Marketing Channel and Technology Adoption; Chinese Villages in the Local Horticulture Market

L. WANG S. ROZELLE J. HUANG T. REARDON X. DONG

Contributed paper prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economists Conference, Gold Coast, Australia, August 12-18, 2006

Copyright 2006 by L. WANG, S. ROZELLE, J. HUANG, T. REARDON and X. DONG. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Marketing Channel and Technology Adoption: Chinese Villages in the Local Horti culture Market

1. Introduction

In the 1950s and 1960s, China was known for its focus on grains self -sufficiency – the "iron rice bowl." At the dawn of economic liberalization, China began a policy focus on agricultural diversification to add horticulture products to the grain foundation, and began the "vegetable basket" program. But it has not been until the 1990s and into the 2000s the domestic horticultural products economy, just like the produce export e conomy, has really taken off. The horticulture sector has grown with the kind of stunning speed and vitality that reflects these characteristics of Chinese rapid overall development in the past two decades.

There has been, however, relatively little field research aimed at understanding how the domestic horticulture market is changing at the village level, who is sharing in the dev elopment, how it is related t o technology adoption and modernization of the millions of small farms, and how the market itself might be restructuring. The fact t hat produce wholesale markets developed from a small base extremely quickly in the late 1980s and 1990s (Ahmadi-Esfahani and Locke 1998) and urban ret ail markets so quickly restructured in the late 1990s and 2000s (Hu et al. 2004) suggest that domestic horticultural markets in the rural and peri -urban areas might also be restructuring.

This paper focuses on that re structuring, and uses a random sample of 200 villages in the Beijing area to inform the debate. The rural area surrounding (to a 140 km radius) Beijing was chosen as the whole area, including Beijing, contains 15 million permanent residents 6.65 million rural and 8.35 million urban) and 5 million migrants/temporary, with incomes growing rapidly and with the economy in a state of ferment and flux and development, a perfect contex t in which to study this change. The paper starts with an examination of the data, then the patt erns in the data with respect to village participation in the hort iculture product markets, and finally an econometric exploration of the relations among subsector choice, market channel choice, and t echnology choice, to understand t he mutual influences of agricultural diversification, market r estructuring, and technolog ical modernization.

2. Village Data

The data comprise observations on village characteristics as well as average behavior (as described by village leader respondents) in production and marketing of crops. Two recalls were made, from 2000 and 2004. The sample is 201 villages selected at ran dom from concentric circles ("rings") drawn, with the center at the steps of the Forbidden City in Beijing, at 40 km, 60, 80, 100, and 140 kms from Be ijing. These rings comprise the peri-urban flatlands up through km 100, and then some 20-30 km of hilly and mountainous

area, and then a further 20-30 kms of flatland into Hebei province. The villages are thus representative of this area. The survey took place in June/July of 2005.

3. The Characteristics of the Villages and their Horticulture Market Participation

Table 1 shows sample village characteristics. There is a clear correlation, a s one moves from the inner ring nearest Bejing, to the furthest ring, that there is a modest increase in land per capita (though all still ti ny farms), a near tripling of average income, a tripling of the poverty incidence from a quarter/ third to nearly 90% in the hinterland rings, a decline in average education as one moves away from Beijing, but a relative h omogeneity given the ring (measured by the income/capita Gini coefficients measured over villages in a ring). Thus within this mere 140 km swath, one finds among the richest and among the poorest rural people in China.

Table 2 shows crop composition across the rings in the two years. In general, there was a remarkable increase in the share of fruits, vegetables, and nuts (FVN) between 2000 and 2004, and a sharp decrease in grain share – showing very rapid agricultural diversification into non-staples. This is predictable from Bennett's Law, where the share of staples in the diet and the economy decreases with increases in incomes, the latter happening quickly over this period, along with improvem ents in infrastruct ure and production. Moreover, a s von Thunen would predict, there is a rough, but very rough, correlation between fruits and vegetables in the

three inner rings, that are neare r the city markets and mostly flat land, and more nuts in the mountain area, and grains as one goes to the outer rings.

Table 3 shows the distribution of veg etable production across the rings. In just four years, the area jumped an incredible 50%, with fastest growth in the inner three rings. While about a quarter of the villages in each ring have some vegetable production, it is really quite concentrate d, with a few villages having the lion's share. The diversity of vegetable crops increased over the mere four years recalled, and is highest as one nears Beijing, explicable by incomes and perishability.

Table 4.1 shows marketing channels acr oss rings. They include: the "**traditional**" or (1) producers directly sell products to consumers ; (2) producers sell products t o small brokers in village, then small brokers sell products to other small brokers; (3) producers sell products to brokers out o f village (could be periodic markets in the town, or wet markets in cities), then small brokers sell products to other small brokers ; and (7) small brokers buy products from pr oducers, then sell to consumers - and the "**modern**", (4) small brokers buy products from producers , then sell to wholesalers or professional suppliers or specialized wholesalers; (5) wholesalers or professional suppliers (specialized wholesalers) buy products from producers, then sell to other wholes alers or professional suppliers; (6) any other channel connected to supermarkets. One can see that the hotbed of modernization of the market channels is concentrated in rings 2 and 3, hence not closest to Beijing (where it is easy for small brokers to access farmers then tr aditional wholesale markets), with some out in the outer rings. The most common market channel is still the traditional (with some 70% of marketing) but there is a tendency, even in this brief recall span, for market modernization to occur. Moreover, one can posit that a decade or so ago the share of the modern channels was next to nothing, so the restructuring is occurring quickly indeed.

Table 4.2 shows that the market modernization is most advanced, and happening fastest , in fruit and nuts. Vegetables are lagging, but the rough share, 8% of modern channels in total for vegetables, is close to the r oughly 10% share of supermarkets in urban retail of vegetables estimated by Hu et al. (2004), so the incipient patter n presents itself. A number of factors will determine how fast any of the FVN categories' market channels are modernized, including the demands for differentiate d products and quality, the cost of using the traditional channels, and the speed of restructuring of the urban wholesale and retail sectors. This will be a phenomenon to track over the next decade.

4. Regressions explaining Market Channel Participation and Technology Adoption in the Horticulture Sec tor

Table 5 shows the regression models explaining participation in an FVN category (does the village produce fruits? Vegeta bles? Nuts?), and the determinants of technology innovation/adoption (measured by use of new technologies in production of one of those), and the determinants of market channel. The hypothesis is that modern market channels and technology modernization are correlated.

Table 6 shows the determinants of crop composition across villag es. Note that more arable/flat land, more labor (becau se of labor intensity), more education, and closeness to the urban market drive vegetable production. By contrast, as fruit is grown in hilly areas, there is a negative sign on flat land.

Table 7 shows the results for each crop cate gory of the determinants of use of modern technology and use of m odern market channels. Space constraints limit the discussion to several striking points. For vegetables (and also for fruit), the results show strongly that the modern market channel determines the use of modern technology, as hypothesized, because farmers have to employ new techniques to meet the product and transaction requirements of the modern channel. Le ss land means more technology innovation, as Hayami and Ruttan would predict. Innovation is less further from Beijing, perhaps due to c ost of inputs. The results are less clear for the determinants of market channel.

5. Conclusions

There has been a remarkably rapid diversification of agriculture in only a half decade in the Be ijing region toward fruits, nuts, and vegetables. At the same time there has been nearly as quick modernization of market channels and production technology. T he traditional market channels still dominate, but there has been a substantial increase and spread of modern channels. While the characte ristics of this market transformation and boom differ widely across rings or space, there is substantial sharing in the boom by very poor villagers in the hinterland as well as better off villagers in the peri urban areas.

References

Ahmadi-Esfahani, F.Z. and C.G. Locke. 1998. "Wholesale food markets with 'Chinese characteristics", Food Policy, 23(1): 89-103.

Hu, D., T. Reardon, S. Rozelle, P. Timmer, H. Wang. 2004. "The Emergence of Supermarkets with Chinese Characteristics: Challenges and Opportunities for China's Agricultural Development," *Development Policy Review*, vol. 22, no. 4, Sept .: 557-86.

Table 1. Summary statisti	<u>cs for sample v</u>	villages				
Socioeconomic variables	year	40KM	60KM	80Km	100Km	140Km
Average population	2004	753	885	831	1,596	1,068
	2000	759	893	853	1,573	1,048
Cultivated land per capita(mu) (1 hectare=15mu)	2004	1	1.11	1.06	1.13	1.22
	2000	1.13	1.22	1.19	1.30	1.64
Farmer's annual net income per cap ita(US \$)	2004	515	441	244	269	199
	2000	385	323	210	191	153
Average ratio of farmers who have high school education in the	2004	12.6%	8.6%	7.4%	7.3%	7.2%
village	2000	9.7%	6.8%	6.7%	5.7%	6.3%
Daily cost for hir ing a man to do farming in the village(US \$)	2004	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.9	3.0
	2000	2.0	2.4	1.8	2.2	2.2
Gini coefficient	2004	0.23	0.27	0.34	0.26	0.27
	2000	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.31	0.3
Share of poor villages ¹	2004	38%	55%	83%	76%	98%
	2000	60%	72%	100%	92%	100%
Share of villager in which villager's income level less than national	2004	23%	48%	75%	71%	93%
average level ²	2000	32%	45%	85%	70%	90%
Average Distance from the village to the nearest county road(KM)	2004	3	5	6	11	6
	2000	3	5	6	12	6

Table 1.	Summary	statistics	for	sample	villages
----------	---------	------------	-----	--------	----------

Note1: the criterion of poor is world bank's 1 dollar a day.

Note 2: in 2004, the national farmer's net income per capi ta was 2,265 RMB. In 2000, the number was 2,252RMB.

		Tab		pa com	position	aci 033 i	ings				
Total 40Km			60Km		80Km		100Km		140Km		
2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000
58%	69%	55%	65%	52%	66%	54%	56%	73%	79%	52%	70%
12%	7%	13%	9%	8%	5%	6%	5%	10%	6%	23%	11%
5%	3%	8%	7%	10%	5%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%
14%	13%	20%	17%	9%	7%	19%	20%	11%	10%	19%	14%
6%	4%	3%	2%	18%	13%	5%	4%	1%	1%	3%	1%
4%	4%	0%	0%	2%	2%	11%	12%	2%	2%	1%	2%
1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
38.6	41.1	5.0	5.3	8.2	7.6	6.4	7.2	10.9	11.9	8.2	9.1
	2004 58% 12% 5% 14% 6% 4% 1%	2004 2000 58% 69% 12% 7% 5% 3% 14% 13% 6% 4% 4% 4% 1% 1%	Total 40 2004 2000 2004 58% 69% 55% 12% 7% 13% 5% 3% 8% 14% 13% 20% 6% 4% 3% 4% 4% 0% 1% 1% 0%	Total40Km200420002004200058%69%55%65%12%7%13%9%5%3%8%7%14%13%20%17%6%4%3%2%4%4%0%0%1%1%0%0%	Total 40Km 60 2004 2000 2004 2000 2004 58% 69% 55% 65% 52% 12% 7% 13% 9% 8% 5% 3% 8% 7% 10% 14% 13% 20% 17% 9% 6% 4% 3% 2% 18% 4% 4% 0% 0% 2% 1% 1% 0% 0% 1%	Total 40Km 60Km 2004 2000 2004 2000 2004 2000 58% 69% 55% 65% 52% 66% 12% 7% 13% 9% 8% 5% 5% 3% 8% 7% 10% 5% 14% 13% 20% 17% 9% 7% 6% 4% 3% 2% 18% 13% 4% 4% 0% 0% 2% 2%	Total 40Km 60Km 80 2004 2000 2004 2000 2004 2000 2004 58% 69% 55% 65% 52% 66% 54% 12% 7% 13% 9% 8% 5% 6% 5% 3% 8% 7% 10% 5% 4% 14% 13% 20% 17% 9% 7% 19% 6% 4% 3% 2% 18% 13% 5% 4% 4% 0% 0% 2% 2% 11% 1% 1% 0% 0% 1% 2% 0%	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total 40Km 60Km 80Km 100 2004 2000 2004 2005 10% 5% 3% 4% 4% 4% 1% 1% 2% 11% 1% 2% 1% 1% 1% 2% 1% 1% 2% 1% 1% 2%	Total 40Km 60Km 80Km 100Km 2004 2000 2004 200 200 2004 200 200 1006 406 200 200 1106 106 406	Total 40Km 60Km 80Km 100Km 140 2004 2000 2004 2005 23% 3% 14% 13% 2% 3% 4% 2% 3% 14% 13% 2% <t< td=""></t<>

Table 2 Crops composition across rings

Note: 1 hect are=15mu

	All r	ings	40KM		60Km		80Km		100Km		140Km	
	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000
Percentage of villages in which farmers grow vegetables	26%	25%	28%	33%	35%	33%	25%	25%	23%	23%	20%	15%
percentage of the biggest three villages to tot al village in the ring	76%	76%	56%	57%	80%	80%	63%	69%	93%	89%	88%	85%
Total vegetables area(1,000mu)	21	14	4.0	3.5	8.0	3.5	2.8	2.3	3.9	2.9	2.2	1.7
Concentration index	0.23	0.26	0.14	0.15	0.21	0.32	0.17	0.21	0.38	0.32	0.26	0.28
Simpson's diversity index	0.45	0.37	0.65	0.48	0.12	0.13	0.44	0.37	0.58	0.48	0.45	0.39

Note: Simpson's diversity index is calculate d by this way: D=sum[n(n-1)]/[N(N-1)]n is the area of a particular vegetable in a village, N is total area of all vegetables in the village. Simpson's index=1 -D

		เสม	ne 4-1. unite		eung chai	ineis acius	s mys		
	channel	channel	Channel	channel	channel	channel	channel	channel	Total number of channels
	Type1	Type2	Type3	Type4	Type5	Type6	Type7	Type8	
40Km	19%	18%	22%	10%	0%	2%	26%	4%	112
60Km	25%	17%	8%	18%	5%	5%	10%	13%	103
80Km	9%	45%	4%	22%	0%	0%	18%	2%	108
100Km	11%	26%	12%	19%	6%	2%	20%	4%	100
140KM	21%	18%	18%	21%	3%	1%	15%	3%	72
		Table 4	-2: Differen	t marketing	g chan nel	s to differe	nt product	s	
	channel	channel	Channel	channel	channel	channel	channel	channel	Total number of channels
	Type1	Type2	Type3	Type4	Type5	Type6	Type7	Type8	
Vegetables	13%	35%	16%	2%	3%	3%	21%	7%	110
Fruits	22%	18%	15%	16%	2%	1%	22%	4%	284
Farm nuts	10%	34%	1%	32%	4%	4%	5%	10%	73
gathered nuts	0%	32%	4%	61%	4%	0%	0%	0%	28
Total	17%	25%	13%	18%	3%	2%	18%	5%	495

table 4-1: differ ent marketing channels across rings

Note: Channel type1: pr oducers directly sell products to consumers.

Channel type2: producers s ell products to small brokers in village, then small brokers sell products to other small brokers.

Channel type3: producers sell products to brokers out of village (could be peri odic markets in the town, or wet markets in cities), then small brokers s ell products to oth er small brokers.

Channel type4: small brokers buy products from producers, then sell to wholesal ers or profess ional suppliers.

Channel type5: wholes alers or professional suppli ers buy products from producers, then sell to other whole salers or professional suppliers.

Channel type6: any channel connected to supermarkets.

Channel type7: small brokers buy products from producers, then sell to consumers.

Channel type8: other channels

Table 5		
Description of explanatory variables in both	regression model	S

Variables	Measurement	Description
Per capita cultivated land	Mu/person (mu=1/15 ha)	Area of per capita cult ivated land in the village
Labors	Persons	Number of total labors (the person aged betwe en 16-60) in the village
Percent of educated labors	%	Percent of labo rs with high-school or higher education levels in the village
No. of off-farm labors	Persons	Number of labors who do off -farm jobs outside the village for at least three months per year
Percent of off-farm labors	%	Percent of labors who do off -farm jobs outside the village for at least three months per year
Labor price	RMB/day	Daily wage of hiring a labor in the village
Distance to Beijing	Kilometers	40, 60, 80, 100, or 140 kilomet ers
Distance to county	Kilometers	Distance from the village administration office to the county government location
Distance to all -year road	Kilometers	Distance from the village administration office to the county -level standard road
Rural periodi c market	Dummy (0 or 1)	Whether majority of villagers go to rural periodic market: 1 is yes, 0 is no
Well depth	Meters	Average depth of wells in the village (depth from the ground th e water surfac e)
No. of agricultural brokers	Persons	Number of agricu ltural brokers in the village
No. of private businesses	Households	Number of households that own small private bus iness with less than 7 employees (such as taxi driver, or small shops in the village, not including agricultural brokers)
New processi ng factory	Factories	Number of newly established agricultural process ing factories in the past five years in the village
New county road project	Dummy (0 or 1)	Whether the new county -level road was built in the village in the past five years: 1 is yes, 0 is no.
New irrigation project	Dummy (0 or 1)	Whether the new irrigation project (with more than 10,000 RMB investment) was implemented in the village in the past five years: 1 is yes, 0 is no.
Number of Vehicles	Vehicles	Number of transportation vehicles (i neluding trucks, tractors and agricultural -pickups) in the village
Number of Managers	Dummy (0 or 1)	Whether someone the people of the village does management jobs in ag ricultural processing factories, s upermarket or export-oriented factories: 1 is yes, 0 is no.
Cell phone signal availability	Dummy (0 or 1)	Whether cell phone signal is available in the village

Note: data is 2004 data if no specific denotat ions.

	Dependent variable : ratio of crops							
	Vegetable	Fruits	Farm nuts	Grain				
Per capita c ultivated land	0.382 (0.14)***	-0.088 (0.12)*	-0.485 (0.25)**	0.489 (0.29)*				
Number of labor ers	0.005 (0.003)*	-0.00002 (0.0002)	-0.002 (0.001)**	0.0002 (0.0004)				
The average depth of wells	-0.002 (0.003)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.016 (0.01)*	0.007 (0.003)***				
Percent of educated labors	2.945 (1.81)*	-0.745 (1.53)	0.939 (1.62)	-6.325 (2.15)***				
Distant to Beijing	-0.007 (0.004)*	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.004)	0.0004 (0.004)				
Distant to the town	-0.0004 (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.001)				
Cell phone signal availability	-0.072 (0.60)	-0.231 (0.48)	-0.279 (0.43)	0.544 (0.61)				
New county road project	-0.303 (0.33)	-0.024 (0.27)	0.223 (0.29)	0.606 (0.48)				
Rural periodic market	0.584 (0.35)*	-0.575 (0.31)*	-0.351 (0.31)	0.451 (0.38)				
New irrigation project	-0.146 (0.26)	-0.465 (0.24)*	-0.015 (0.29)	0.774 (0.31)**				
No. of off-farm labors	0.0004 (0.0005)	-0.001 (0.01)	0.001 (0.002)	0.003 (0.002)				
No. of agricultural brokers	-0.008 (0.004)*	-0.001 (0.002)	0.0003 (0.003)	-0.007 (0.002)***				
Constant	-0.778 (0.88)	1.940 (0.82)**	0.47 (0.77)	-1.080 (0.99)				
Log likelihood	-102.96	-127.89	-62.51	-28.15				
Observations	198	198	198	198				

Table 6 **Crop composition determinants**

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. * Significant at 10%. ** Significant at 5%. *** Significant at 1%.

Table 7

Estimation of simultaneous technology and market channel equations

Vegetable			Fruit		
	Technology index	Market channel index		Technology index	Market c hannel index
Technology index		-0.151 (0.38)	Technology index		0.027 (021)
Market channel index	2.152 (1.18)*		Market channel index	1.113 (0.64)*	
Per capita cultivated l and	-0.557 (0.27)**	0.275 (0.16)**	Per capita cultivated 1 and	0.084 (0.25)	0.049 (0.12)
Percent of educated labors	0.807 (2.24)	-1.561 (0.56)***	Percent of educated labors	1.997 (2.21)	-0.661 (0.97)
Labor price	0.071 (0.06)	0.008 (0.03)	Number of labors	-0.0004 (0.001)	0.00002 (0.001)
Distance to Beijing	-0.020 (0.01)**	0.005 (0.01)	Distance to Beijing	-0.011 (0.01)	0.001 (0.002)
Distance to county	0.002 (0.003)	0.0005 (0.002)	Distance to county	-0.013 (0.01)*	0.006 (0.003)*
Distance to all -year road	-0.019 (0.06)	-0.059 (0.04)	Distance to all -year road	-0.001 (0.01)	
Rural periodic market	0.856 (0.60)	0.012 (0.24)	Rural Periodic market	-0.038 (0.57)	-0.113 (0.19)
Well depth	-0.007 (0.01)		Well depth	0.004 (0.003)*	
No. of private businesses		-0.001 (0.01)	No. of private businesses		-0.0008 (0.0004)*
No. of agricultural brokers		0.030 (0.03)	No. of agricultural brokers		0.005 (0.002)**
Percent of off-farm labors		1.669 (0.81)**	Percent of off-farm labors		0.249 (0.48)
New proce ssing factories		0.142 (0.23)	Number of Vehicles		-0.001 (0.0008)*
New county road project		0.056 (0.24)	Number of Managers		0.568 (0.16)***
New irrigation project		0.020 (0.17)			
Inverse Mills ratio	0.465 (0.58)	0.103 (0.29)	Inverse Mills ratio	1.494 (2.53)	-0.720 (0.86)
Constant	-0.384 (2.11)	-0.085 (0.91)	Constant	1.017 (0.69)	0.238 (0.81)
Observations	46	51	Observations	100	100
R^2	0.13	0.13	R^2	0.13	0.28
<i>F-test</i> value	1.66	2.39	<i>F-test</i> value	3.02	6.13

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. * Significant at 10%. ** Significant at 5%. *** Significant at 1%.