



INTERNATIONAL FOOD
POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
sustainable solutions for ending hunger and poverty

Supported by the CGIAR

IFPRI Discussion Paper 00717

September 2007

Quality Control in Non-Staple Food Markets

Evidence From India

Marcel Fafchamps, Oxford University
Ruth Vargas Hill, International Food Policy Research Institute
and
Bart Minten, International Food Policy Research Institute

New Delhi Office

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) was established in 1975. IFPRI is one of 15 agricultural research centers that receive principal funding from governments, private foundations, and international and regional organizations, most of which are members of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTORS AND PARTNERS

IFPRI's research, capacity strengthening, and communications work is made possible by its financial contributors and partners. IFPRI gratefully acknowledges generous unrestricted funding from Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the World Bank.



INTERNATIONAL FOOD
POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
sustainable solutions for ending hunger and poverty

Supported by the CGIAR

IFPRI Discussion Paper 00717

September 2007

Quality Control in Non-Staple Food Markets

Evidence From India

Marcel Fafchamps, Oxford University
Ruth Vargas Hill, International Food Policy Research Institute
and
Bart Minten, International Food Policy Research Institute

New Delhi Office

PUBLISHED BY

**INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
Tel.: +1-202-862-5600
Fax: +1-202-467-4439
Email: ifpri@cgiar.org

www.ifpri.org

Notices:

¹ Effective January 2007, the Discussion Paper series within each division and the Director General's Office of IFPRI were merged into one IFPRI-wide Discussion Paper series. The new series begins with number 00689, reflecting the prior publication of 688 discussion papers within the dispersed series. The earlier series are available on IFPRI's website at www.ifpri.org/pubs/otherpubs.htm#dp.

² IFPRI Discussion Papers contain preliminary material and research results. They have not been subject to formal external reviews managed by IFPRI's Publications Review Committee but have been reviewed by at least one internal and/or external reviewer. They are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment.

Copyright 2007 International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. Sections of this material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without the express written permission of but with acknowledgment to IFPRI. To reproduce the material contained herein for profit or commercial use requires express written permission. To obtain permission, contact the Communications Division at ifpri-copyright@cgiar.org.

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Acknowledgments..... | v |
| Abstract | vi |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2. Conceptual Framework..... | 3 |
| 3. Data..... | 9 |
| 4. Empirical Results..... | 13 |
| 5. Conclusion | 30 |
| References..... | 32 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Descriptive statistics of sampled traders..... | 11 |
| 2. Descriptive statistics of sampled farmers | 12 |
| 3. Production, post-harvest, sanitary, and phyto-sanitary practices of farmers..... | 14 |
| 4. Infrastructure, drainage, and pest control in agricultural markets | 16 |
| 5. Perceived quality and price difference by traders and farmers..... | 17 |
| 6. Information transmission and requirements for buyers | 19 |
| 7. Farmer access to information on agricultural and post-harvest practices..... | 21 |
| 8. Reporting of produce characteristics at market auctions | 22 |
| 9. Quality control by traders, processors, and exporters..... | 23 |
| 10. Attitudes on sanitary and phyto-sanitary issues by commission agents, wholesalers, retailers, and processors/exporters | 24 |
| 11. Perceived price premiums by traders, processors, and exporters | 26 |
| 12. Determinants of producer prices..... | 29 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the staff of IMRB for their assistance with the data collection. We are grateful to the government of India for the support and advice received during the survey. Data collection was funded by the World Bank. We would like to thank Forhad Shilpi, Dina Umali-Deininger, Nick Minot, and the participants of the FAO Rural Development Conference for useful comments on an earlier draft. The support of the World Bank, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and the Economic and Social Research Council (UK) is gratefully acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

Using original data collected about growers, traders, processors, markets, and village communities, we compare the situation in four states – Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Orissa. We examine the way that information about crop attributes is conveyed (or not) along the value chain. We also document the infrastructure available at the level of the market. We find that little information circulates about unobservable crop characteristics. Growers receive a price premium when they dry, grade, and pack their produce, but we find no evidence that information about crop health and safety or agricultural practices circulates through the value chain or that growers are encouraged to follow specific agricultural practices for quality purposes. Market infrastructure is deficient regarding sanitation, with few public toilets, inadequate drainage, and no coordinated pest control.

Keywords: food marketing, food safety, food quality, value chain, India

1. INTRODUCTION

Product quality affects the value of a good to a buyer. Some product attributes are observable, such as size and shape. Others, such as pesticide use, can only be observed at a cost or not at all, but can have delayed health effects. Economists have long recognized the importance of product quality. The issue has received most attention in the industrial organization literature where it has been modeled primarily in terms of product differentiation. In that literature, the focus has been on firms' decisions to position their products in quality space, taking into account the response of other firms (for example Perloff and Salop 1985; Dixit and Stiglitz 1977). Limited operability is typically assumed to be solved through a reputation mechanism based on brand name and product recognition (for example Tadelis 1999; Horner 2002).

This approach is not easily applied to agricultural markets in poor countries. The large number of producers and market intermediaries makes it impossible for consumers to rely on brand names. This raises empirical questions regarding agricultural markets in poor countries: Is information about product quality transmitted through the value chain? If yes, which dimensions of quality are transmitted and how?

We partially answer these questions using original survey data collected about the marketing of non-staple food crops in India. We investigate the way information about quality is conveyed (or not) along the value chain. Non-staple crops such as fruits and vegetables are a good study choice because quality (for example, taste, perish ability, safety) varies and matters more to consumers for fruits and vegetables than for grain. Given its rapid economic growth and large middle class, India is a perfect country in which to study product quality in agricultural markets. Rising incomes translate into both rapidly increasing demand for fruits and vegetables and a higher value on quality.¹

Results show that a large number of growers, traders, and processors are involved in the production, marketing, and processing of non-staple crops. There is very little evidence of horizontal or vertical integration/coordination, and the use of modern forms of organization is negligible. Contract farming is rare (and in some cases illegal). There is little involvement by supermarkets. Most of the economic agents involved in the value chain are quite small, except in wholesale, where concentration is marked. Except for a handful of processors, brand names are not used to identify and differentiate products. The use of modern technology is also limited. The services and infrastructure provided by wholesale markets remain basic, with little cold storage and little or no organized pest control. The environment thus does not appear designed to identify, protect, and certify quality differences that are not observable.

Unsurprisingly, we found that information about product quality does not circulate well. The data show that quality differences exist and that they are translated into price differences throughout the value

¹ The rise in meat consumption also inflates the derived demand for chicken feed which, in India, is primarily maize. It is generally thought that half of all maize produced in India is devoted to animal production.

chain. But quality is largely defined on the basis of observable attributes such as size and color. Quality differences are not translated into well-defined grades and product attributes have to be assessed individually by each market participant.² Some quality information travels along only part of the chain, stopping at the level of wholesalers – perhaps because it is not relevant for retailers located downstream. Information about unobservable attributes is not conveyed at all. This is true, for instance, of information about pesticide and fertilizer application, post-harvest pesticide treatment, or the origin of irrigation water. As a result, sanitary risk is difficult to assess. Given that it is not assessed, it is not rewarded and growers do not even appear aware of sanitary risk. Finally, we find that most processors of the studied crops focus on transforming inferior quality products that they purchase at a discount, suggesting that the function of agro-processing is to reduce wastage.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the current value chain for non-staple crops in India provides a basic service, focusing on quantity rather than quality. This may be because many consumers are unwilling to pay a premium for attributes – such as food safety – that they do not perceive as relevant. As India further develops, however, urban consumers may put pressure on the chain to upgrade.

Agricultural markets in India have been studied extensively. The research has mainly focused on the effect of international trade liberalization (for example Sahwney 2005; Storm 1997; Parikh et al. 1997; Athukorala and Jayasuriya 2003), the impact of public policy interventions (for example Umali-Deininger and Deininger 2001; Ramaswami and Balakrishnan 2002; Banerji and Meenakshi 2004), and the existence of market integration (Palaskas and Harriss-White 1996). Little specific information is available about the value chain for non-staple crops.

More recent research has focused on the effect of contract farming and the emergence of new marketing arrangements for high-value food commodities (for example Singh 2002; Deshingkar et al. 2003; BIRTHAL, Joshi and Gulati 2005). This is in line with emerging research on changing food marketing systems and the rise of vertical integration in commodity chains in developing and transition economies (for example Reardon and Barrett 2000; Reardon et al. 2003; Reardon and Swinnen 2004; Gulati et al. 2005). Our findings complement this literature, showing that Indian fruit and vegetable markets have yet to be affected by the supermarket revolution.

This paper is organized as follows. The conceptual framework is outlined in Section 2. The data collection process and the general characteristics of agents in the value chain are described in Section 3. The empirical analysis of the circulation of information about product quality is presented in Section 4. We finish with the conclusions in Section 5.

² Grading is not facilitated by the fact that the studied crops are produced using land races rather than standardized purchased seeds. This probably results in large multi-faceted variation in attributes across consignments, making grade standardization difficult.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

To clarify the issues surrounding quality control in the agricultural value chain, we begin by developing a simple model of the value and provision of quality. We then examine the conditions under which ‘first best’ is achieved.

A Model of Quality

Let $q_i = \{q_i^0, q_i^1, \dots, q_i^N\}$ be a vector of attributes (for example, size, color, taste) associated with a consignment i . Variable q_i^k denotes the quantity of attribute k associated with the consignment. Weight is treated as the first attribute of a consignment, so that q_i^0 denotes the weight of the consignment. We normalize attributes so that consumers derive positive utility from them, that is:³

$$U = U(q_i^0, q_i^1, \dots, q_i^N) = \sum_{k=0}^N \alpha_k q_i^k$$

with $\partial U / \partial q_i^k \geq 0$. For simplicity, we assume that U is measured in money equivalent.

Now consider two consignments i and j , differing only in attribute k . For the consumer to be indifferent between the two, the price differential between the two must be equal to the difference in utility:

$$U(q_i^0, \dots, q_i^k, \dots, q_i^N) - p_i = U(q_j^0, \dots, \tilde{q}_j^k, \dots, q_j^N) - p_j$$

$$p_i - p_j \approx \frac{\partial U}{\partial q^k} (q_i^k - \tilde{q}_j^k)$$

The price differential between the two consignments can thus be regarded as the implicit price of attribute k .⁴

We now turn to the production of attributes. Suppose for a moment that all attributes are perfectly observable. Growers have a joint production function for attributes denoted in implicit form as:

$$G(q_i^0, \dots, q_i^N; x_1, \dots, x_M) \leq 0$$

where x is a vector of production inputs. Dropping the i subscript to improve readability, the efficient allocation is obtained from solving a social planner problem of the form:

³ If an attribute yields negative utility, for example the presence of bacteria, then we define q_i^k as the negative of that attribute.

⁴ If utility is additively separable, that is, if $U = \sum_{k=0}^N \alpha_k q_i^k$, the formula holds exactly:

$$p_i - p_j = \alpha_k (q_i^k - \tilde{q}_j^k)$$

$$\max_{\{x, q^k\}} U(q_i^0, \dots, q_i^N) - \sum_{n=1}^M p_n x_n \text{ subject to}$$

$$G(q_i^0, \dots, q_i^N; x_1, \dots, x_M) \leq 0$$

which yields first-order conditions of the form:

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial q^k} - \lambda \frac{\partial G}{\partial q^k} = 0$$

$$-p_n - \lambda \frac{\partial G}{\partial x_n} = 0$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the constraint. This yields the efficiency condition:

$$\lambda = \frac{\partial U / \partial q^k}{\partial G / \partial q^k} = -\frac{p_n}{\partial G / \partial x_n} \forall k, n$$

In equilibrium, λ is the price of the consignment. Combining the consumption and production sides, it follows that:

$$\frac{dp}{dq^k} = \frac{\partial U}{\partial q^k} = p \frac{\partial G}{\partial q^k}$$

The above equation says that, in an efficient equilibrium, the price premium associated with attribute k is equal to the marginal utility of that attribute (expressed in money terms) and also equal to the marginal cost of producing the attribute.

For an efficient equilibrium to arise, correct information about attributes must be conveyed down the value chain. To see this, imagine that correct information is only conveyed about a subset S of attributes with $S < N$. Since consumers only pay for attributes about which information is available, the price of consignment i can only vary with $\{q_i^0, \dots, q_i^S\}$. Consequently, growers receive no incentive for producing attributes q_i^k with $k > S$. As a result, these attributes are set at the lowest level defined by the technology function $G(\cdot)$. In some cases, this implies that $q_i^k = 0$.

This would be the case, for instance, for costly but unobservable post-harvest treatment. In many other cases, the quantity of unobserved attributes is not 0 simply because these attributes are produced at no extra cost in conjunction with observable attributes, for example, tomatoes have a taste even if no special effort has been made to enhance it.⁵

⁵ Some attributes, such as storability, may be valued by traders but not by consumers. Other attributes may even be valued negatively by consumers but positively by traders. Tomatoes and mangoes, for instance, bruise less during transport and handling if harvested early. But taste deteriorates when the fruit is harvested early because it does not mature in the sun. We abstract from these complications in the discussion here, but the same general principles apply.

The marginal utility of certain product attributes is likely to be income sensitive. For instance, interest in organic foods and concerns over pesticide residues are higher among rich consumers. Accessing different markets thus requires variation in the mix of attributes. Poor Indian consumers, for instance, may be unwilling or unable to pay for the cost of reducing the health risks associated with food consumption. Foreign consumers in export markets, on the other hand, tend to be concerned with sanitary issues. Better-off domestic consumers are also likely to be willing to pay more for certain attributes, such as freshness and taste. In order to serve these categories of consumers, the market must convey information about the attributes that more discriminating consumers care about. If the necessary information does not circulate through the chain, it is impossible for these consumers to signal their willingness to pay more for specific attributes.

Information Flows

So far we have discussed the cost of providing the attributes themselves. Now we will consider the cost of transferring information about attributes. Imagine a consumer deciding whether or not to purchase a consignment. Not buying yields a normalized payoff of 0. There is one discrete attribute k that is either present or absent, that is, $q^k = \{0,1\}$. This attribute is revealed through consumption, but is not immediately observable at buying time. There is no warranty. Let U_1 denote the consumer's utility when the attribute is present, and U_0 when it is absent. The buyer announces the attribute of the good by making an announcement $m_k = \{0,1\}$, which may or may not correspond to the true attribute q^k . A consignment claimed to possess the attribute (that is, $m_k = 1$) is sold at price p_1 ; one that does not is sold at price p_0 with $p_1 > p_0$. Let the quality price premium be denoted α with $p_1 = p_0 + \alpha$.

There is no reason for the seller to report $m_k = 0$ when $q^k = 1$ since this would yield a lower price. But the seller has an incentive to report $m_k = 1$ when $q^k = 0$ since doing so raises the price. Knowing this, the buyer may either accept the seller's quoted price and quality, or incur cost c to inspect the good and assess its true attribute q^k . If the good is found to be of inferior quality, the buyer only pays p_0 . If he does not inspect, the buyer's expected payoff is $\pi^n = \tau U_1 + (1 - \tau)U_0 - p_1$ where τ is the probability that the seller is telling the truth. If the buyer inspects, his payoff is $\pi^i = \tau(U_1 - p_1 - c) + (1 - \tau)(U_0 - p_0 - c)$.

The gain from inspecting is:

$$G = \pi^i - \pi^n = \alpha(1 - \tau) - c$$

This shows that if the seller always tells the truth $G=-c$: in that case, inspecting is a waste of money. On the other hand, if the seller always lies, $G=\alpha-c$: if the price premium is larger than the cost of inspecting, the buyer chooses to inspect.

Let us now concentrate on the seller's incentives. We first note that buyers purchase the low-quality good whenever $U_0 \geq p_0$. It is therefore in the seller's interest to set $p_0^* = U_0$. Turning to the high-quality good, we first note that if the seller lies and the buyer inspects, lying yields nothing since the good is sold at price p_0 anyway. The seller gains from misreporting quality only if the buyer does not inspect. Solving the above equation for τ tells us how much lying is feasible without inducing the buyer to inspect:⁶

$$\tau^* = \frac{\alpha - c}{\alpha}$$

To illustrate what is going on, let us first consider two special cases. First, suppose that the cost of verifying quality is 0. In this case the buyer inspects whenever there is even a small probability that the seller may not be telling the truth. Lying thus yields no advantage for the seller: $\tau^* = 1$. To find the price at which the high-quality good is sold, we note that the buyer purchases whenever $\pi^n \geq 0$. Since:

$$\pi^n = \tau U_1 + (1 - \tau)U_0 - p_1 = U_1 - p_1$$

it follows that the maximum price the seller can set is $p_1^* = U_1$. In this case efficiency obtains because the equilibrium price differential $\alpha^* = p_1^* - p_0^*$ is equal to the utility gain from the attribute $U_1 - U_0$. Consequently, growers receive the correct incentive to produce the attribute valued by consumers.

Now suppose in contrast that the cost of verifying quality is so high that the buyer never inspects. This is guaranteed whenever $c > U_1 - U_0$. In this case, the seller has no incentive to tell the truth, hence $\tau^* = 0$. Knowing this, the buyer buys the high-quality good if $\pi^n \geq 0$:

$$\pi^n = \tau U_1 + (1 - \tau)U_0 - p_1 = U_0 - p_1$$

Since in equilibrium $p_0^* = U_0$, it follows that the only price the seller can set for the high-quality good is $p_1 = p_0$.

In the intermediate case, the equilibrium price premium is found by combining $\pi^n = 0$ with equation $\tau^* = \frac{\alpha - c}{\alpha}$ and using $p_0^* = U_0$. After some straightforward algebra we get:

⁶ Assuming that the buyer knows τ , for instance as a result of repeated buying over time.

$$\alpha^* = \frac{1}{2}(b + \sqrt{v(b-4c)})$$

where $b \equiv U_1 - U_0$.⁷ It is easy to verify that $\alpha^* < U_1 - U_0$, except when $c=0$, in which case $\alpha^* = U_1 - U_0$. Consequently, growers do not receive the right price signal and there is under-provision of quality. The above equation further shows that the price charged for the high-quality good $p_1 = p_0 + \alpha^*$ falls with inspection cost c . This is because as the inspection cost increases, the seller has more incentive to cheat, and this discourages the buyer. These results can be summarized as follows:

Proposition 1:

- (1) When the inspection cost c is 0, the price differential between the high- and low-quality good is equal to the utility gain generated by the quality differential: $\alpha^* = U_1 - U_0$. As a result growers receive the right incentive to produce quality.
- (2) *The price differential falls as the inspection cost rises.*
- (3) *For a high enough inspection cost, the price differential vanishes. At that point both qualities are sold at the same price. The quality announcement made by the seller is irrelevant.*
- (4) For any $c > 0$, there is under-provision of quality.

Proposition 1 illustrates that the existence of inspection costs undermines the market for quality and results in under-provision. If quality is totally unobservable, the production of quality is not rewarded. That means, for instance, that sellers will not report any health risks associated with the good.

This unsatisfactory outcome arises because sellers do not provide warranty. If they did, they could promise to compensate the buyer if, upon consumption, the good is revealed to be of inferior quality.⁸ Given the small size of most transactions and the relative poverty of most parties, we do not expect the threat of court action to be credible and courts are probably unable to enforce warranty (Bigsten et al. 2000; Fafchamps and Minten 2001). Contract enforcement mechanisms based on repeated interactions⁹ can, in principle, enforce warranty obligations and thus reward the production of quality. Warranty has to be provided each time the product changes hands.

⁷ The other root is smaller and hence is never optimal for the seller.

⁸ The optimal compensation is $b \equiv U_1 - U_0$. With warranty, the buyer no longer needs to inspect the good since his payoff without inspecting now is: $\pi^n = \tau(U_1 - p_1) + (1 - \tau)(U_0 - p_1 + b) = U_1 - p_1$

irrespective of τ . It is therefore optimal for the seller to set $p_1^* = U_1$, which ensures first best. Finally if, as is reasonable, we assume that the seller incurs a cost when compensating a defrauded buyer, it follows that truth-telling is optimal at: $\tau=1$.

⁹ These mechanisms are discussed in detail, for instance, in Fafchamps (1996) and Fafchamps (2004) and need not be debated here.

This is difficult to implement in an atomistic value chain with lots of intermediaries. Better vertical coordination can help solve this problem by reducing the number of transactions between grower and consumer. Examples of vertical coordination include contract farming and out-grower schemes. Supermarkets also favor vertical coordination by reducing the number of intermediaries between wholesaler and consumer (Reardon et al. 2003).

There are hidden attributes, such as health risk, that are not immediately or unambiguously revealed upon consumption. In principle, it may be possible to hold sellers responsible for the damage they have caused even if the damage is manifested with a lag. But providing the necessary evidence may be extremely difficult, and tracing the guilty party may be close to impossible in an atomistic market. In this case, external verification of the chain is necessary.

This can be accomplished by the government through health and safety regulations. It can also be provided privately through franchising or independent certification. In recent years there has been an expansion of private and semi-private certification and labeling.¹⁰ In developing countries, certification often involves non-governmental organizations that act as external guarantors.

To summarize, in the absence of regulations and certification, the theory predicts that, unless reputation effects enable economic agents to credibly offer warranty, attributes that are completely unobservable by the buyer do not carry a price premium. In contrast, attributes that are observable may carry a premium if the attribute is valued by the buyer. Attributes that are valued by certain intermediaries but not by the final consumers carry a premium in the value chain only up to the level of those intermediaries.

The model also predicts that sellers announce the attributes of what they sell only if this attribute can be observed at a cost. If the attribute can be observed without cost, making an announcement is irrelevant; if the attribute cannot be observed at all, announcements are not believed so there is no point making them. The objective of our empirical analysis is to investigate whether these predictions hold in the case of non-staple food marketing in India.

¹⁰ Examples include organic, shade-grown, GM-free, and fair-trade labels. Ethical labels also apply to manufactured goods.

3. DATA

Detailed data was collected from representative random samples of growers, traders, and processors of non-staple crops. To facilitate comparison, the surveys focus on five crops: mango, tomato, potato, turmeric, and maize. The first three are perishable fruit and vegetable crops.¹¹ Turmeric is partly destined for export markets, and maize is a feed crop. Information on individual agents is supplemented by data collected from market and village authorities.

We focus on four Indian states – Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Orissa. These states were chosen to capture the geographical and institutional diversity of India. Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra represent middle and southern states. The main difference between the two is institutional: in Maharashtra agricultural markets are tightly regulated while in Tamil Nadu they are not. Uttar Pradesh and Orissa represent northern states. Again, the main difference between the two is institutional. While both are regulated, in Orissa government intervention in agricultural markets is generally regarded as ineffective, but in Uttar Pradesh is thought to be better in this respect.

Except in Tamil Nadu, where the intervention of the state in agricultural markets is limited, the exchange of non-staple agricultural products falls in principle under the same rule as trade in major staples. In principle, all wholesale trade must take place within regulated markets and lots must be sold via auction through the intermediation of commissioned agents. In practice, auctions are seldom used for non-staple crops, and when they are they take the form of a silent auction. Commission agents play an important role in non-staple markets but their function and contractual responsibility is ambiguous. In practice, they seem to operate in a way that is indistinguishable from that of wholesalers. In the end, government intervention in non-staple markets boils down to providing market infrastructure and subsidized stalls to traders, who in turn have to pay a market tax. In none of the states are there effective regulations on quality issues.

Detailed surveys of traders, growers, and processors were conducted in each of the four states covered by the study. In each state 20 wholesale markets and 40 villages were selected in order to construct a sample of 400 traders and 400 farmers. Community surveys were conducted at the market and village level. We also surveyed 600 processors and exporters. Given the difficulties encountered in constructing a reliable sampling frame and in getting selected enterprises to respond to the questionnaire, we make little use of those data here. Details of the sampling strategy can be found in Fafchamps, Hill, and Minten (2006).

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for surveyed traders, weighted to ensure representativeness in each state. There is some diversity in the composition of the sample observed across states. Fewer commission agents are found in Orissa, and many wholesale traders also sell retail in Orissa and

¹¹ In India potatoes are highly perishable because ambient heat favors germination.

Maharashtra. There is greater separation of marketing functions in Uttar Pradesh, with only 9 percent of sampled traders selling retail. Few traders in Tamil Nadu and Orissa sell in regulated markets. This confirms the characterization of Tamil Nadu as a state without regulated markets and Orissa as a state with regulated markets that function imperfectly. Most of the interviewed traders report buying from farmers. The mean working capital of a trader is around US\$3,000, but the median working capital is only \$476. Although there is some variation across states, trading in the five study crops is a low-tech enterprise. Aside from owning mechanical weighing scales and a telephone, trading enterprises own very little physical capital (see Table 1). What this shows is that trade in non-staple crops is atomistic, with lots of intermediaries involved. Supermarkets are basically absent from the fruit and vegetable value chain. Contract farming is extremely rare and, in many states, still illegal. We found no public or private grading, certification, or labeling program in place for the five non-staple crops covered by the study.

Descriptive statistics for surveyed farmers are presented in Table 2. Figures are weighted to ensure representativeness in each state. Production of non-staple crops is even more atomistic than marketing, with tens of millions of small farmers involved. The characteristics of heads of farming households are similar across states. The distance to markets reported by farmers indicates that markets are located much further from producers in Tamil Nadu than in other states. This is true for both wholesale and retail markets. Maharashtra follows Tamil Nadu, with average wholesale market distances of 17 and 30 kilometers. However the larger distances to wholesale markets in Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra do not deter farmers from selling there, as more farmers sell at wholesale markets in these states than in Uttar Pradesh and Orissa. In Orissa, in contrast to the other states, farmers are more likely to sell at retail than wholesale markets.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of sampled traders

| | Tamil Nadu | Orissa | State Maharash- tra | Uttar Pradesh | Total |
|--|---------------|--------|---------------------------|------------------|-------|
| Type of activity (%) | | | | | |
| Commission agent | 34 | 1 | 69 | 54 | 24 |
| Sell wholesale | 77 | 89 | 91 | 98 | 92 |
| Sell retail | 54 | 95 | 65 | 9 | 56 |
| Buy directly from farmers | 82 | 96 | 88 | 82 | 89 |
| Sell or buy other than agricultural products | 8 | 23 | 9 | 1 | 11 |
| Sell in regulated markets | 7 | 30 | 60 | 84 | 55 |
| Socio-economic background | | | | | |
| Age (years) | 43 | 42 | 41 | 36 | 39 |
| Proportion that are male (%) | 98 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 99 |
| <i>Education, % of traders who have...</i> | | | | | |
| No formal education | 20 | 21 | 2 | 32 | 24 |
| Primary | 11 | 29 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| Middle | 18 | 19 | 21 | 15 | 17 |
| Secondary | 29 | 23 | 30 | 26 | 26 |
| High secondary | 5 | 7 | 23 | 14 | 11 |
| Undergraduate or more | 16 | 1 | 22 | 9 | 8 |
| Scale and structure of business | | | | | |
| Proportion that are sole owners (%) | 93 | 93 | 93 | 91 | 92 |
| Median annual purchases (\$) | 11238 | 3095 | 3333 | 2381 | 2381 |
| Median annual sales (\$) | 12262 | 3881 | 3429 | 2143 | 2857 |
| Median annual net revenue (\$) | 857 | 577 | 292 | 238 | 238 |
| Equipment (% of traders that own...) | | | | | |
| Mechanical scales | 67 | 95 | 85 | 52 | 73 |
| Processing equipment | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Generator | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Telephone | 29 | 3 | 87 | 30 | 24 |
| Computer | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 2 |
| Non-motorized transportation | 6 | 75 | 3 | 24 | 42 |
| Motorized transportation | 11 | 3 | 68 | 27 | 20 |

Source: Trader survey

Contract farming could potentially solve some of the coordination and information problems between suppliers and buyers. Information on contract farming collected during the survey indicates that very few farmers – only 5 percent of the farmers in our study – are engaged in contract farming. Nearly all the contracts observed in the survey are for mango farmers. The only input provided by a large proportion of buyers is harvesting labor. Farming contracts thus boil down to forward sales of mangoes on the trees, which the buyer harvests himself in half of the contracts. The perceived advantages of contract farming in its current form are mostly related to price and client security; few farmers report provision of inputs or quality control. One fourth of respondents mention “cash in advance” as the reason for selling their crop forward. The major perceived disadvantage is getting a lower price than they would

get if they sold on the spot after harvest. Taken together, the evidence thus indicates that contract farming, as it is currently practiced, is not used for quality-control purposes.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of sampled farmers

| | Tamil Nadu | Orissa | State Maharashtra | Uttar Pradesh | Total |
|--|---------------|--------|----------------------|------------------|-------|
| Characteristics of household head | | | | | |
| Age (years) | 47 | 47 | 51 | 47 | 49 |
| Gender (% male) | 96 | 99 | 99 | 96 | 98 |
| Education (mean years) | 7 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 7 |
| Religion (% Hindi) | 96 | 98 | 96 | 76 | 90 |
| Caste (% scheduled caste/scheduled tribe) | 10 | 55 | 5 | 31 | 18 |
| Welfare characteristics (% of households that...) | | | | | |
| Live in a <i>pucca</i> house (with tin roof) | 81 | 35 | 95 | 55 | 75 |
| Have a toilet in the house | 31 | 10 | 26 | 32 | 27 |
| Own a television | 71 | 26 | 91 | 25 | 61 |
| Own a telephone | 25 | 7 | 45 | 17 | 30 |
| Have problems satisfying their food needs | 56 | 43 | 1 | 46 | 27 |
| Scale of farming enterprise | | | | | |
| Total value of output (mean, \$) | 1200 | 500 | 2600 | 1100 | 1700 |
| Total value of sales (mean, \$) | 1100 | 400 | 2200 | 900 | 1500 |
| Retail/wholesale market access (median distance, km) | | | | | |
| Closest wholesale market for grain | 45 | 10 | 17 | 7 | 13 |
| Closest wholesale market for fruit | 35 | 10 | 30 | 7 | 15 |
| Closest retail market for grain | 13 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| Closest retail market for fruit | 10 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| General selling practices (% of farmers) | | | | | |
| Sold at wholesale market in last year | 79 | 39 | 96 | 71 | 80 |
| Sold at retail market in last year | 9 | 53 | 3 | 13 | 11 |
| Sell as a group with other farmers | 9 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| Engage in contract farmers | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Sell in advance | 37 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 9 |
| Perform post-harvest activities | 90 | 49 | 97 | 86 | 88 |
| Store before sale | 9 | 29 | 28 | 19 | 23 |

Source: Farmer survey

4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

We have briefly summarized the main characteristics of the population of growers, traders, processors, and exporters of mango, tomato, potato, maize, and turmeric. We have seen that production and marketing are atomistic, with little or no use of vertical integration or contracting to solve information problems. We now examine their trading practices, with a focus on quality control and the transfer of information about crop attributes.

Theory predicts that, in the absence of external certification, an atomistic value chain will only relay information about attributes that are observable by buyers. Information on attributes that are not observable by buyers – such as agricultural practices – will not be provided, whether these practices are valued by consumers or not. As a result, there will be no difference in the unit price of goods grown using different agricultural practices. Theory also predicts that sellers need not explicitly provide information about characteristics that are observable without cost by buyers, such as size and color.¹² Information should only be explicitly provided for attributes that are observable at a cost, such as taste or weight.

We examine the evidence in two ways. First we take advantage of the rich descriptive data we have collected to document quality control and information transfer practices. We also look for evidence that the government uses its involvement in agricultural marketing to promote quality and safety. We then turn to multivariate analysis to test whether unit prices paid to growers only vary with observable characteristics.

Information Transfer and Quality Control

We begin by showing in Table 3 that a large majority of farmers use pesticides, irrigation, and fertilizer on the five studied crops. The only exception is mango, which is seldom irrigated. The median number of pesticide applications is between two and three times over a crop cycle, depending on the state. The median time elapsed between harvest and the last pesticide application is large for maize, mango, and turmeric (six to eight weeks) but is much smaller for tomato and potato (two to three weeks). Few farmers have their soil tested, and when they do it is primarily to determine what the soil is good for, not to find out about pesticide residues. While about 60 percent of the villages were visited by agricultural officers over the last year, only 8 percent were told that certain pesticides should not be used and that their post-harvesting practices should be changed. Only 1 percent of the villages have been told that certain water sources should not be used for irrigating crops. Not all growers dry or clean their produce before selling it. Fumigation or any other type of post-harvest treatment is hardly ever undertaken by growers, except for the turmeric crop. Only for turmeric do growers undertake any grading.

¹² That is, if the buyer is physically present and the produce is packed in such a way that it can be observed.

Table 3: Production, post-harvest, sanitary, and phyto-sanitary practices of farmers

| | Crop | | | | |
|--|---------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| | Maize | Potato | Tomato | Mango | Turmeric |
| Proportion of farmers that undertake one of the following practices to improve quality (%): | | | | | |
| Choose particular seeds / variety | 91 | 94 | 97 | 79 | 84 |
| Plant at a specific time | 92 | 91 | 96 | - | 87 |
| Apply pesticides | 68 | 93 | 92 | 87 | 73 |
| Apply fertilizer | 93 | 88 | 96 | 87 | 82 |
| Irrigate | 96 | 95 | 90 | 18 | 79 |
| Dry after harvest | 66 | - | - | - | 91 |
| Clean after harvest | 64 | 74 | 38 | 34 | 80 |
| Grade | 28 | 84 | 69 | 81 | 69 |
| Fumigate / treat after harvest | 9 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 64 |
| Package / crate | 8 | 52 | 45 | 60 | 32 |
| Mill / grind | 44 | - | - | - | 6 |
| Phyto-sanitary practices | | | | | |
| Median number of times pesticide is used | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Median number of weeks between harvest and last application | 7 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Proportion of crop grown by farmer who tested soil properties | 27 | 27 | 26 | 6 | 10 |
| Of those who tested, reason for testing soil (%): | | | | | |
| Determine what soil is good for | 94 | 78 | 91 | 47 | 95 |
| Find out if there is pesticide residue | 5 | 8 | 2 | 53 | 5 |
| Training of farmers on sanitary and phyto-sanitary practices | | | | | |
| | Overall | | | | |
| % of villages visited by agricultural officers over last year | 60 | | | | |
| % of farmers visited by agricultural officers at least once over last year | 20 | | | | |
| % of villages where farmers have been told... | | | | | |
| ... that certain pesticides should not be used | 8 | | | | |
| ... that certain water sources should not be used for irrigating crops | 1 | | | | |
| ... that their post-harvesting practices should be changed | 8 | | | | |

Source: Farmer survey

From this evidence, it appears that farmers are primarily concerned about the quantity and appearance of their produce, which are undoubtedly enhanced by the use of fertilizer, irrigation, and pesticides. But growers are less involved in post-harvest treatment and processing. Few of them seem aware of possible sanitary issues raised by pesticide usage or irrigation. This could be explained by the lack of concern for sanitary issues further down the value chain: if produce is likely to be soiled during handling at the wholesale or retail market, there is little reason for growers to worry about sanitary issues.

Table 4 shows that market infrastructure is indeed minimal in most cases. This is true even though our sample focuses on large wholesale and regulated markets that are probably better on average than rural retail markets. We note a lack of tarred surfaces and of public toilets in the wholesale and retail

markets generally. There is a lack of piped water in individual stalls, which is crucial for hygiene. There is little cold storage, and few if any grading/sanitary services were found in the markets that we studied. Drainage is poor. Wherever measures had been taken against rats and pests, which had not happened frequently, they were undertaken by individual traders, not by market authorities. Given these conditions, it is likely that the studied crops are cleaner when they leave the farm than when they reach the consumer.

Does this imply that there are no differences in quality? Quite the contrary. As shown in Table 5, almost all of the growers and traders recognize different varieties for the five crops under study. Farmers associate quality differences with differences in size, shape, color, and moisture content – the latter being relevant only for maize and turmeric. These are easily observable attributes. Some growers reckon that quality depends on taste and smell, but these attributes appear less important. They are also less immediately observable.¹³ Quality differences are associated with large price differences, especially for turmeric, tomato, and mango. From this it appears that growers perceive a strong price premium associated with observable quality.

A similar picture emerges from the answers provided by traders (second panel of Table 5). Except for maize, where one-fifth of growers and traders think that size does not matter, size is associated with quality by virtually all respondents. Shape matters somewhat less for traders than growers, except for potato. While nearly all growers think that color matters for quality, traders seem less concerned about it, except in the case of tomato. Smell is also less important, especially for maize and potato. Similarly, traders seem less interested in taste than growers: a majority of traders state that quality does not depend on taste, while half of the growers claim that it does. The difference is particularly striking in the case of turmeric, where 54 percent of growers state that quality depends on taste while only 8 percent of traders say so. These results show that in their assessment of what affects product quality, traders grant less weight than growers to less observable attributes.

¹³ Tomatoes and mangos could in principle be assessed on the spot, but often they are not fully ripe when harvested. For maize and potatoes, taste and smell only become fully apparent once cooked.

Table 4. Infrastructure, drainage, and pest control in agricultural markets

| Market infrastructure | Percentage |
|--|-------------------|
| Type of road inside market yard (%) | |
| <i>Kutcha</i> road | 42 |
| Paved road | 12 |
| <i>Pucca</i> tar road | 42 |
| Other | 3 |
| % of markets that have public toilets | 50 |
| Proportion (%) of stalls in markets that have... | |
| Electricity | 61 |
| Piped water | 25 |
| Telephone (land line) | 40 |
| Grading equipment | 3 |
| Packing equipment | 1 |
| Fumigation machine | 4 |
| Availability at the market of (% of markets) | |
| ... grading machine | 16 |
| ... authorities that offer grading services to traders, for example visual inspection or certification | 21 |
| ... drying machine | 1 |
| ... area to dry crops | 16 |
| ... crop fumigation equipment | 5 |
| % of markets with cold-storage facilities | 7 |
| Drainage and pest control in markets | |
| Type of drainage (% of markets) | |
| Covered sewer | 22 |
| Concrete open sewer | 27 |
| Both covered and concrete open sewer | 4 |
| Earthen open sewer | 15 |
| No drainage | 32 |
| % of markets where drainage is adequate | 56 |
| If not adequate, why not? (% of markets) | |
| Drains are too narrow | 13 |
| Drains are clogged due to lack of planning | 68 |
| Other | 19 |
| Measures taken against rats (% of markets) | |
| Employees of market/association in charge | 5 |
| Pest control contracted to outside firm | 3 |
| Individuals take care of rats in their store | 32 |
| No particular measures taken | 59 |
| Measures taken against insects damaging crops (% of markets) | |
| Employees of market/association in charge | 7 |
| Pest control contracted to outside firm | 3 |
| Individuals fumigate in their store | 27 |
| No particular measure taken | 59 |
| Other | 4 |

(neighed average over the four states)

Source: Market survey

Table 5. Perceived quality and price difference by traders and farmers

| | Maize | Potato | Product Tomato | Mango | Turmeric |
|--|-------|--------|-------------------|-------|----------|
| Farmers | | | | | |
| Proportion reporting different varieties for this crop | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 97 |
| Proportion of crop grown by farmer who believes crop quality is determined by (%): | | | | | |
| Size | 81 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| Shape | 71 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 96 |
| Color | 97 | 93 | 96 | 95 | 87 |
| Smell | 46 | 14 | 34 | 51 | 58 |
| Taste | 48 | 68 | 36 | 98 | 54 |
| Moisture content | 93 | - | - | - | 73 |
| <i>Perceived price differences</i> | | | | | |
| Mean per kilo premium for crop of high quality (Rs) | 1.5 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| Mean per kilo discount for crop of low quality (Rs) | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 9.3 | 7.5 |
| Traders | | | | | |
| Number of observations | 353 | 543 | 568 | 476 | 185 |
| % of traders that say different varieties exist | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| <i>Perceived determinants of quality (%)</i> | | | | | |
| Quality is determined by size? | | | | | |
| A lot | 65 | 97 | 95 | 95 | 59 |
| A little | 13 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 39 |
| Not at all | 22 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Quality is determined by shape? | | | | | |
| A lot | 48 | 82 | 57 | 73 | 39 |
| A little | 23 | 15 | 39 | 13 | 59 |
| Not at all | 28 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 2 |
| Quality is determined by color? | | | | | |
| A lot | 56 | 55 | 87 | 58 | 41 |
| A little | 20 | 39 | 11 | 20 | 24 |
| Not at all | 23 | 6 | 2 | 21 | 34 |
| Quality is determined by smell? | | | | | |
| A lot | 2 | 4 | 29 | 38 | 21 |
| A little | 6 | 11 | 11 | 34 | 36 |
| Not at all | 91 | 84 | 59 | 28 | 43 |
| Quality is determined by taste? | | | | | |
| A lot | 9 | 37 | 12 | 57 | 1 |
| A little | 24 | 19 | 11 | 16 | 6 |
| Not at all | 67 | 44 | 77 | 27 | 92 |
| Quality is determined by moisture content? | | | | | |
| A lot | 79 | - | - | - | 16 |
| A little | 17 | - | - | - | 83 |
| Not at all | 4 | - | - | - | 1 |
| <i>Perceived price differences</i> | | | | | |
| Mean per kilo premium for crop of high quality (Rs) | 1.0 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 6.7 |
| Mean per kilo discount for crop of low quality (Rs) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 6.9 | 9.0 |

Source: Farmer and trader survey

Traders and farmers report large price differentials associated with differences in quality. This is particularly true for tomato and mango, the most perishable of the studied crops. Prices for these crops can increase or decrease by 50 percent for good and bad quality, respectively. The differential is significantly lower for maize. Turmeric is an oddity: according to growers, price varies a lot with quality but according to traders it does not. More investigation is required to understand these features.

Next we turn to the information transmission process. Table 6 compares the information that growers claim buyers can tell by direct observation with the information they report transmitting to buyers. Growers vary a lot in the size of their production of non-staple crops. To capture the proportion of aggregate marketed surplus for which agronomic information is conveyed to the buyer, we weight farmers' answers by the quantity they sell. In so doing, we get a sense of the information available for the average produce in the value chain.

The first panel of Table 6 represents the percentage of marketed output for which the grower reports that the buyer can observe various crop attributes. We see that – with the possible exception of potato – buyers cannot tell whether growers have used fertilizer, pesticides, or irrigation. Buyers can quite easily tell which variety they are being offered. For those growers who undertake post-harvest operations such as drying, cleaning, or grading, the majority state that buyers can tell whether the activity has been undertaken. In this case fumigation is the strong exception, with buyers being unable to tell whether it has been applied by growers.

The second panel of Table 6 presents the percentage of market output for which growers reported a given attribute. Percentages are computed only for those farmers who undertake the activity associated with the given attribute. We see that growers transmit very little information directly to buyers. The only apparent exception is packaging, but presumably buyers can tell whether the produce is packaged or not.

The explanation for this apparent lack of information transfer does not seem to lie with growers. Buyers show little interest in – and require little information on – agronomic practices. For instance, a very low percentage of farmers said that during the last five years buyers have asked them not to use certain agricultural inputs, or asked for changes in post-harvest practices. Virtually no farmer states that a buyer would pay more for produce complying with new specifications or requirements.

Table 6. Information transmission and requirements for buyers

| | Crop | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| | Maize | Potato | Tomato | Mango | Turmeric |
| Information available to buyers | | | | | |
| Proportion of crop grown by farmer who reports that buyer can tell practice has been undertaken:** | | | | | |
| (% of those that have undertaken practice) | | | | | |
| Choose particular seeds / variety | 62 | 85 | 58 | 81 | 78 |
| Plant at a specific time | 23 | 65 | 48 | - | 44 |
| Apply pesticides | 11 | 33 | 20 | 7 | 21 |
| Apply fertilizer | 9 | 63 | 21 | 5 | 16 |
| Irrigate | 23 | 56 | 32 | 7 | 11 |
| Dry after harvest | 84 | - | - | - | 91 |
| Clean after harvest | 75 | 77 | 54 | 62 | 77 |
| Grade | 39 | 80 | 62 | 69 | 54 |
| Fumigate / treat after harvest | 10 | 14 | 9 | 27 | 30 |
| Proportion of crop grown by farmer who tells buyer that practice has been undertaken:** | | | | | |
| (% of those that have undertaken practice) | | | | | |
| Choose particular seeds / variety | 2 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 6 |
| Plant at a specific time | 1 | 5 | 7 | - | 6 |
| Apply pesticides | 1 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 7 |
| Apply fertilizer | 1 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 5 |
| Irrigate | 1 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| Dry after harvest | 1 | - | - | - | 0 |
| Clean after harvest | 3 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Grade | 1 | 6 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| Fumigate / treat after harvest | 0 | 25 | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| Package / crate | 13 | 65 | 10 | 3 | 7 |
| Mill / grind | 3 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 15 |
| Requests on production, post-harvest, and phyto-sanitary practices by buyers | | | | | |
| Proportion of crop sold for whom buyers have (in last five years, %):** | | | | | |
| ...changed specifications regarding product quality | 1 | 15 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| ...indicated that the farmer should not use certain chemicals / inputs | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| ...requested / required that the farmer change post-harvest practices | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| ...paid more if farmer complies with new specifications/regulations | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Proportion of crop grown by farmers who have changed practices to comply** | | | | | |
| | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Buyers of agricultural products in this village pay attention to...(%) of villages)* | | | | | |
| ... what type of seed has been used | 32 | 40 | 38 | 13 | 33 |
| ... what kind of pesticides have been used | 17 | 22 | 22 | 6 | 14 |
| ... when pesticides have been applied | 13 | 17 | 17 | 6 | 12 |
| ... what kind of irrigation water has been used | 10 | 8 | 14 | 2 | 12 |
| Buyers of agricultural products in this village refuse... | | | | | |
| produce affected by pests/fungus (% of villages) * | 54 | 54 | 63 | 35 | 52 |

*source is village survey; for other variables source is farmer survey.

**Growers vary a lot in the size of their production of non-staple crops. To capture the proportion of aggregate marketed surplus for which agronomic information is conveyed to the buyer, we weight farmers' answers by the quantity they sell. In so doing, we get a sense of the information available for the average produce in the value chain.

Statements by farmers are confirmed by the results of village focus-group interviews. While between 30 and 40 percent of village focus groups declare that buyers of maize, potato, tomato, and turmeric pay attention to the type of seed that is used, percentages quickly drop off for the buyers' interest in the type of pesticides that are used, the timing of the use of these pesticides, and the kind of irrigation water used. Only about half of the villages state that buyers of agricultural produce in the village would refuse produce affected by fungus/pests.

Farmers were also asked where they obtain information on acceptable agricultural and post-harvest practices. The majority of farmers said that they obtained this information from other farmers (Table 7). Agricultural traders are seldom cited as a source of information on fertilizer and pesticide use (6 percent), irrigation practices (3 percent), sorting/grading of crops (7 percent), or post-harvest practices (5 percent). This confirms that very little information travels from traders to farmers regarding agricultural practices that could potentially affect the quality or safety of non-staple crops. This is consistent with earlier information indicating that traders care little about such crop attributes.

From this we conclude that the value chain does not reward specific agronomic practices, except to the extent that these practices affect directly observable characteristics. This finding is consistent with our model, which indicates that conditioning the price on unobservable characteristics is only feasible if sufficient trust exists between seller and buyer. If sufficient trust is not present, such conditioning is not credible because it would result in misreporting. That misreporting is indeed possible is suggested by the observation that growers who fumigate fail to report this information to buyers.

Table 7. Farmer access to information on agricultural and post-harvest practices

| | State | | | | Total |
|--|------------|--------|-------------|---------------|-------|
| | Tamil Nadu | Orissa | Maharashtra | Uttar Pradesh | |
| Main source of information on fertilizer and pesticide use (%): | | | | | |
| Other farmers | 14 | 35 | 74 | 60 | 58 |
| Agricultural officers | 21 | 34 | 11 | 8 | 13 |
| Agricultural campus students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural traders | 6 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 6 |
| Buyer of produce (based on contract) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Input suppliers | 27 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 13 |
| Radio/television | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Newspaper/magazine | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Personal observation | 27 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Other | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Main source of information on irrigation practices (%): | | | | | |
| Other farmers | 26 | 50 | 81 | 86 | 73 |
| Agricultural officers | 14 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 10 |
| Agricultural campus students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural traders | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 |
| Buyer of produce (based on contract) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Input suppliers | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Radio/television | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Newspaper/magazine | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Personal observation | 53 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Main source of information on sorting/grading of crops (%): | | | | | |
| Other farmers | 30 | 54 | 79 | 76 | 69 |
| Agricultural officers | 8 | 18 | 11 | 2 | 8 |
| Agricultural campus students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural traders | 4 | 17 | 1 | 13 | 7 |
| Buyer of produce (based on contract) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 |
| Input suppliers | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Radio/television | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Newspaper/magazine | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Personal observation | 50 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Main source of information on post-harvest practices (%): | | | | | |
| Other farmers | 31 | 56 | 77 | 77 | 69 |
| Agricultural officers | 7 | 20 | 11 | 2 | 8 |
| Agricultural campus students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural traders | 1 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 5 |
| Buyer of produce (based on contract) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 |
| Input suppliers | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Radio/television | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Newspaper/magazine | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Personal observation | 52 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Other | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of observations | 378 | 401 | 401 | 400 | 1580 |

Source: Farmer survey

Similar information was collected for market auctions that take place in regulated markets. Results are presented in Table 8. We see that surprisingly little information is explicitly conveyed to potential buyers. The quantity for sale is not reported in many cases, probably because individual buyers bid only for a portion of the consignment. We note that, consistent with our earlier findings, little or no information is provided regarding agronomic practices. Buyers also learn little about the humidity content, the place of origin, the grade or size, or the crop variety. Attributes that are least observable are the least likely to be explicitly mentioned at the auction. Buyers have to make up their own mind based on observable characteristics of lots offered for sale.

Table 8. Reporting of produce characteristics at market auctions

| | Yes for all crops | Yes for some crops | No |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----|
| Explicit reporting of (%) | | | |
| ... quantity offered for sale | 61 | 17 | 22 |
| ... package/bag size | 54 | 20 | 27 |
| ... reserve price | 51 | 15 | 34 |
| ... place of origin | 34 | 24 | 41 |
| ... name of farmer/seller | 41 | 17 | 41 |
| ... name of broker/commission agent | 44 | 10 | 46 |
| ... type of seed/variety | 32 | 20 | 47 |
| ... grade/size | 49 | 20 | 32 |
| ... percentage broken | 44 | 10 | 46 |
| ... humidity content | 17 | 12 | 71 |
| ... application of pesticides | 7 | 5 | 88 |
| ... organic or non-organic farming | 5 | 7 | 88 |

Source: Market survey

This interpretation is confirmed by Table 9, which shows quality control by individual traders. Respondents were asked to comment on quality control by themselves and by buyers during their last completed transaction. Responses indicate that the overwhelming majority of buyers and sellers check variety, quality, and grade directly. In contrast, there is little interest in unobservable characteristics such as storage conditions, post-harvest treatments, and use of pesticides. Very similar results were obtained for exporters and processors. While some traders refuse produce due to quality concerns, this is much less the case for food safety concerns. Food safety seems to be a relatively minor concern of value chain participants.

Table 9. Quality control by traders, processors, and exporters

| | Product | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|--------|-------|----------|-------|
| | Maize | Potato | Tomato | Mango | Turmeric | Total |
| Trader | | | | | | |
| Number of observations | 292 | 365 | 366 | 316 | 134 | 1473 |
| <i>Type of transaction</i> | | | | | | |
| Quantity traded (kg) (median) | 800 | 1500 | 475 | 800 | 800 | 1000 |
| Value sale (amount received) (\$) (median) | 135 | 195 | 78 | 178 | 571 | 142 |
| <i>Quality checks (% of transactions)</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>By the trader himself</i> | | | | | | |
| Variety | 81 | 72 | 86 | 92 | 84 | 83 |
| Quality and grade | 85 | 83 | 87 | 92 | 84 | 86 |
| Moisture content | 73 | 36 | 35 | 19 | 70 | 43 |
| Presence of stones and unwanted material | 68 | 26 | 30 | 11 | 55 | 35 |
| Storage conditions (use of pest./treatment) | 17 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| <i>By the buyer</i> | | | | | | |
| Variety | 77 | 76 | 88 | 92 | 82 | 83 |
| Quality and grade | 80 | 85 | 87 | 93 | 83 | 86 |
| Moisture content | 69 | 40 | 40 | 17 | 69 | 43 |
| Presence of stones and unwanted material | 63 | 30 | 34 | 11 | 51 | 36 |
| Storage conditions (use of pesticide/treatment) | 16 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Some buyers refused to buy some of the produce | | | | | | |
| ... due to quality concerns | 13 | 21 | 21 | 17 | 7 | 17 |
| ... due to food safety concerns | 10 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 9 |
| Enterprises | | | | | | |
| <i>Type of transaction</i> | | | | | | |
| Quantity purchased (kg) (median) | 1500 | 1000 | 300 | 300 | 450 | 500 |
| Value purchase (\$) (median) | 36 | 21 | 52 | 26 | 60 | 38 |
| <i>Quality checks (% of transactions)</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>By the enterprise itself</i> | | | | | | |
| Variety | 90 | 81 | 96 | 96 | 94 | 93 |
| Quality and grade | 90 | 85 | 91 | 86 | 97 | 90 |
| Moisture content | 87 | 37 | 60 | 46 | 81 | 62 |
| Presence of stones and unwanted material | 42 | 33 | 30 | 16 | 37 | 28 |
| Storage conditions (use of pesticide/treatment) | 10 | 26 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 16 |

(using data from their last completed transaction)

Source: Trader survey

To pursue this issue further, we report in Table 10 detailed answers to attitudes towards sanitary and phyto-sanitary issues by traders, processors, and exporters. Traders are broken down into commission-agents, wholesalers, and retailers. A majority of respondents claim to purchase mostly from regular suppliers they trust. Most respondents also state that buyers buy from them because they trust the quality of the products they sell. Yet, most respondents appear unaware of possible sanitary issues related with their activity. This is particularly true among retailers, who deal directly with consumers, and for processors, who transform agricultural products for human consumption. Table 10 shows that few retailers and processors are willing to pay more for produce of better sanitary quality, and that few of

them purchase from specific buyers because they trust the sanitary condition of what they buy. These results are consistent with the non-observable character of sanitary attributes.

Wholesalers are more aware of sanitary issues, however, with half of them incurring costs for sanitary purposes. However, those who purchase from wholesalers – retailers and processors – do not appear to care or to be willing to pay a sanitary quality premium. Consequently, the benefits from better sanitary care by wholesalers – assuming it exists – are likely to be lost further down in the value chain.

In marketing systems in developed countries, packaging is often used to convey information to buyers about the characteristics of the produce. Our survey shows that only one-third of the retailers bought bagged or boxed produce. This figure is higher for commission agents and wholesalers. In most cases, packaging material is returned to the seller. All this suggests that bags and boxes are mostly used for transportation purposes. Information about unobservable characteristics does not appear to be transmitted through marked packaging.

Table 10. Attitudes about sanitary and phyto-sanitary issues by commission agents, wholesalers, retailers, and processors/exporters

| | Percentage of ... who agree with statement | | | |
|--|--|-------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | Commission agents | Wholesalers | Retailers | Processors/exporters |
| I buy from a regular supplier whose produce quality I trust. | 55 | 89 | 72 | 73 |
| Buyers buy from me because they trust the quality of the product I sell. | 74 | 95 | 84 | 89 |
| There are sanitary issues for human health/pest/diseases. | 20 | 62 | 45 | 25 |
| I incur costs for sanitary purposes. | 22 | 49 | 24 | 27 |
| I bought bagged or boxed products during my last transaction. | 76 | 43 | 37 | 51 |
| If so, I provided bagged/boxed products during my last transaction. | 15 | 46 | 3 | 34 |
| I obtain a health certificate. | - | - | - | 33 |
| I obtain a phyto-sanitary certificate. | - | - | - | 15 |
| Buyers pay more for crops with better sanitary qualities. | 70 | 81 | 6 | 18 |
| I only buy from regular suppliers whose sanitary conditions I trust. | 73 | 89 | 51 | 59 |
| Buyers buy from me because they trust my sanitary conditions. | 77 | 88 | 61 | 70 |
| I have dealt with a government agency during the last 12 months about... | | | | |
| ... sanitation/epidemiology issues. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| ... environmental regulation issues. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Source: Trader survey

We have already seen that regulated wholesale markets only offer basic infrastructure, with poor drainage and sanitation. Table 10 suggests that regulation is also deficient. Few processors or exporters obtain a health or phyto-sanitary certificate. Virtually no trader, processor, or exporter of agricultural products has dealt with a government agency regarding sanitary or environmental regulation issues.

Prices

Now that we have a better sense of how information circulates in the value chain, we turn to prices. In the survey, traders, processors, and exporters were asked whether prices depend on various crop attributes. Their answers are summarized in Table 11.¹⁴ The most striking finding is the contrast between answers given by wholesalers compared to other participants in the value chain, mainly retailers, processors, and exporters. A majority of wholesalers are of the opinion that prices paid for the five studied crops depend on various post-harvest practices. In contrast, the majority of retailers, processors, and exporters do not think that post-harvest practices affect the price. A large proportion of processors and exporters even report that they do not know whether the price they pay depends on post-harvest practices or not. Commission agents occupy an intermediate position: they reckon prices depend on cleaning, packaging, and grading, but not on any other post-harvest practice.

These results imply that these attributes are important for wholesalers but not for downstream retailers and processors. This may be because handling and transport losses affect wholesalers but not consumers. The price premium thus stops somewhere along the chain, as suggested in the conceptual section. The relative lack of interest in post-harvest practices expressed by processors is consistent with our earlier observation that, if anything, processors purchase mainly low-quality fruits and vegetables and hence care little about attributes that determine quality.

¹⁴ Respondents were also asked whether the price paid depends on various agricultural practices such as planting date, irrigation, and the application of pesticides and fertilizer. Many respondents answered that it does, a surprising outcome since, as we have seen, little information about agricultural practices travels through the value chain. We suspect that some respondents failed to draw the distinction between unit price and revenue. For instance, many traders answered that the price paid depends on the planting date. They may have understood the question as referring to the price paid for the entire crop, which depends on yield and thus on planting date. The same reasoning probably applies to questions about irrigation and the application of pesticide and fertilizer. For this reason we focus on questions regarding post-harvest treatment, which are less subject to this bias.

Table 11. Perceived price premiums by traders, processors, and exporters

| | | Percentage of... who agree with statement | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|---|-------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | | Commission agents | Wholesalers | Retailers | Processors-Exporters |
| <i>Price depends on ...</i> | | | | | |
| ... planting date | yes | 59 | 73 | 65 | 38 |
| | no | 37 | 26 | 26 | 35 |
| | don't know | 4 | 1 | 9 | 27 |
| ... application of pesticides | yes | 46 | 77 | 71 | 39 |
| | no | 50 | 22 | 27 | 36 |
| | don't know | 3 | 1 | 2 | 25 |
| ... application of fertilizer | yes | 62 | 78 | 76 | 45 |
| | no | 30 | 21 | 23 | 33 |
| | don't know | 7 | 1 | 1 | 22 |
| ... irrigation by farmer | yes | 53 | 77 | 59 | 43 |
| | no | 44 | 22 | 31 | 34 |
| | don't know | 2 | 1 | 10 | 23 |
| ... drying | yes | 12 | 66 | 30 | 46 |
| | no | 87 | 33 | 62 | 35 |
| | don't know | 1 | 2 | 8 | 19 |
| ... cleaning | yes | 80 | 91 | 55 | 51 |
| | no | 20 | 8 | 44 | 31 |
| | don't know | 0 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| ... packaging/crating | yes | 78 | 84 | 5 | 30 |
| | no | 18 | 15 | 84 | 43 |
| | don't know | 4 | 1 | 11 | 26 |
| ... grading | yes | 92 | 92 | 45 | 51 |
| | no | 8 | 7 | 45 | 28 |
| | don't know | 0 | 1 | 10 | 21 |
| ... fumigating | yes | 10 | 48 | 28 | 12 |
| | no | 74 | 40 | 60 | 55 |
| | don't know | 16 | 12 | 11 | 33 |
| ... cold storage | yes | 23 | 69 | 10 | 14 |
| | no | 71 | 29 | 79 | 53 |
| | don't know | 6 | 1 | 11 | 37 |
| ... certification | yes | 17 | 55 | 3 | 15 |
| | no | 70 | 35 | 86 | 49 |
| | don't know | 12 | 10 | 11 | 35 |

Source: Trader survey

To pursue this issue further, we test whether unit prices paid to producers vary significantly with crop attributes. To this effect, we regress, the unit price paid to growers on various agricultural and post-harvest practices. We estimate a regression of the form:

Log p_i

$$\log p_i = \alpha \log Q_i + \sum_k \beta_k q^k + \sum_t \delta_t D_t + \sum_j \gamma_j C_j + \mu_i$$

where p_i is the price per kilogram, Q_i is quantity sold, q^k is a vector of crop attributes/practices, D_t a vector of month dummies, and C_j a vector of controls. We expect the unit price to be lower for large transactions, because transactions costs are lower.¹⁵ Monthly dummies are included to capture seasonal effects. Control variables include dummies for whether the buyer is a consumer or another trader, crop dummies, location of sales dummies, type of payment dummies, and regional dummies. Because the unit price is computed as the total price divided by quantity sold, the price data exhibit signs of measurement error in the form of large outliers. To eliminate the role played by these outliers, we use a median (quantile) regression.

Results are in agreement with the qualitative information reported earlier. As anticipated, agricultural practices such as irrigation and fertilizer and pesticide application are never significant.¹⁶ Results presented in Table 12 therefore focus on post-harvest practices. They show a price premium for crops sold dried and graded. Not only are the coefficients strongly significant, the magnitude of the effect is also rather large. Results suggest that grading raises the price paid by 6 percent on average, while drying the crop raises it by 32 percent. Looking at individual crop results, we see that drying is a practice that is relevant only for maize and turmeric. For the latter, drying basically doubles the value of the crop. Of course, drying reduces moisture content and weight, so that part of the effect is mechanical. But drying also increases storability.

Pooled results also suggest a large positive premium for fumigated crops, but this result seems to be an artifact of pooling. Indeed, the significance of the fumigation coefficient completely disappears in the regressions at the product level. It is seemingly driven by the fact that turmeric fetches a much higher unit price than other crops and is also much more likely to be fumigated: 25 percent of turmeric is reported to be fumigated by farmers, compared to 3 to 7 percent for other crops.

Other regressors are also of interest. When the product is harvested by the farmers themselves, we observe on average a positive price premium, especially for mango. This is normal since the buyer has to incur the harvesting cost. In the case of maize, we get the opposite result: farmers who do not harvest the crop themselves get on average a higher price. This may correspond to situations in which the farmer is approached by a trader keen to secure maize quantities when the maize price is high. Crops sold under a contract farming contract receive a slightly lower price, but the difference is significant only for tomato and potato.¹⁷ We also note that farmers receive a significantly higher price when selling to a commission agent.

¹⁵ Measurement error in quantity sold may also affect the result.

¹⁶ There is an issue of the extent to which the farmer practices are captured by observable quality characteristics. Variety, quality, and grade are observed and that information is used in price determination but the quality outcomes are in part a consequence of some unobservable farm-level practices (for example pesticide and fertilizer use).

¹⁷ Different reasons might exist for this. Perhaps farmers accept a discount in return for the risk-reduction associated with the fixed price; perhaps the price reflects the provision of “free” inputs before planting; or perhaps this is an artifact of the year of the survey, in which the market price happened to be higher than usual.

The price paid also depends on where the crop was sold, a point studied in detail for Uganda by Fafchamps and Hill (2005). Selling at a village retail market seems to yield a large (10 percent) price premium, but the effect is only significant in the pooled regression, so it could be a compositional artifact. Looking at the un-pooled specific regressions, we see that the premium by sales varies considerably depending on the crop: selling on wholesale markets (unregulated or regulated) fetches a significantly higher premium for tomato. Prices for mango are higher at the farm gate, especially compared to unregulated wholesale markets.

Table 12. Determinants of producer prices

| | Unit | Maize | | Potato | | Tomato | | Mango | | Turmeric | | All products pooled | |
|---|---------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| | | Coefficient | t-value | Coefficient | t-value | Coefficient | t-value | Coefficient | t-value | Coefficient | t-value | Coefficient | t-value |
| Quantity sold | log(kg) | -0.012 | -1.170 | -0.031 | -2.140 | -0.005 | -0.390 | -0.036 | -1.810 | -0.083 | -0.910 | -0.048 | -5.960 |
| Crop attributes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product was harvested by farmer | yes=1 | -0.153 | -1.750 | -0.077 | -1.350 | 0.078 | 1.130 | 0.283 | 4.850 | -0.766 | -1.490 | 0.013 | 0.400 |
| Product was milled | yes=1 | 0.076 | 1.600 | - | - | - | - | - | - | -0.024 | -0.110 | | |
| Product was dried | yes=1 | 0.055 | 1.310 | - | - | - | - | -0.052 | -0.300 | 1.047 | 3.520 | 0.323 | 7.440 |
| Product was graded | yes=1 | 0.093 | 1.810 | 0.046 | 1.240 | -0.024 | -0.390 | 0.020 | 0.350 | 0.210 | 1.030 | 0.061 | 2.500 |
| Product was packed | yes=1 | 0.017 | 0.670 | 0.016 | 0.380 | 0.025 | 0.530 | -0.044 | -0.670 | -0.071 | -0.300 | 0.036 | 1.490 |
| Product was fumigated | yes=1 | -0.223 | -1.330 | -0.002 | -0.020 | -0.088 | -0.820 | 0.071 | 1.010 | 0.107 | 0.370 | 0.271 | 5.160 |
| Product was washed | yes=1 | - | - | 0.007 | 0.070 | -0.115 | -1.640 | 0.248 | 2.600 | 0.331 | 0.730 | -0.018 | -0.290 |
| Buyer dummies (omitted category is consumer) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Buyer is trader | yes=1 | -0.025 | -0.420 | -0.039 | -0.780 | -0.022 | -0.430 | -0.038 | -0.500 | 0.126 | 0.260 | -0.042 | -1.400 |
| Buyer is commission agent | yes=1 | -0.076 | -0.910 | -0.029 | -0.460 | -0.054 | -0.860 | -0.011 | -0.130 | 0.785 | 1.140 | 0.078 | 2.130 |
| Buyer is other | yes=1 | -0.039 | -0.580 | -0.104 | -0.560 | -0.199 | -1.060 | -0.239 | -1.420 | 0.569 | 0.920 | 0.289 | 3.510 |
| Place of sales (omitted category is at the farmgate) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract farming | yes=1 | 0.086 | 0.820 | -0.275 | -1.840 | -0.241 | -2.790 | -0.051 | -0.570 | -0.599 | -1.420 | 0.013 | 0.240 |
| Regulated market (RMC) | yes=1 | 0.057 | 1.330 | -0.060 | -1.040 | 0.158 | 2.600 | -0.133 | -1.300 | 0.275 | 0.700 | 0.055 | 1.610 |
| Unregulated wholesale market | yes=1 | 0.022 | 0.420 | -0.107 | -1.760 | 0.104 | 1.940 | -0.207 | -3.370 | 0.211 | 0.720 | 0.007 | 0.230 |
| Village market | yes=1 | 0.037 | 0.660 | 0.034 | 0.450 | 0.027 | 0.280 | -0.084 | -0.730 | 0.134 | 0.630 | 0.099 | 2.180 |
| Other | yes=1 | 0.033 | 0.350 | 0.133 | 1.230 | 0.244 | 2.520 | -0.172 | -1.540 | -0.138 | -0.300 | 0.060 | 1.180 |
| Time of payment dummies (omitted category is payment before sale) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Payment at sale | yes=1 | 0.081 | 1.250 | 0.080 | 0.980 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.034 | 0.310 | 0.112 | 0.380 | 0.007 | 0.130 |
| Payment after sale | yes=1 | 0.111 | 1.480 | 0.047 | 0.550 | 0.191 | 1.920 | -0.092 | -0.790 | 0.200 | 0.460 | 0.002 | 0.030 |
| Monthly dummies | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| State dummies | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| included but not shown | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| included but not shown | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of observations | | 400 | | 540 | | 846 | | 805 | | 181 | | 2802 | |
| R-squared | | 0.32 | | 0.64 | | 0.30 | | 0.61 | | 0.72 | | 0.40 | |
| Root MSE | | 0.19 | | 0.30 | | 0.40 | | 0.51 | | 0.66 | | 0.52 | |

Source: farmer survey

*variety dummies (or product dummies in the case of the pooled regression) and intercept included but not shown due to space restrictions (median regression; dependent variable =log(producer price per kg))

** **bold t-values: significant at the 5* level**

5. CONCLUSION

Using original survey data that we collected in four Indian states, we have examined how quality control takes place in the value chain for five non-staple crops – mango, tomato, potato, maize, and turmeric. We presented a model in which information about crop attributes influences unit price. We showed that, in the absence of external verification, theory predicts that information about unobservable attributes cannot be credibly transmitted if buyer and seller do not trust each other. As a result, information about these attributes does not circulate through the value chain and growers receive no incentive regarding unobservable crop attributes.

In agreement with model predictions, we find that information about the type of irrigation crops received or the application of pesticide and chemical fertilizer is not passed along the value chain. As a result, producers are only interested in agricultural practices that raise the quantity sold or improve observable characteristics of the crop, such as grading, packaging, or drying. The same is true for post-harvest treatment such as fumigation, which is undertaken by few traders and seldom reported to buyers. Sellers in general only report observable attributes to potential buyers. This is consistent with the absence of trust: if the buyer does not trust the seller, there is no point making unverifiable claims about items for sale. There is further confirmation of this interpretation in the finding that buyers always check observable attributes of what they purchase – they do not simply rely on the seller's report.

Retail market infrastructure for non-staple crops is not very developed. The majority of markets are not paved, many do not have dedicated stalls for non-staple traders, and there are few grading or cold-storage facilities. Sanitation facilities are largely deficient, with few public toilets, inadequate drainage, and little or no coordinated pest control. Auctions are conducted in an informal manner, with little information explicitly conveyed to buyers who have to inspect each consignment personally.

We find that agricultural practices have no effect on unit price. In contrast, a significant price premium is paid to growers for drying, grading, and packaging the crops they sell – attributes that are immediately observable by buyers. The purpose of these attributes appears to be to reduce transaction costs to traders: they are only valued by traders and do not translate into unit price premiums further down the value chain. This is consistent with the view that packaging only serves to facilitate the work of wholesalers, but carries no useful information further down the value chain.

By vertically integrating the value chain and by creating a long-term trust relationship between grower and buyer, contract farming can in principle provide a commitment mechanism capable of overcoming the information transfer problem. In our sample we find that few growers sell on contract. Those who do are predominantly mango growers who sell their crop forward. Contracts are of relatively short duration and the buyer only provides harvest labor, not inputs, seeds, or directions to improve

quality. It is possible that more sophisticated contract farming practices exist in India, but they are probably quantitatively very small for the five non-staple crops that we studied.

These findings suggest that the value chain for non-staple crops in India remains fairly undeveloped. The findings reported here suggest that, because of credibility issues, the market cannot deliver sanitary food in a decentralized manner. There is therefore room for coordinated action to improve the infrastructure and pest-control practices of existing retail markets. We are particularly concerned about the poor sanitation that characterizes most non-staple retail markets. Although the Indian poor may not have the money to pay for more sanitary food, we are concerned about the potential health risk that results from this situation – particularly with respect to *e. coli* and other bacteria.

It is conceivable that, given the level of development of the country, many Indian consumers are unwilling to pay a large price premium for higher quality fruits and vegetables. We also suspect that few consumers would value organically grown produce. But rapid growth and the rapid rise in incomes are likely to result in a dramatic rise in the demand for safe, high-quality food. India's capacity to export non-staple produce, in raw or processed form, also depends on its ability to guarantee quality. The current value chain for the crops studied is mostly unable to satisfy this demand.

REFERENCES

- Athukorala, P. C., and S. Jayasuriya. 2003. Food safety issues, trade and WTO rules: A developing country perspective. *World Economy* 26(9): 1395–1416.
- Banerji, A., and J. V. Meenakshi. 2004. Buyer collusion and efficiency of government intervention in wheat markets in northern India: An asymmetrical structural auction analysis. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 86(1): 236–253.
- Bigsten, A., P. Collier, S. Dercon, M. Fafchamps, B. Gauthier, J. W. Gunning, A. Isaksson, A. Oduro, R. Oostendorp, C. Patillo, M. Soderbom, F. Teal, and A. Zeufack. 2000. Contract flexibility and dispute resolution in African manufacturing. *Journal of Development Studies* 36(4): 1–37.
- Birthal, P., P. Joshi, and A. Gulati. 2005. *Vertical coordination in high-value food commodities: Implications for smallholders*. Technical report, MTID Discussion Paper 85. Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Conley, T. and C. Udry. 2001. Social learning through networks: The adoption of new agricultural technologies in Ghana. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 83(3): 668–673.
- Deshingkar, P., U. Kulharni, L. Rao, and S. Rao. 2003. Changing food systems in India: Resource sharing and marketing arrangements for vegetable production in Andhra Pradesh. *Development Policy Review* 21(5–6): 627–39.
- Dixit, A., and J. Stiglitz. 1977. Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity. *American Economic Review* 67: 297–308.
- Fafchamps, M. 1996. The enforcement of commercial contracts in Ghana. *World Development* 24(3): 427–448.
- Fafchamps, M., and B. Minten. 2001. Property rights in a flea market economy. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 49(2): 229–268.
- Fafchamps, M. 2004. *Market institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fafchamps, M., and R. V. Hill. 2005. Selling at the farm-gate or traveling to market. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 87(3): 717–734.
- Fafchamps, M., R. V. Hill, and B. Minten. 2006. Non-staple food markets in India. Mimeo.
- Gulati, A., N. Minot, C. Delgado, and S. Bora. 2005. Growth in high-value agriculture in Asia and the emergence of vertical links with farmers. Paper presented at workshop at the World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Horner, J. 2002. Reputation and competition. *American Economic Review* 92(3): 644–63.
- Palaskas, T. B., and B. Harriss-White. 1996. The identification of market exogeneity and market dominance by tests instead of assumption: An application to Indian material. *Journal of International Development* 8(1): 11–23.
- Parikh, K. S., N.S.S. Narayana, M. Panda and A.G. Kumar 1997. Agricultural trade liberalization: Growth, welfare and large country effects. *Agricultural Economics* 17(1): 1–20.
- Perloff, J. M., and S. C. Salop. 1985. Equilibrium with product differentiation. *Review of Economic Studies* 52(1): 107–20.
- Ramaswami, B., and P. Balakrishnan. 2002. Food prices and the efficiency of public intervention: The case of the Public Distribution System in India. *Food Policy* 27(5–6): 419–36.
- Reardon, T., and C. Barrett. 2000. Agroindustrialisation, globalization and international development: An overview of issues, patterns and determinants. *Agricultural Economics*. 23: 195–205.
- Reardon, T. and J. Swinnen. 2004. Agrifood sector liberalization and the rise of supermarkets in former state-controlled economies: Comparison with other developing countries. *Development Policy Review* 22(5): 515–524.

- Reardon, T., C. Timmer, C. Barrett, J. Berdegue. 2003. The rise of supermarkets in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 85(5): 1140–1146.
- Sawhney, A. 2005. Quality measures in food trade: The Indian experience. *World Economy* 28(3): 329–348.
- Singh, S. 2002. Contracting out solutions: Political economy of contract farming in the Indian Punjab. *World Development* 30(9): 1621–1638.
- Storm, S. 1997. Agriculture under trade policy reform: A quantitative assessment for India. *World Development* 25(3): 425–36.
- Tadelis, S. 1999. What's in a name? Reputation as a tradable asset. *American Economic Review* 89(3): 548–563.
- Umali-Deininger, D. L., and K. Deininger. 2001. Towards greater food security for India's poor: Balancing government intervention and private competition. *Agricultural Economics* 25(2–3): 321–35.

RECENT IFPRI DISCUSSION PAPERS

**For earlier discussion papers, please go to www.ifpri.org/pubs/pubs.htm#dp.
All discussion papers can be downloaded free of charge.**

716. *Investment, Subsidies, and Pro-Poor Growth in Rural India*. Shenggen Fan, Ashok Gulati, and Sukhadeo Thorat, 2007.
715. *Risk Aversion in Low Income Countries: Experimental Evidence from Ethiopia*. Mahmud Yesuf and Randy Bluffstone, 2007.
714. *Micro-Level Analysis of Farmers' Adaptation to Climate Change in Southern Africa*. Charles Nhemachena, and Rashid Hassan, 2007.
713. *Resource Abundance and Regional Development in China*. Xiaobo Zhang, Li Xing, Shenggen Fan, Xiaopeng Luo, 2007.
712. *Is Food Insecurity More Severe in South Asia or Sub-Saharan Africa?: A Comparative Analysis Using Household Expenditure Survey Data*. Lisa C. Smith and Doris Wiesmann, 2007.
711. *Managing Conflict Over Natural Resources in Greater Kordofan, Sudan: Some Recurrent Patterns and Governance Implications*. El Fatih Ali Siddig, Khalid El-Harizi, and Betinna Prato, 2007.
710. *Mortality, Mobility, and Schooling Outcomes Among Orphans: Evidence from Malawi*. Mika Ueyama, 2007.
709. *Agricultural Technology Choices for Poor Farmers in Less-Favored Areas of South and East Asia*. John Pender, 2007.
708. *Sharing Science, Building Bridges, and Enhancing Impact: Public Private Partnerships in the CGIAR*. David J. Spielman, Frank Hartwich, and Klaus von Grebmer, 2007.
707. *Policies to Promote Cereal Intensification in Ethiopia: A Review of Evidence and Experience*. Derek Byerlee, David J. Spielman, Dawit Alemu, and Madhur Gautam, 2007.
706. *Sistemas de Innovación Piscícola en la Amazonia Boliviana: Efectos de la Interacción Social y de las Capacidades de Absorción de los Pequeños Agricultores*. Frank Hartwich, Vicente Eguez Camacho, Mario Monge, y Luis Ampuero Ramos, 2007.
705. *The Role of Clustering in Rural Industrialization: A Case Study of the Footwear Industry in Wenzhou*. Zuhui Huang, Xiaobo Zhang, and Yunwei Zhu, 2007.
704. *The Economics of GM Food Labels: An Evaluation of Mandatory Labeling Proposals in India*. Sangeeta Bansal, Bharat Ramaswami, 2007.
703. *The Power Mapping Tool: A Method for the Empirical Research of Power Relations*. Eva Schiffer, 2007.
702. *The Bang for the Birr: Public Expenditures and Rural Welfare in Ethiopia*. Tewodaj Mogues, Gezahegn Ayele, and Zelekawork Paulos, 2007.
701. *Public Spending and Poverty Reduction in an Oil-Based Economy: The Case of Yemen*. Mohamed A. Chemingui, 2007.
700. *Integrated Management of the Blue Nile Basin in Ethiopia: Hydropower and Irrigation Modeling*. Paul J. Block, 2007.
699. *Building Public-Private Partnerships for Agricultural Innovation in Latin America*. Suresh Babu, Maria Veronica Gottret, Frank Hartwich, and Jaime Tola, 2007.
698. *Cost Implications of Agricultural Land Degradation in Ghana: An Economywide, Multimarket Model Assessment*. Xinshen Diao and Daniel B. Sarpong, 2007.
697. *Is HIV/AIDS Undermining Botswana's 'Success Story'? Implications for Development Strategy*. James Thurlow, 2007.
696. *Supermarket Purchases and the Dietary Patterns of Households in Guatemala*. Abay Asfaw, 2007.
695. *Agricultural Growth Linkages in Ethiopia: Estimates using Fixed and Flexible Price Models*. Xinshen Diao, Belay Fekadu, Steven Haggblade, Alemayebu Seyoum Teffesse, Kessu Wamisbo, and Bingxin Yu, 2007.
694. *Is the Relationship Between Aid and Economic Growth Nonlinear?*. Andros Kourtellos, Chih Ming Tan, and Xiaobo Zhang, 2007.
693. *Regional Disparities in Ghana: Policy Options and Public Investment Implications*. Ramatu M. Al-Hassan and Xinshen Diao, 2007.

**INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

www.ifpri.org

IFPRI HEADQUARTERS

2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
Tel.: +1-202-862-5600
Fax: +1-202-467-4439
Email: ifpri@cgiar.org

IFPRI ADDIS ABABA

P. O. Box 5689
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel.: +251 11 6463215
Fax: +251 11 6462927
Email: ifpri-addisababa@cgiar.org

IFPRI NEW DELHI

CG Block, NASC Complex, PUSA
New Delhi 110-012 India
Tel.: 91 11 2584-6565
Fax: 91 11 2584-8008 / 2584-6572
Email: ifpri-newdelhi@cgiar.org