance range (Km)	Haldibari		Cooch Behar II	
	Transportation cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Transportation cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)
≤ 2	5.83	23.80	2.69	11.91
2-4	6.25	27.32	5.90	22.81
4-6	9.17	27.99	10.00	30.50
Above 6	-	-	12.50	30.52
Average	6.50	25.84	4.82	18.09

<u>Dinhata I</u>		<u>Tufanganj II</u>		<u>Cooch Behar district</u>	
<u>Transportation cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>	<u>Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>	<u>Transportation cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>	<u>Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>	<u>Transportation cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>	<u>Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)</u>
2.45	6.60	3.00	11.17	3.30	12.95
7.08	20.08	6.44	19.97	6.35	21.72
10.56	25.67	11.07	24.68	10.47	26.32
11.40	28.95	13.75	27.86	12.13	28.88
7.78	19.70	7.25	20.30	6.61	20.32

Table 11.7 Per Quintal Transportation Cost and Marketing Cost at Grower's Level Relating to Different Modes of Transport in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Mode of Transport	Haldibari		Cooch Behar II	
	Transport cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Transport cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)
Headload	6.67	25.63	2.90	12.50
Rickshaw/Rickshaw van	6.41	26.05	5.11	18.93
Bullock cart	-	-	-	-
Boat	-	-	-	-
More than one mode of transport	7.50	23.10	-	-
Average	6.50	25.84	4.82	18.09

Dinhata I		Tufanganj II		Cooch Behar district	
Transport cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Transport cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Transport cost per quintal (in Rs.)	Marketing cost per quintal (in Rs.)
6.81	16.74	4.89	16.33	5.86	16.81
7.33	20.78	5.97	18.48	5.86	20.60
10.64	26.57	7.25	23.10	9.41	25.31
-	-	-	-	-	-
11.50	20.09	9.89	23.56	9.84	23.32
7.78	19.70	7.25	20.30	6.61	20.32

Table 11.8 Number of Jute Growing Farmers in Absolute and Percentage Term Selling Their Output in Different Distance Ranges Over Various Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Distance range (Km)				Total
		<2	2-4	4-6	Above 6	
Haldirbari	Marginal	12 (38.71)	12 (38.71)	5 (16.13)	2 (6.45)	31 (100.00)
	Small	8 (42.11)	10 (52.63)	1 (5.26)	-	19 (100.00)
	Large	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (20.00)	1 (10.00)	10 (100.00)
	All farms	24 (40.00)	25 (41.67)	8 (13.33)	3 (5.00)	60 (100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	12 (42.86)	11 (39.29)	4 (14.28)	1 (3.57)	28 (100.00)
	Small	11 (64.71)	5 (29.41)	1 (5.88)	-	17 (100.00)
	Large	5 (50.00)	5 (50.00)	-	-	10 (100.00)
	All farms	28 (50.91)	21 (38.18)	5 (9.09)	1 (1.82)	55 (100.00)
Dinhata I	Marginal	6 (21.43)	4 (14.28)	12 (42.86)	6 (21.43)	28 (100.00)
	Small	4 (22.22)	2 (11.11)	9 (50.00)	3 (16.67)	18 (100.00)
	Large	-	2 (18.18)	3 (27.27)	6 (54.55)	11 (100.00)
	All farms	10 (17.54)	8 (14.04)	24 (42.10)	15 (26.32)	57 (100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.8 (Contd..)

Tufanganj II	Marginal	2 (5.40)	28 (75.68)	6 (16.22)	1 (2.70)	37 (100.00)
	Small	2 (11.76)	9 (52.94)	4 (23.53)	2 (11.76)	17 (100.00)
	Large	-	5 (83.33)	-	1 (16.67)	6 (100.00)
	All farms	4 (6.67)	42 (70.00)	10 (16.66)	4 (6.67)	60 (100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	32 (25.81)	55 (44.36)	27 (21.77)	10 (8.06)	124 (100.00)
	Small	25 (35.21)	26 (36.62)	15 (21.13)	5 (7.04)	71 (100.00)
	Large	9 (24.33)	15 (40.54)	5 (13.51)	8 (21.62)	37 (100.00)
	All farms	66 (28.45)	96 (41.38)	47 (20.26)	23 (9.91)	232 (100.00)

Note : Figures in the parentheses are the respective percentages

Table 11.9 Number of Jute Growing Farmers in Absolute and Percentage Term Selling Their Output through Different Modes of Transportation over various Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Modes of transportation					Total
		Headload	Rickshaw/ Rickshaw van	Bullock cart	Boat	More than one mode of transport	
Haldibari	Marginal	5 (16.13)	24 (77.42)	-	-	2 (6.45)	31 (100.00)
	Small	2 (10.53)	15 (78.95)	1 (5.26)	-	1 (5.26)	19 (100.00)
	Large	-	8 (80.00)	1 (10.00)	-	1 (10.00)	10 (100.00)
	All farms	7 (11.67)	47 (78.33)	2 (3.33)	-	4 (6.67)	60 (100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	6 (21.43)	22 (78.57)	-	-	-	28 (100.00)
	Small	3 (17.65)	13 (76.47)	1 (5.88)	-	-	17 (100.00)
	Large	-	8 (80.00)	2 (20.00)	-	-	10 (100.00)
	All farms	9 (16.36)	43 (78.18)	3 (5.46)	-	-	55 (100.00)
Dinhata I	Marginal	16 (57.14)	9 (32.14)	3 (10.72)	-	-	28 (100.00)
	Small	6 (33.33)	8 (44.45)	4 (22.22)	-	-	18 (100.00)
	Large	2 (18.18)	3 (27.27)	5 (45.46)	-	1 (9.09)	11 (100.00)
	All farms	24 (42.11)	20 (35.09)	12 (21.05)	-	1 (1.75)	57 (100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.9 (Contd..)

Tufanganj II	Marginal	8 (21.62)	11 (29.73)	7 (18.92)	-	11 (29.73)	37 (100.00)
	Small	3 (17.65)	9 (52.94)	-	-	5 (29.41)	17 (100.00)
	Large	-	3 (50.00)	1 (16.67)	-	2 (33.33)	6 (100.00)
	All farms	11 (18.33)	23 (38.33)	8 (13.33)	-	18 (30.00)	60 (100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	35 (28.23)	66 (53.23)	10 (8.06)	-	13 (10.48)	124 (100.00)
	Small	14 (19.72)	45 (63.38)	6 (8.45)	-	6 (8.45)	71 (100.00)
	Large	2 (5.41)	22 (59.46)	9 (24.32)	-	4 (10.81)	37 (100.00)
	All farms	51 (21.98)	133 (57.33)	25 (10.78)	-	23 (9.91)	232 (100.00)

Note : Figures in the parentheses are the respective percentages

Table 11.10 Magnitudes of Output in Absolute and Percentage Term Sold in Harvest and Post-Harvest Periods by the Jute Growing Farmers Belonging to Different Sizes of Holding in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Magnitudes of sale in		Total (in quintals)
		Harvest period (in quintals)	Post-harvest period (in quintals)	
Haldibari	Marginal	171.28 (90.11)	18.80 (9.89)	190.08 (100.00)
	Small	85.20 (34.72)	160.20 (65.28)	245.40 (100.00)
	Large	66.80 (25.54)	194.80 (74.46)	261.60 (100.00)
	All farms	323.28 (46.38)	373.80 (53.62)	697.08 (100.00)
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	122.80 (87.97)	16.80 (12.03)	139.60 (100.00)
	Small	94.40 (54.63)	78.40 (45.37)	172.80 (100.00)
	Large	50.00 (32.81)	102.40 (67.19)	152.40 (100.00)
	All farms	267.20 (57.49)	197.60 (42.51)	464.80 (100.00)
Dinhata I	Marginal	101.40 (88.33)	13.40 (11.67)	114.80 (100.00)
	Small	63.40 (64.69)	34.60 (35.31)	98.00 (100.00)
	Large	39.20 (49.62)	39.80 (50.38)	79.00 (100.00)
	All farms	204.00 (69.91)	87.80 (30.09)	291.80 (100.00)

Contd..

Table 11.10 (Contd..)

Tufanganj II	Marginal	110.20(90.18)	12.00(9.82)	122.20(100.00)
	Small	55.20(61.88)	34.00(38.12)	89.20(100.00)
	Large	28.80(49.32)	29.60(50.68)	58.40(100.00)
	Large farms	194.20(71.98)	75.60(28.02)	269.80(100.00)
Cooch Behar district	Marginal	505.68(89.24)	61.00(10.76)	566.68(100.00)
	Small	298.20(49.26)	307.20(50.74)	605.40(100.00)
	Large	184.80(33.51)	366.60(66.49)	551.40(100.00)
	All farms	988.68(57.37)	734.80(42.63)	1723.48(100.00)

Note : Figures in ~~the~~ parentheses are the respective percentages

Table 11.11 Price per Quintal of Jute Received by the Jute Growing Farmers in Harvest and Post-Harvest Periods in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Price received by the farmers in	
	Harvest period (in Rs.)	Post-harvest period (in Rs.)
Haldibari	465.77	531.19
Cooch Behar II	385.01	435.93
Dinhata I	393.16	455.91
Tufanganj II	404.43	459.92
Cooch Behar district	416.92	489.25