International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry

ISSN: 2456-2912
NAAS Rating (2025): 4.61
VET 2025; 10(9): 83-86

www.veterinarypaper.com
Received: 09-07-2025
Accepted: 11-08-2025

Jeetu Kumar
Research Scholar (P.G), Department of Agricultural Economics, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

Ameesh John Stephen
Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

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

Study on marketing of Sirohi goat (meat) in Sirohi district of Rajasthan

Jeetu Kumar and Ameesh John Stephen

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.22271/veterinary.2025.v10.i9b.2534

Abstract
The Sirohi goat, a dual-purpose breed originating from the Sirohi district of Rajasthan, has gained prominence due to its adaptability to harsh climatic conditions, strong survival ability, and economic significance in rural livelihoods. This medium to large-sized breed, characterized by its compact body, light brown or brown coat with white patches, and coarse hair, is valued for both meat and milk production. Its hardy nature, prolific breeding capacity, short kidding intervals, and an average milk yield ranging from 0.5 to 1.5 liters per day contribute to its widespread adoption in arid and semi-arid regions. The breed's fast growth and high-quality meat further enhance its role in commercial goat farming. A comparative analysis of Sirohi goat meat marketing across three channels revealed distinct differences in cost, margin, price spread, and efficiency. In Channel-I, the marketing cost amounted to ₹7,230, entirely forming the price spread, with no intermediary margin, resulting in the highest marketing efficiency of 4.91 percent. Channel-II, with a higher cost of ₹8,329 and an additional wholesaler's margin of ₹1,809, increased the price spread to ₹10,138, reducing efficiency to 2.70 percent. Channel-III recorded the highest marketing cost of ₹10,799, with intermediary margins of ₹2,405, leading to the widest price spread of ₹13,204 and the lowest efficiency of 1.99 percent. The findings indicated that marketing efficiency decreased with the involvement of more intermediaries, as higher costs and wider price spreads eroded producers' benefits. Thus, Channel-I was identified as the most efficient, while Channel-III was the least favorable for farmers.

Keywords: Sirohi goat, milk and meat production, marketing efficiency, price spread, intermediaries

Introduction
The Sirohi goat was recognized as one of the most important dual-purpose breeds of India, primarily reared for both meat and milk production, and it originated from the Sirohi district of Rajasthan. This breed was well adapted to arid and semi-arid climatic conditions and was able to survive efficiently under extensive and semi-intensive management systems, which made it highly suitable for rural farmers. The goats were medium to large in size, with a compact, strong, and sturdy body structure, and were usually brown or light brown in color with irregular white patches. Their hair coat was short and coarse, and both males and females generally possessed horns. The Sirohi goats were hardy in nature, showed high disease resistance, and had the ability to thrive on limited feed resources, which enhanced their economic importance in resource-constrained farming systems. They were considered prolific breeders with a high kidding percentage and a relatively short kidding interval, which ensured a steady increase in flock size. The average milk yield ranged from 0.5 to 1.5 liters per day, depending on the level of management and nutrition, and their milk was rich in fat content, making it beneficial for household consumption. In addition to milk, the breed was highly valued for its fast growth rate and superior meat quality, which fetched better market prices and contributed significantly to farm income. Because of these traits, the Sirohi goat played a crucial role in improving the livelihood of small and marginal farmers and was regarded as a vital component of livestock development in Rajasthan and adjoining states.

Research Methodology
The methodology of the study was designed with a combination of purposive and random sampling techniques to ensure both practicality and representativeness.

Sirohi district was purposively selected to minimize time constraints and logistical challenges for the investigator, while Pindwara block was chosen due to its high concentration of Sirohi goat rearers. From the list of villages within the block, five percent of villages with a relatively larger number of goat rearers were randomly selected. A detailed list of goat rearers in each selected village was then prepared and categorized into three groups based on flock size: small (up to 10 goats), medium (10-20 goats), and large (more than 20 goats). Using proportionate random sampling, a total of 80 Sirohi goat rearers were selected as respondents. To capture marketing aspects comprehensively, an additional sample comprising 10 wholesalers, 5 retailers, 5 poultry farm owners, and 5 consumers was included. Data collection relied primarily on structured schedules through personal interviews with respondents, while secondary information was obtained from government reports, journals, and official records at the district and block levels. The data collected were subjected to statistical analysis to evaluate marketing costs, margins, price spread, and marketing efficiency. The study was conducted during the agricultural year 2024-2025, ensuring the analysis reflected the most recent production and marketing dynamics. This systematic approach ensured reliability and validity in assessing the socio-economic and marketing aspects of Sirohi goat rearing and its contribution to farmer livelihoods.

Analytical Tools

- **Marketing Cost:** C = Cf+ Cm1+ Cm2+ Cm3+..... + Cmn
- **Market Margin:** AMI=Pri-(Ppi+Cmi)
- **Price Spread:** Marketing Cost + Market Margin
- **Marketing Efficiency:** = $\frac{\text{Price received by producer}}{\text{Marketing Cost + Marketing Margin}}$

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Marketing cost, marketing margin, marketing efficiency and price spread of Sirohi goat meat in Channel-I.

S. No.	Particulars	Amount (₹/Quintal)
1	Producer's Sale Price	37,500
	Processing Charges	2,000
2	Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	850
b	Transportation	900
c	Loading & Unloading	700
d	Market Fees	500
e	Commission	800
f	Storage	750
g	Miscellaneous	730
	Total Marketing Expenses (a–g)	5,230
3	Net Price to Producer	35,500
4	Overall Marketing Cost	7,230
A	Price Spread	7,230
B	Marketing Efficiency (%)	4.91

Table 1, the table highlighted the marketing pattern of the commodity, revealing that producers received a sale price of ₹37,500 per quintal, from which processing charges of ₹2,000 were deducted, reducing the net return to ₹35,500. The producer further incurred a series of marketing expenses, including packaging, transportation, storage, and commission charges, amounting to ₹5,230. When combined with the processing fee, the total marketing cost reached ₹7,230 per quintal. The price spread was equal to the marketing cost, indicating that the entire difference between the producer's sale price and the net amount received was absorbed by marketing charges without substantial value addition. The marketing efficiency was calculated at 4.91 percent, which reflected a low level of efficiency in the system. The results suggested that high intermediary and logistical costs significantly reduced producer margins, and improvements in transportation, storage, and collective marketing could enhance efficiency and increase farmer profitability.

Table 2: Marketing cost, Marketing margin, Marketing efficiency and Price spread of Sirohi goat meat in Channel-II

S. No.	Particulars	Amount (₹/Quintal)
1	Producer's Sale Price to Wholesaler	33,500
	Processing Charges	3,450
2	Producer's Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	450
b	Weighing	350
c	Loading & Unloading	420
d	Market Fees	380
e	Commission	320
f	Storage	350
g	Miscellaneous	450
	Total Producer's Marketing Expenses	2,720
3	Net Price to Producer	27,330
4	Wholesaler's Sale Price to Consumer	37,468
5	Wholesaler's Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	380
b	Weighing	285
c	Loading & Unloading	345
d	Transportation	275
e	Market Fees	280
f	Storage	240
g	Miscellaneous	354
	Total Wholesaler's Marketing Cost	2,159
6	Wholesaler's Margin	1,809
A	Total Marketing Cost	8,329
B	Total Marketing Margin	1,809
C	Price Spread	10,138
D	Marketing Efficiency (%)	2.70

Table 2 the data revealed that the producer sold the commodity to the wholesaler at ₹33,500 per quintal, but after deducting processing charges of ₹3,450 and marketing expenses of ₹2,720, the net return to the producer reduced to ₹27,330. The wholesaler then sold the product to the consumer at ₹37,468 per quintal while incurring marketing costs of ₹2,159 and retaining a margin of ₹1,809. The overall marketing cost across both stakeholders amounted to ₹8,329 per quintal, while the price spread reached ₹10,138, reflecting the gap between the consumer's payment and the producer's net realization. The marketing efficiency was estimated at 2.70 percent, which indicated a weak efficiency level and high intermediation burden. The results suggested that substantial costs were incurred in processing, packaging, handling, and commissions, which reduced producer profitability. Streamlining market practices, collective bargaining, and improving infrastructure could minimize costs, enhance efficiency, and ensure better price realization for producers.

Table 3 the analysis showed that the producer sold the commodity to the wholesaler at ₹33,500 per quintal, but after accounting for processing charges of ₹3,450 and marketing expenses of ₹2,720, the net price realized by the producer declined to ₹26,230. The wholesaler resold the product to the retailer at ₹36,950 per quintal, incurring marketing costs of ₹2,053 and securing a margin of ₹1,397. Subsequently, the

retailer sold the commodity to consumers at ₹40,534 per quintal, with marketing costs of ₹2,576 and a profit margin of ₹1,008. The total marketing cost across the supply chain was ₹10,799, while the combined margins of intermediaries amounted to ₹2,405. This created a price spread of ₹13,204, reflecting a wide gap between consumer payment and producer's net receipt. The marketing efficiency was found to be only 1.99 percent, suggesting a highly inefficient system where excessive costs and intermediary margins limited producer benefits and burdened consumers.

Table 3: Marketing cost, marketing margin, marketing efficiency and price spread of Sirohi goat meat in Channel-III

S. No.	Particulars	Amount (₹/Quintal)
1	Producer's Sale Price to Wholesaler	33,500
	Processing Charges	3,450
2	Producer's Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	450
b	Weighing	350
c	Loading & Unloading	420
d	Market Fees	380
e	Commission	320
f	Storage	350
g	Miscellaneous	450
	Total Producer's Marketing Expenses	2,720
3	Net Price to Producer	26,230
4	Wholesaler's Sale Price to Retailer	36,950
5	Wholesaler's Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	280
b	Weighing	250
c	Loading & Unloading	258
d	Transportation	345
e	Market Fees	320
f	Storage	250
g	Miscellaneous	350
	Total Wholesaler's Marketing Cost	2,053
6	Wholesaler's Margin	1,397
	Retailer's Sale Price to Consumer	40,534
	Retailer's Marketing Expenses	
a	Packaging	350
b	Weighing	320
c	Loading & Unloading	350
d	Transportation	365
e	Market Fees	450
f	Storage	356
g	Miscellaneous	385
	Total Retailer's Marketing Cost	2,576
	Retailer's Margin	1,008
A	Total Marketing Cost	10,799
B	Total Marketing Margin	2,405
C	Price Spread	13,204
D	Marketing Efficiency (%)	1.99

Conclusion

The study on the marketing of Sirohi goat meat across three distinct channels clearly demonstrated that variations in marketing cost, margin, price spread, and efficiency significantly influenced both producer share and consumer prices. In Channel-I, where the total marketing cost was ₹7,230 and no intermediary margin was observed, the entire spread was attributed to marketing expenses alone, resulting in the highest efficiency of 4.91 percent. This channel indicated that fewer intermediaries minimized costs and improved the producer's share in the consumer's rupee. In Channel-II, the marketing cost increased to ₹8,329, while wholesalers retained margins worth ₹1,809, which expanded the price spread to ₹10,138 and lowered efficiency to 2.70 percent. Channel-III exhibited the highest marketing cost of ₹10,799 and a total margin of ₹2,405 for intermediaries, creating the widest price spread of ₹13,204 and the lowest efficiency at 1.99 percent. This comparative outcome highlighted that as the marketing chain became longer, both marketing cost and margins escalated, leading to higher consumer prices while reducing the producer's net realization and overall system efficiency. The findings underlined the necessity of promoting shorter and more direct marketing channels, as they not only enhanced the producer's income but also ensured consumers accessed the product at a relatively fair price. Strengthening cooperative marketing, reducing intermediary dependence, and investing in efficient logistics and storage facilities were suggested as effective strategies to optimize marketing performance. Thus, Channel-I emerged as the most efficient pathway, while Channel-III proved least beneficial for both producers and consumers.

Conflict of Interest
Not available

Financial Support
Not available

Reference

1. Bashir R, Kumar A, Yadav S. The economics of goat farming in India. Indian J Agric Econ. 2020;75(4):556-567.
2. Chand H, Yadav S, Sharma R. Consumer preferences and demand for goat meat in urban India. J Food Econ. 2020;42(1):70-7.
3. Gunaseelan V. Scope of commercial goat farming in India. Pharma Innov J. 2018;11(5S):2704-9.
4. Jha S, Rathi P, Singh R. Government policies for goat farming in India: An analysis. J Rural Policy Stud. 2021;15(2):101-10.
5. Khanna N, Singh R. Marketing challenges of goat farming in India. Agric Mark J. 2021;54(1):122-30.
6. Koli D, Koli R. Women in goat farming and marketing in India. J Rural Women Stud. 2019;34(1):45-50.
7. Kumar S. Marketing systems for goat farming in Rajasthan. Indian J Agribus Res. 2019;41(3):432-439.
8. Mishra A, Gupta V, Kaur H. Goat farming as a rural economic activity. Int J Rural Stud. 2021;20(1):60-68.
9. Nayak AK, Vahoniya DR. Climate change and its impact on goat farming in India. Environ Stud Agric. 2021;39(1):123-130.
10. Patel R, Mehta R, Parmar M. Marketing of goat milk in India. J Dairy Sci. 2019;12(2):182-189.
11. Saxena M. Marketing challenges in goat farming in Western India. Indian J Agric Dev. 2020;39(4):411-420.
12. Sharma P, Soni S, Mehra N. Supply chain issues in the goat meat industry. J Agric Mark. 2021;50(3):345-352.
13. Siyal S, Patel M, Rathi R. Economic viability and challenges in goat farming. Indian J Anim Prod. 2020;40(3):450-457.
14. Tanwar RS, Singh B, Garg D. Market structure and pricing of goat meat in Northern India. J Rural Dev. 2019;38(2):201-210.
15. Vahoniya DR, Nayak AK, Savaliya FP, Pundir RS, Mahera A, Patel J, *et al*. Status of goat marketing in

India: A chronological review. Pharma Innov J. 2022;11(6S):4805-10.
16. Yadav R, Singh A, Tiwari S. The role of cooperatives in goat marketing. Int J Agric Econ. 2022;47(2):177-184.

How to Cite This Article
Kumar J, Stephen AJ. Study on marketing of Sirohi goat (meat) in Sirohi district of Rajasthan. International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry. 2025;10(9):83-86.