A study on price spread and marketing efficiency of fish marketing in Nalgonda, Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts of Telangana

ABSTRACT

Aim: To study marketing of fish in Nalgonda, Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts of Telangana state.

Study Design: The study was conducted in Nalgonda, Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts of Telangana state during the year 2019-20. Nalgonda district was purposively selected as it has highest area under fish farming in Telangana. Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts were part of undivided Nalgonda district before formation of new districts in Telangana in 2016. Hence, they were also included in the study.

Methodology:A sample of 60 fish farmers and 30 market intermediaries were randomly selected for the study. Primary data was collected from respondents using pre-tested questionnaire by survey method. Price spread, producers share in consumer rupee and marketing efficiency of fish were computed.

Results: Three marketing channels were found prominent for marketing of fish viz., Channel 1 (Fish farmer⇨ Commission Agent/Trader⇨Wholesaler at Hyderabad⇨Retailer at Hyderabad⇨ Consumer), Channel 2 (Fish farmer⇨ Commission Agent/Trader ⇨ Wholesaler at Kolkata ⇨Retailer at Kolkata ⇨ Consumer) and Channel 3 (Fish farmer ⇨ Commission Agent/Trader ⇨ Vendor ⇨Consumer). Among the three channels, Channel 3 was found highly efficient with marketing efficiency of 2.04 % followed by Channel 1 (1.80%) and least for Channel 2 (1.33%).

Conclusion: Creating local demand for fish, encouraging fish farmers to form into co-operatives and bringing awareness in producers and consumers on daily prices of various fish species will help in developing the marketing of fish.

Comment [SC1]: Could be brief enough

Keywords:Fish, marketing channel, marketing efficiency, price spread

UNDER PEER REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

India is the third largest fish producing country contributing 7 % to the global fish production. The country had produced 10.43 MMT of inland fish and 3.72 MMT of marine fish in the year 2020.[1] Telangana was newly formed land locked state where only inland fish production exists. Though the state is landlocked with no coastal line, it is the third largest inland water resource territory in the country with a total water spread area of 6,55,005 hectares which comprises of reservoirs and tanks. Fish production in the state had increased from 2.60 lakh tonnes to 3.76 lakh tonnes from the year 2014 to 2021with compound annual growth rate of 5.42 %.

Fish is the most perishable product, which has to be marketed either live or fresh. Market price of fish is determined by freshness, species and availability of fish in the market.[2] Thus much emphasis should be given for marketing of fish to reduce spoilage. Compared to achievements in fish production the fish marketing system is very poor and highly inefficient in India [3]. Fish marketing is crucial for achieving the target efficient production system and consumer satisfaction. [4] Growth of fish production and development of fisheries sectordepends largely on an efficient marketing system.[5] However very few studies are available on production and marketing of inland fish in Telangana. With this brief background, this study aimed to analyse price spread and marketing efficiency of various channel involved in marketing of fish.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study was carried out inNalgonda,Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts of Telangana state. Nalgonda district was purposively selected as it has highest area underfish

farming. Suryapet and YadadriBhuvanagiri districts were part of undivided Nalgonda district before formation of new districts in Telangana in 2016. Hence, they were also included in the study. The list of fish farmers for the study area was obtained from department of Fisheries, Telangana and a sample of 60 fish farmers were selected using proportionate random sampling method. A sample of 30 intermediaries were randomly selected which include wholesalers, retailers, vendors. Thus, sample size consists of 90 respondents. Primary data was collected from respondents using pre-tested questionnaire by survey method. Marketing efficiency, Price spread and Producer's share in Consumer rupee was estimated by employing following statistical tools.

Comment [SC2]: Explain the methodology in a lucid manner, Why only 90 respondents were selected so?

2.1 Marketing Cost

$MC = Cf + Cm1 + Cm2 + Cm3 + \cdots + Cmi$
Where,
MC= Total cost of marketing
Cf = Cost incurred by the farmer
Cmi = Cost incurred by the different intermediaries in the process of marketing of fish

2.2 Marketing Margin

MM=Pr-(Pp+Cm)
Where,
MM= Marketing margin
Pr = Price received by the intermediary (Sale price)
Pp = Purchase price of the intermediary
Cm = Cost incurred by the intermediary

2.3 Marketing Efficiency Analysis

The marketing efficiency was estimated by using the Acharya approach by Acharya and Agarwal (2001).[6] In this approach the ratio of price received by the fish farmer to the sum of marketing costs and marketing margins used as measure of marketing efficiency.

MME= FP/(MC+MM)

Where,
MME = Modified measure of marketing efficiency
FP = Price received by fish farmer
MC = Marketing costs
MM = Marketing margins

2.4 Price Spread

Price spread refers to the difference between price paid by the consumer and price received by the producer for equivalent quantity of the farm product. Price spread consists of marketing costs and margins of the intermediaries. It gives fair idea about relative efficiency of various marketing system and channels.

2.5 Producer's Share in Consumer's Rupee

The ratio of price received by the producer to the price paid by consumer is known as producers share in consumer rupee.

$$Producers\ share\ in\ consumer\ rupee = \frac{Net\ price\ received\ by\ producer}{Price\ paid\ by\ consumer}\ X\ 100$$

UNDER PEER REVIEW

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are 3 major marketing channels observed in the study area, through which fish reached the ultimate consumer. The different marketing channels observed were as follows.

a. **Channel 1:**Fish farmer --- Commission Agent/Trader --- Wholesaler at Hyderabad --- Retailer at Hyderabad --- Consumer
b. **Channel 2:**Fish farmer --- Commission Agent/Trader --- Wholesaler at Kolkata ---Retailer at Kolkata --- Consumer
c. **Channel 3:**Fish farmer --- Commission Agent/Trader ---Vendor --- Consumer

In the study area, most of the fish were marketed to Hyderabad and Kolkata indicated by Channel 1 and 2. In Channel 3, the fish was marketed in nearby villages through vendors. Direct marketing of fish from producers to consumes was negligible. Price spread, Producers share in consumer rupeewere calculated for all the three marketing channels and indicated in the Table 1 ,while marketing efficiency was indicated in Table 2.

Comment [SC3]: Add arrows for easy understanding

3.1 Price Spread

The price spread for Channel 1, 2 and 3 are given in the Table 1. The price spread was less for Channel 3 when compared to other channels as it involved a smaller number of intermediaries.

3.2 Marketing Margin

From Table 1, it can be observed that in Channel 1, the commission agents received the higher margin per Kg of fish (₹ 8.00) followed by retailers (₹ 5.94) and wholesalers (₹ 3.68). In Channel 2, similarly the commission agents received the higher margin per Kg of fish (₹ 12.00) followed by retailers (₹ 10.00) and wholesalers (₹ 6.00). While in Channel 3 Vendor received highest margin (₹ 10.60) than commission agents (₹ 9.76).

3.3 Producer's Share in Consumer's Rupee

Producer share in consumer rupee was found to be highest for Channel 3 (67.36 %) followed by Channel 1 (64.34 %) and 2 (57.17 %) respectively. There was less number of market intermediaries in the Channel 3 which resulted in the higher producers share in the consumer rupee.

Table 1. Marketing costs, margin and price spread of different fish marketing channels

Particulars (₹/Kg)	Channel 1	Channel 2	Channel 3
Farmer selling price/Commission agent purchase price	98.82	98.82	98.82
Cost incurred by commission agent	13.77	19.17	12.61
Margin	8.00	12.00	9.76
Commission agent selling price	120.59	129.99	120.59
Cost incurred by Wholesaler	12.32	12.25	-
Margin	3.68	6.00	-
Wholesaler selling price/Retailer purchase price	136.59	148.24	-
Cost incurred by Retailer	11.06	14.61	-
Margin	5.94	10.00	-
Retailer selling price	153.59	172.85	-
Cost incurred by vendor	-	-	15.51
Margin	-	-	10.60

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Vendors selling price	-	-	146.70
Consumers purchase price	153.59	172.85	146.70
Price spread	54.77	74.03	47.88
Producer's share in Consumer'sRupee	64.34	57.17	67.36

3.4 Marketing Efficiency

The marketing efficiencies were calculated for marketing channels identified in the study area using Acharya approach (modified measure of marketing efficiency) and represented in the Table 2. The marketing efficiency was found highest for Channel 3 (2.04%) followed by Channel 1 (1.80%) and least for Channel 2 (1.33%). Thus, Channel 3 was found to be most efficient and Channel 2 as least efficient one.

Table 2. Marketing efficiency of different fish marketing channels

Sl. No	Particulars	Channel 1	Channel 2	Channel 3
1	Marketing Cost	37.15	46.03	28.12
2	Marketing margin	17.62	28	20.36
3	Price received by farmer	98.82	98.82	98.82
4	Marketing efficiency	1.80	1.33	2.04
5	Rank	II	III	I

These results are similar to the findings of Raj *et al*.[7,8] who also reported that the marketing efficiency was highest for the shortest marketing channel with less number of intermediaries.

4. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that Chanel 3 was the most efficient with marketing efficiency of 2.04. It was found that as the number of market intermediaries increases, the marketing efficiency of the channel decreases there by reducing the producers share in consumer rupee. Thus, encouraging farmers to form into co-operatives, creating awareness to increase consumption of fish in rural areas will create domestic demand by which market can be developed in the local areas. It is also necessary to bring awareness among the producers and sellers about "Fish Market Price Information System" (FMPIS) project implemented by National Fisheries Development Board (NFDB) which aims at developing price stability for the traded commercially important fish species, developing e-trading facilitating platform and facilitate better marketability for fisher/sellerand accessibility for consumer or buyer of fish.

Comment [SC4]: Make an effective conclusion and indicate the future scope

REFERENCES

1. Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying. Handbook on Fisheries Statistics, Government of India, New Delhi; 2020.
2. Salim Sultan. Fish marketing in Uttar Pradesh: An overview, In: Souvenir, national Workshop on Development of Strategies for Domestic Marketing of Fish and Fishery products.7-8 Feb. 2008 at CoFSc., SVV University, Muthukur.
3. Ganesh Kumar B, Datta K.K, Joshi P.K,Katiha P.K, Suresh R, Ravisankar T., Ravindranath K. and Muktha Menon. Domestic fish marketing in India – Changing structure, conduct, performance and policies, Agricultural Economics Research Review (Conference Issue.),2008; 21: 345 - 354.
4. Upadhyay A.D,Jagpal and Roy Piyashi Deb. Structural performance of fish market and socio-economic status of market functionaries of Naveen Machhali Mandi Mahanva of Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh. Economic Affairs.2016; 61(3):511-518.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

5. Shyam S Salim, Stanley L, Athira NR, Lakshmanadinesh K. Species diversity across Fish markets in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana. Indian Journal of Economics and Development. 2021; 9(4):1-9.

6. Acharya S.S. and Agarwal N.N., Agricultural Marketing in India, 4th ed. Oxford and IBH Publishing; 2004.

7. Raj B Mohan Uday, MY Teggi and SY Mukartal. A study on price spread and marketing efficiency of inland fish marketing in Northern dry zone of Karnataka. The Pharma Innovation. 2022; 11(4):986-900.

8. Hatte V.M, Prakash S, Krishnan M, Kumar N.R,Gawa S and Patil S.V. Efficiency and performance of Inland Fish markets in Nanded District of Maharashtra: A supply chain Approach. International Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences.2017; 5(4):1936-1944.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Comment [SC5]: Kindly follow the author guidelines and update