

FACTORS DETERMINING MARKETING OF PADDY DURING COVID-19 REGIME IN ANDHRA PRADESH

Comment [D1]: Re-write
It is not appropriate according to the presented text

Comment [D2]: , INDIA

Abstract: Rice is the major food crop. In A.P during COVID-19 marketing of rice was affected by factors like lack of accessibility to market, scarcity of labour and high transportation cost which led to farmgate sales and resulted in the reduction of farmers income. Multistage sampling was used for the study. In India, Andhra Pradesh was selected. West Godavari district from the state, three mandals from the district and two villages from each mandal were selected based on the area of paddy. About 120 farmers from all villages were selected to collect the necessary information. Ordinal logistic regression was used to evaluate the factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 using STATA software. The results of the study revealed that non-availability of storage facility, labour scarcity and availability of transportation facility were the major factors. Marketing of produce can be done through formation of effective FPO's by strengthening the market linkages.

Comment [D3]: Where??
Or in India.

Comment [D4]: ??

Comment [D5]: Why??

Key words: COVID-19, Paddy Marketing, Ordinal Logistic Regression.

Comment [D6]: According to the journal guidelines >3

Introduction

In Andhra Pradesh, West Godavari district ranked first in rice with an area of 1.7 million hectares, with a production of 2.65 million tonnes production and with 6723 kg ha⁻¹ productivity (Agricultural Statistics at a glance, 2019-2020). Marketing of rice was majorly affected by the lockdown imposed during COVID-19 since the harvesting period coincided with the restrictions on the movement of people and machinery. The constraints viz., lack of accessibility to market, scarcity of labour due to social distancing measures, high transportation costs due to restrictions on transport and non-availability of the market information were also experienced by the rice farmers. Heavy losses of life due to the disease prolonged lockdowns, shutdowns, and other protection measures necessitated by the COVID-19 pandemic gave an additional blow, where the society has witnessed a severe disruption to the upstream (input supply and production), midstream (processing, marketing, and logistics), and downstream (retail and consumption) segments of the paddy value chain (IRRI, 2020). Significant decline in the availability of pesticides, fertilizers, and seeds was reported due to restrictions on the movement of vehicles, closure of shops and markets. Keeping in view of the above facts present study was designed to analyse the factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 Regime in West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh.

Comment [D7]: It is missing in the Reference list.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling Design

Multistage sampling design was adopted for selection of sample at different levels of district, mandal and village for the present study. In Andhra Pradesh, West Godavari district was selected for the study as it possessed the highest area and production under rice with 1.7

million hectares and 2.65 million tonnes respectively (Agricultural Statistics at a glance 2019-2020). Three mandals were selected i.e., Tadepalligudem, Ungutur and Pentapadu based on the highest area under paddy with 21.68 thousand hectares, 19.91 thousand hectares and 18.58 thousand hectares respectively. Two villages were selected from each mandal based on highest area thus making a total of 6 villages for the present study. From Unguturmandal, Ungutur and Chebrol, from Pentapadumandal, Darsiparru and Jatlapalem and from Tadepalligudemmandal Jagannadhapuram and Madhavaram villages were selected. Twenty farmers from each selected villages were randomly selected, thus comprising a total of 120 farmers.

Comment [D8]: Why Two? Any justification, please mention.

Comment [D9]: What was the criteria for random selection?

Comment [D10]: What was the procedure of sample size calculation?

What was the margin of error?

What was the population size?

Comment [D11]: What was the reliability score? Is it calculated?

Methods of Data Collection

The data necessary for selection of district, mandals and villages were collected from secondary source. The primary data was collected from the sample farmers through a pre-tested and well-designed questionnaire developed for the study. The secondary data pertaining to the area, production and productivity of the rice cultivation in the selected district for the year 2019-20 were collected from the Agriculture Statistics at glance 2019-2020.

Methods of Data Analysis

An ordinal logistic regression model was employed to analyse the determinants of paddy marketing during post COVID-19 regime. An ordinal logistic regression model determines the association among variables of interest. It is an extension of standard logistic regression. An ordinal regression model assumes that a dependent variable has categories which have a meaningful sequential order (Grilli and Rampichini, 2014). The response variable Y has three groups (1,2,3) then the ordered multiple response models assume the following relationship:

$$\text{Logit} = p[(Y \leq j - 1/X)] = \alpha_j + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_p X_p$$

Where, j= 1,2 and 3.

Comment [D12]: Please clear the sub-script typos

The ordinal logistic regression model is given as

$$P_1 = \frac{\exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p)}{1 + \exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p)}$$

$$P_2 = \frac{\exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p) + p_1}{1 + \exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$P_3 = \frac{\exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p) + p_2}{1 + \exp(\alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_p X_p)}$$

$$P_1 + P_2 + P_3 = 1$$

Where, P_1 is the probability of $P(Y=1)$,

P_2 is the probability of $P(Y=2)$ and

P_3 is the probability of $P(Y=3)$.

α_j = is the threshold or cut points

Comment [D13]: Please also note the capital and small alphabet characters in typing

X_i = Independent variables as described in table 1. for factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 regime in Andhra Pradesh.

ε = is the error term

The maximum loss of income in the study area was observed 30% hence the dependent variable income was categorized into three groups (Y_1 = Income decreased by < 10 per cent considered Low, Y_2 = Income decreased by 10 to 20 per cent considered as Medium and Y_3 = income decreased by 20 to 30 per cent considered as High) based on the degree of decrease in the income when compared to the past three years average income of the sample farmers. The ordinal logistic regression model was performed by using STATA software.

Results and Discussions

The factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 regime were analysed by using Ordinal Logistic Regression and the results were presented in Table 2. It was observed that the model was well fitted as the pseudo-R-Square value was found to be 0.3417, which indicated the denial of null hypothesis. That entire coefficients in the model were equal to zero. Therefore, parallel with Hensher *et al.* (2005) criterion for best fit model (Values of pseudo R^2 between 0.2 and 0.4 are considered as to strongly fit), The overall fit of the ordinal logistic regression model (0.3417) was found to be extremely good. Also, from the outcomes, Chi-Square statistics showed that the parameters included in the model were significantly diverse from zero at 1% level.

Assessed coefficients after an ordered logistic regression were hard to infer as they are in log-odds units; as such, the marginal effects were considered. Marginal effects were interpreted relative to the category and sign. A positive coefficient for a category indicates an increase in that variable increases the probability of being in that category, whereas, a negative coefficient indicates a decrease in probability of being in that category.

It could be observed from the results that the variables non-availability of storage facility and Labour scarcity were significant at 1% level, other variables *viz.*, restrictions on the movement of produce, availability of transportation facility and access to market information were significant at 5% level. Marginal effects for each category were calculated. It could be observed from the marginal effects that except for the availability of transportation facility and access to market information all the other variables have negative and significant impact on income levels. The base category which was taken for interpretation was the low impact category.

Non-availability of storage facility

Comment [D14]: ??

X_i

Comment [D15]: How?? It is not mentioned in the Logit Model.

Comment [D16]: $Y=1$ or Y_1

Not clear

Decrease in Income –Not Clear

What was the procedure to calculate decreased in Income?

The results revealed that non-availability of storage facility was negatively significant at 1% level, the marginal effect of the non-availability of storage facility to the farmers during COVID-19 regime implies that, other things remain constant, a unit increase in non-availability of storage facility led to the probability of being in low income loss level decreased by 24.89 per cent, whereas, the probability of being in medium and high income loss level increased by about 9.36 per cent and 15.53 per cent respectively. The negative marginal effect was mainly due to the peak harvesting period of paddy that was coincided with the restriction on movement of vehicles as well as persons exerted a need to store the produce, majority of the farmers in the study area was small and marginal farmers, so due to lack of storage facility they have sold their produce lower than the Minimum Support Price (MSP) at their fields itself to the middlemen's/rice millers and that has reduced the farmers income.

Restrictions on movement of produce

The results revealed that restrictions on the movement of produce was negatively significant at 5% level, the marginal effect of the restrictions on movement of produce during COVID-19 regime implied that, other things remaining constant, a unit increase in restrictions on movement of produce led to the probability of being in low income loss level decreased by 82.89 per cent, whereas, the probability of being in medium and high income loss level increased by about 49.36 per cent and 33.53 per cent respectively. The negative effect of restrictions on movement of produce was mainly due to, imposition of complete lockdown by the government which included restrictions on the movement of harvested produce. With the fear of decreasing in anticipated prices and due to lack of proper storage facilities farmers had sold their produce at lower prices which led to decrease in income level of the farmers.

Labour scarcity

The results revealed that labour scarcity was negatively significant at 1% level, the marginal effect of the labour scarcity implied that, other things remaining constant, a unit increase in labour scarcity led to the probability of being in low-income loss level decreased by 37.36 per cent, whereas, the probability of being of medium and high-income loss level increased by about 16.01 per cent and 21.35 per cent respectively. labour scarcity especially during peak harvesting season and for loading and unloading the produce during transaction process adversely affected their income realization.

Availability of transportation facility

The results revealed that availability of transportation facility was positively significant at 5% level, the marginal effect of the availability of transportation facility implied that, other things remaining constant, a unit increase in availability of

transportation facility led to the probability of being in low-income loss level increased by 17.64 per cent, whereas, the probability of being in medium and high-income loss level decreased by about 2.70 per cent and 14.94 per cent respectively. This is due to the fact that, the better transportation facility offers place utility so that the farmers can sell their produce at the distant markets which may offer high prices ultimately increases the farmers income.

Access to market information

The results revealed that access to market information was positively significant at 5% level, the marginal effect of the access to market information implied that, other things remaining constant, a unit increase in access to market information led to the probability of being in low-income loss level increased by 30.81 per cent, whereas, the probability of being in medium and high-income loss level decreased by about 15.65 per cent and 46.46 per cent respectively. This is due to the better access to market information enables the farmers to be aware of the prices and sell their produce at maximum price to get more income.

Similarly, the direct benefit cash transfer scheme (YSR RythuBharosa-PM Kisan Scheme) also helped the farmers significantly to procure quality inputs, higher yields and thereby income. It could be observed that better market linkages, access to market information, access to good storage and transportation facilities have exerted positive and significant influence on incomes of farmers during COVID-19 regime. These findings signify the importance of collective marketing of farm produce by the farmers, as they can transact large quantum of marketable surplus through realizing the economies of scale. Further, strengthening the market linkages of farmers should deserve prime attention and in this context formation of FPOs in the study area play a very crucial role.

Conclusion

Ordinal Logistic Regression was employed to study the factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 regime in West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh by using STATA software. The results of the study revealed that the variables such as non-availability of storage facility and labour scarcity were significant at 1%. Other variables *viz.*, restrictions on the movement of produce, availability of transportation facility and access to market information were significant at 5%. Marginal effects were calculated for each category, it could be observed that except for the availability of transportation facility and access to market information all the other significant variables had negative impact on income level *viz.*, Strengthening the market linkages, promoting online and e-NAM marketing, marketing of produce through formation of effective FPO's, constructing storage facilities at rural/mandal level, buying the

harvest produce at farmer's fields, Increasing transportation facilities should be increased by constructing roads, providing transport vehicles to the distant villages by connecting the major cities, disseminating correct and reliable market information to the farmers may lead to effective marketing of rice during COVID-19.

REFERENCES

- Agricultural Statistics at a glance 2019-2020, Andhra Pradesh, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, DAC and FW.
- Alemu, T. (2015). Determinants of wheat yield variation of smallholders in South Eastern Ethiopia: application of ordered logistic regression. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*, 4(3), 61-66.
- Baffoe, J. D., Mizunoya, T., & Yabar, H. (2021). Determinants of Rice Farmers' Willingness to Pay for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Swampy Wetlands in Ghana's Northern and Ashanti Regions. *Agriculture*, 11(6), 507.
- Chiphang, S., and Singh, R. (2020). Livelihood Security Determinants of the Organic Farm Household in Sikkim, India: Ordered Logistic Regression Approach. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 39(20), 138-143.
- Das, S., & Rahman, R. M. (2011). Application of ordinal logistic regression analysis in determining risk factors of child malnutrition in Bangladesh. *Nutrition journal*, 10(1), 1-11.
- Directorate of Economics and Statistics, DAC and FW,
<https://eands.dacnet.nic.in/PDF/At%20a%20Glance%202019%20Eng.pdf>
- Grilli, L and C. Rampichini. [2014]. Ordered Logit Model. *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. AC Michalos.
- Hensher, D. A., Rose, J. M., Rose, J. M., & Greene, W. H. (2005). *Applied choice analysis: a primer*. Cambridge university press.
- Jega, A. A., Man, N., AbdLatiff, I., and Wong, K. K. S. (2018). Flood Disaster Effect on Smallholder Farmers' Food Security in Kelantan: An Ordered Logistic Regression Analysis. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science*. 11(3): 42-50.
- NABARD, 2020.
{<https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID.pdf>}
- Najafabadi, M. O., Mirdamadi, S. M., and Najafabadi, A. T. P. (2011). Ordinal Logistic Regression to Design an Efficient Mobile Training System from Iranian Experts' Point of View. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 34, 89-96.
- Nguyen, P., Nguyen, T., & Nguyen, M. (2020). An analysis of factors affecting residents' perception of peri-urban agriculture in Hanoi, Vietnam. *Management Science Letters*, 10(15), 3469-3476.
- Ojo, I. O. (2019). Ologit analysis of determinants of vulnerability to food insecurity by cocoa farming households in Southern Asunafo, Republic of Ghana. *Agricultural and resource economics: international scientific e-journal*, 5(3), 31-46.
- Season and crop report, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, GoAP, 2018-19.

Comment [D17]: Typing:-
Follow the journal guidelines and maintain the symmetry in standard pattern.

Please check, some of the References are not mentioned in the text.

Comment [D18]: () ??

Table 1. Description of variables used in Ordinal Logistic Regression - factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19

| S. No | Variable | Description |
|-------|--|--|
| 1. | Y = Income (Dependent variable) | Y ₁ = Low Y ₂ = Medium Y ₃ = High |
| 2. | X ₁ = High transportation cost (Increase in transport cost) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 3 | X ₂ = Access to market information (Whether farmers had access to market information or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 4. | X ₃ = Anticipating decline in price of output (Anticipating prices of output) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 5. | X ₄ = Non availability of storage facility (Weather storage facilities available or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 6. | X ₅ = Restrictions on movement of produce (weather there was restriction on movement of product or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 7. | X ₆ = Labour scarcity (Labour scarcity during COVID-19 regime) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 8. | X ₇ = Availability of transportation facility (Weather the transportation facility available or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
| 9. | X ₈ = Cash transfer by Government or any N. G. O (Recovery resource) (Weather the cash transferred by government or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |

Comment [D19]: What was the procedure of calculation of Income

| | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|
| 10. | X_9 = Market linkages (Does the farmer have any marketing linkages or not) | 1 = Yes 0 = No |
|-----|---|-------------------|

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 2. Ordinal Logistic Regression co-efficients for evaluating factors determining marketing of paddy during COVID-19 regime

| Number of observations = 120 LR chi2(9) = 85.27 Probability > chi2 = 0.0000 Log likelihood = -82.13913 Pseudo R2 = 0.3417 | | | | | | | Marginal effects | | |
|---|---------|-----------|---------|----------|----------------------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|
| Income | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P> z | [95% Conf. Interval] | | Low | Medium | High |
| Market linkages | -0.3531 | 0.8872 | -0.4000 | 0.6910 | -2.0920 | 1.3858 | 0.0478 | -0.0166 | -0.0312 |
| High transportation cost | 0.4658 | 0.5846 | 0.8000 | 0.4260 | -0.6800 | 1.6115 | -0.0714 | 0.0360 | 0.0353 |
| Anticipating decline in prices of output | 1.9559 | 1.2426 | 1.5700 | 0.1150 | -0.4796 | 4.3913 | -0.3532 | 0.2300 | 0.1232 |
| Non -availability of storage facility | 1.7418 | 0.4547 | 3.8300 | 0.0001** | 0.8505 | 2.6330 | -0.2489 | 0.0936 | 0.1553 |
| Restrictions on movement of produce | 5.0838 | 1.4227 | 3.5700 | 0.0201* | 2.2953 | 7.8723 | -0.8289 | 0.4936 | 0.3353 |
| Labour scarcity | 2.4575 | 0.4969 | 4.9500 | 0.0022** | 1.4837 | 3.4313 | -0.3736 | 0.1601 | 0.2135 |
| Cash transfer by Government | -0.9219 | 0.8408 | -1.1000 | 0.2730 | -2.5699 | 0.7262 | 0.1190 | -0.0310 | -0.0880 |
| Availability of transportation facility | -1.4355 | 0.4876 | 2.9400 | 0.0530* | 0.4800 | 2.3911 | -0.1764 | 0.0270 | 0.1494 |
| Access to market information | -3.1757 | 1.3679 | -2.3200 | 0.0230* | -5.8566 | -0.4947 | 0.3081 | 0.1565 | -0.4646 |
| /cut1 | 3.2387 | 0.7871 | | | 1.6960 | 4.7813 | | | |
| /cut2 | 7.1088 | 1.0537 | | | 5.0437 | 9.1740 | | | |

Note: ** - Significant at 1% level; * - Significant at 5% level